THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

ary

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

620158

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

THIRD SERIES:

COMMENCING WITH THE ACCESSION OF

WILLIAM IV.

48° VICTORIÆ, 1884-5.

VOL. CCXCVI.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM

THE TWENTIETH DAY OF MARCH, 1885,

TO

THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF APRIL, 1885.

FOURTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1884-5.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY CORNELIUS BUCK,
AT THE OFFICE FOR "HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,"
22, PATERNOSTER ROW. [E.C.]

1885.

8995

BIBL.
LONDIN.
UNIV.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CCXCVI.

THIRD SERIES.

LORDS, FRIDAY, MARCH 20.

Page

PARLIAMENT — ADJOURNMENT—THE EASTER RECESS — Observations, Earl Granville 1

EGYPT (FINANCE, &c.)—COST OF THE ARMY OF OCCUPATION—Question, Observations, The Earl of Jersey; Reply, The Earl of Morley .. 2

OPENING OF MUSEUMS ON SUNDAYS—THE NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM, SOUTH KENSINGTON—RESOLUTION—

Moved to resolve, "That whereas a considerable majority of the Trustees of the British Museum present at a general meeting on the 17th of January last specially called to consider the question, voted in favour of opening the Natural History Museum at South Kensington on Sunday afternoons; and whereas it is desirable to afford the working classes of London such further opportunities of instruction, recreation, and enjoyment as they would obtain thereby, and as are already conceded in Manchester, Birmingham, Stoke-upon-Trent, Dublin, Newcastle, Middlesbro', and other centres of industry; that, for the above and for other reasons affecting the health and happiness, the morality and sobriety, of the working classes of London, this House is of opinion that the time has now come to support the decision taken by the Trustees of the British Museum in regard to this question,"—(*The Lord Thurlow*) 7

Amendment *moved*,

To leave out all the words after ("That") and insert ("the Trustees of the British Museum having applied to the Treasury for the funds necessary to light up the Natural History Museum with the electric light, and having lighted up the Reading Room of the British Museum with the electric light till eight o'clock at night for several years with 'very satisfactory results,' and having obtained estimates for lighting the whole of the British Museum at night with electricity, and bearing in mind that the South Kensington Museum has been opened till ten o'clock at night for twenty-eight years, and been visited at night by 6,885,722 persons, and that the Bethnal Green Museum has been opened at night for twelve years, and been visited in the evenings by 3,567,278 persons, and that a Parliamentary Committee has recommended 'That the British Museum and National Gallery should be opened on week-day evenings between the hours of seven and ten in the evening at least three days in the week,' this House is of opinion that the time has arrived when this recommendation should be carried into effect, and the national collections opened on week-day evenings but not on Sundays,")—(*The Earl Cairns.*)

After debate, on Question, whether the words proposed to be left out shall stand part of the Motion? their Lordships *divided;* Contents 64; Not-Contents 64.

Division List, Contents and Not-Contents 34

The numbers being equal, the Not-Contents had it, according to the established Rule.

Amendment (*Earl Cairns*) put, and *agreed to.*

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS—CORRECTION—Question, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon; Answer, Lord Carlingford 36

INDIA — BENGAL TENANCY ACT—THE BENGAL LANDLORDS—Observations, The Earl of Wemyss, The Marquess of Salisbury; Reply, The Earl of Kimberley 36

SCIENCE AND ART—THE NATIONAL GALLERY—THE ANNUAL GRANT—Question, Observations, The Earl of Wemyss; Reply, Lord Thurlow:—Short debate thereon 3

WATER COMPANIES (REGULATION OF POWERS) BILL — NOMINATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE—List of the Committee 40

[7.30.]

COMMONS, FRIDAY, MARCH 20.

QUESTIONS.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—COLONEL FORBES, R.M., BELFAST—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 41

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—COOTEHILL UNION—ROBERT GRAHAM, CLERK TO THE GUARDIANS—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 41

IRELAND—REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS AND DEATHS, BELFAST—Questions, Mr. Biggar; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 41

PHARMACY AND POISONS ACTS (IRELAND)—LEGISLATION—Questions, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Warton; Answers, Mr. Mundella 42

THE ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—FISHING IRREGULARITY, LISBURN DISTRICT —Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 43

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—OFFERS OF MILITARY CO-OPERATION BY INDIAN PRINCES—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross .. 43

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—THE INDIAN CONTINGENT—VETERINARY ARRANGEMENTS—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross .. 44

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—ELECTION OF PETTY SESSIONS CLERK, TOOME BRIDGE DISTRICT, CO. ANTRIM—MR. KELLY—Question, Mr. Small; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 45

INLAND REVENUE (IRELAND)—MR. RICHARD HARVEY, STAMP DISTRIBUTOR AT DROGHEDA—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Hibbert .. 45

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES (IRELAND)—DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Hibbert 46

THE ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—SERGEANT M'CANLEY AND OTHERS—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 46

FRANCE AND CHINA—HOSTILITIES—INTERNATIONAL LAW—THE RIGHT OF SEARCH—Questions, Mr. Gorst, Mr. Bourke; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 47

THE NEWSPAPER PRESS (IRELAND)—THE "UNITED IRELAND"—OFFENSIVE CARTOONS—Questions, Mr. Beresford, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman; Question, Mr. Sexton [no reply] .. 48

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—EXAMINATIONS—Question, Lord Arthur Hill; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington; Question, Sir Herbert Maxwell [no reply] 49

ARMY—THE 5TH ROYAL IRISH LANCERS—Question, Sir Joseph Bailey; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 50

POST OFFICE—THE PARCEL POST HORSES—Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre 50

NAVY—THE ERICSON TORPEDO BOAT—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Caine 50

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (REDISTRIBUTION) BILL—THE BOUNDARY MAPS —Question, Mr. Francis Buxton; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke .. 51

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIAN MISSION TO CABUL—M. LESSAR—Question, Mr. Ashmead Bartlett; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice.. .. 51

[*March* 20.] *Page*

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—PRISONERS OF THE MAHDI—Questions, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 51

CRIMINAL LAW—THE DYNAMITE EXPLOSIONS AT WESTMINSTER HALL—CONSTABLES COLE AND COX—Question, Mr. Fay; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 52

SOUTH AFRICA—SIR CHARLES WARREN'S MISSION—Question, Mr. William Redmond; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley 53

CENTRAL ASIA—THE RUSSIAN RAILWAY FROM THE CASPIAN TO SARAKHS—Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 53

CENTRAL ASIA—THE RUSSO-AFGHAN BOUNDARY—Questions, Mr. Onslow, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 53

EGYPT (AFFAIRS OF THE SOUDAN)—LORD WOLSELEY AND THE SOUDAN—Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 54

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (REDISTRIBUTION) BILL—REPRESENTATION OF THE CITY OF LONDON—Question, Mr. J. G. Hubbard; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 55

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—QUESTIONS TO MINISTERS—Question, Mr. Leake; Answer, Mr. Gladstone.. 56

NEW GUINEA—Questions, Mr. William Redmond; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 57

EGYPT (FINANCE, &C.)—THE INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT—Questions, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Chaplin, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Onslow; Answers, Mr. Gladstone, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 58

ISLANDS OF THE PACIFIC—SAMOA—Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 62

SUPPLY—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES—WAYS AND MEANS—Question, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 63

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—IRISH BILLS—Questions, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 63

EGYPT (EVENTS IN THE SOUDAN)—MR. FRANK POWER—Question, Mr. William Redmond [no reply] 64

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE EAST INDIA (LOAN) BILL—Question, Mr. E. Stanhope; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 65

NAVY—H.M.S. "INFLEXIBLE"—THE 81-TON GUN—Question, Mr. French-Brewster; Answer, Sir Arthur Hayter 65

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE CAPE OF GOOD HOPE (ADVANCE) BILL—Question, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answer, Mr. Hibbert 66

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—o—

Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 49] [Seventh Night]—

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 18th March*] 66

After long time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Monday* next.

SUPPLY—REPORT—ARMY (ANNUAL) BILL—Resolutions [19th March] *reported* 170

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—GENERAL GRAHAM'S ADVANCE—ACTION NEAR SUAKIN—Question, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 170

First Resolution [Numbers] *agreed to.*

Resolution 2 [Pay and Allowances].

Amendment proposed, to leave out "£4,543,000," and insert "£4,043,000," —(*Mr. Labouchere,*)—instead thereof 172

[*March* 20.] *Page*

SUPPLY—REPORT—ARMY (ANNUAL) BILL—*continued.*

Question proposed, "That '£4,543,000' stand part of the said Resolution:"—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 67, Noes 18; Majority 49.—(Div. List No. 74.)

Resolution *agreed to.*

Ordered, That the Resolution, which, upon the 19th day of this instant March, was reported from the Committee of Supply, and then agreed to by the House, be now read; and the same was read, as followeth:—

"That 59,000 men and boys be employed for the Sea and Coast Guard Services for the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, including 12,900 Royal Marines."

Ordered, That leave be given to bring in a Bill to provide, during Twelve Months, for the Discipline and Regulation of the Army; and that The Marquess of HARTINGTON, The JUDGE ADVOCATE, and Sir THOMAS BRASSEY do prepare and bring it in.

Bill [Army (Annual) Bill] *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 104.]

WAYS AND MEANS—REPORT—
Consolidated Fund (No. 2) Bill

Resolutions [March 19] *reported* 178

After debate, Resolutions *agreed to:*—Bill *ordered* (*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Hibbert*); *presented*, and read the first time.

Post Office Sites Bill [Bill 72]—

Bill read a second time, and *committed* to a Select Committee:—Short debate thereon 193

MOTIONS.

POSTAL SERVICE (GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTH AMERICA)—APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE—

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed 'to inquire into the conditions of the Postal Service between Great Britian and North America, and to report what alterations should be made with a view to its improvement,"—(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre*) .. 193

After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

Registration (Occupation Voters) Bill [Bill 63]—

Select Committee *nominated:*—List of the Committee 195

Royal Irish Constabulary Redistribution Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 105] .. 195

Burial Boards (Contested Elections) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Stuart-Wortley, Mr. Arnold Morley*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 106] 195

[2.15.]

LORDS, MONDAY, MARCH 23.

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—MILITARY CO-OPERATION OF THE COLONIES—

Her Majesty's Answer to the Address *brought up*, and read by the Earl Sydney 196

Address and Answer to be *printed* and *published.* (No. 52.)

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—ARTICLES IN THE "TIMES" NEWSPAPER—Question, Observations, The Duke of Marlborough; Reply, Earl Granville 196

Trinity College (*Perpetuity Grants*) *Bill*—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl of Leitrim*) .. 198

After short debate, on Question? their Lordships *divided;* Contents 16, Not-Contents 42; Majority 26.

Resolved in the *negative.*

[*March* 23.] *Page*

Educational Endowments (Ireland) Bill (No. 44)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord President*) .. 207
Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Friday* next.

MINISTER FOR SCOTLAND—SCOTCH NATIONAL SCHOOLS—Question, Observations, The Earl of Minto, The Earl of Fife, The Earl of Aberdeen; Reply, The Earl of Dalhousie 208

Solicitors (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord FitzGerald*); read 1ª (No. 53) .. 212

PRIVATE BILLS—
Ordered, That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after *Friday* the 19*th day of June* next: [and other Orders] .. 212

[7.0.]

COMMONS, MONDAY, MARCH 23.

QUESTIONS.

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS (IRELAND)—ARKLOW BREAKWATER—Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, Mr. Hibbert 213
HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE—CHANCERY DIVISION—Questions, Mr. W. H. Smith, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Tomlinson; Answers, The Attorney General 214
FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACTS, 1876 AND 1877—DISPUTES BETWEEN HEAD SOCIETIES AND BRANCHES—Question, Mr. Tomlinson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 215
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—AYR (LANDWARD) AND AYR (BURGH)—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. Mundella 216
RAILWAYS (INDIA)—BHOPAL, GWALIOR, AND CAWNPORE RAILWAY—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 217
THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—TRIM PETTY SESSIONS—MAJOR TRAILL, R.M., Co. MEATH—Question, Mr. O'Sullivan; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 217
EGYPT (THE MILITARY EXPEDITION)—SMALL-POX—Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 218
LANDLORD AND TENANT (IRELAND)—SIR GILBERT KING'S TENANTS—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 218
LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—DEATH OF DENIS MURPHY—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 219
NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—MODEL SCHOOL AT BAILIEBOROUGH, Co. CAVAN—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 220
NATIONAL SCHOOLS (IRELAND)—TEACHERS' EXAMINATIONS—Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 221
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—BRAILES ENDOWED SCHOOL—A POLITICAL SCHOOLMASTER—Question, Mr. Wills; Answer, Mr. Mundella 221
PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—WORKS AT EASKY AND AUGHRIS—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Hibbert 222
THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—MR. SAMUEL DONALDSON, J.P., Co. DONEGAL—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 223
SUEZ CANAL—THE PROPOSED COMMISSION—Questions, Mr. Norwood, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice; Questions, Mr. Onslow, Mr. Gibson [no reply] 224
SUEZ CANAL—NAVIGATION OF THE CANAL—INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 225
POOR LAW (IRELAND)—ELECTION OF GUARDIANS—DUNFANAGHY UNION—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 225

[*March* 23.] *Page*

India—The Permanent Settlement of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa, 1793—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross .. 226
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—The International Agreement—Questions, Mr. M'Coan, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Gibson; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 227
Parliament—Palace of Westminster—The Smoking Room—Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, Mr. Herbert Gladstone 229
General Gordon's Diaries—Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 230
France and China—Hostilities—International Law—The Right of Search—Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 230
Suspension of Evictions (Scotland) Bill—Question, Mr. Macfarlane; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 230
Central Asia—England and Russia—The Russo-Afghan Frontier—Questions, Mr. Macfarlane, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 231
Fiji—Mortality, &c.—Question, Mr. Cropper; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley 232
Accidents in Mines—Report of the Royal Commission—Question, Mr. J. Lowther; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 232
Central Asia—The Russo-Afghan Frontier—Reported Disturbance at Penjdeh—Question, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 233
Egypt (War in the Soudan)—General Graham's Forces—Action near Suakin (March 22)—Question, Colonel Stanley; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 233
Post Office—Sixpenny Telegrams—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre 234
Palace of Westminster—Westminster Hall (Restoration)—Questions, Sir Herbert Maxwell, Mr. Causton; Answers, Mr. Herbert Gladstone 234
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—The International Agreement—Questions, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Gibson; Answers, Mr. Gladstone .. 235

Adjournment—New Rules of Procedure (Rule 2) (Draft Convention relating to Egyptian Affairs)—
Moved, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Sir Stafford Northcote*) .. 235
After debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—o—

Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 49] [Eighth Night]
Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 20th March*] 266
After long time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow*.

Cape of Good Hope (Advance) Bill [Bill 101]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Hibbert*) .. 347
Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months,"—(*Mr. Monk.*)
Question proposed, "That the word 'now,' stand part of the Question:"
—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*.
Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow*.

Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers) Bill [Bill 99]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Attorney General*) 360
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday*.

[*March* 23.] *Page*

COUNTY OFFICERS AND COURTS (IRELAND) [PENSIONS]—
Considered in Committee.
Moved, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of special pensions to Clerks of the Crown and Clerks of the Peace in Ireland, under certain circumstances,"—(*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman*) 365
After short debate, Resolution *agreed to*; to be reported *To-morrow*.

Army (Annual) Bill [Bill 104]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*The Marquess of Hartington*) 366
After short debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Kenny*:)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.
Original Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday*.

East India (Loan) Bill—Resolution [March 19] *reported*, and *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* (*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Kynaston Cross*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 109] 371

MOTIONS.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 2) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. George Russell, Sir Charles Dilke*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 107] .. 371

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 3) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. George Russell, Sir Charles Dilke*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 108] .. 371

Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 110] .. 372
[2.15.]

LORDS, TUESDAY, MARCH 24.

FRANCE AND CHINA—HOSTILITIES—INTERNATIONAL LAW—RIGHT OF SEARCH—Question, Earl De La Warr; Answer, Earl Granville .. 372

METROPOLITAN IMPROVEMENTS—PARLIAMENT STREET, &c.—MOTION FOR PAPERS—
Moved, "That there be laid before this House, papers relating to the widening of Parliament Street, Charles Street, &c.,"—(*The Lord Lamington*) 373
After short debate, Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn*.

NAVY—TORPEDO BOATS—THE CONTROLLER OF THE NAVY—Questions, Viscount Sidmouth; Answers, The Earl of Northbrook.. .. 376

County Justices Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Earl Beauchamp*): read 1ª (No. 55) .. 377
[5.0.]

COMMONS, TUESDAY, MARCH 24.

QUESTIONS.

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS—BRITISH BARLEY—Question, Mr. Hicks; Answer, Mr. J. Holms 377
LOCAL TAXATION AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT—LEGISLATION—Question, Mr. Duckham; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 378
THE BOUNDARY COMMISSION (SCOTLAND)—INSTRUCTIONS TO THE COMMISSIONERS—Question, Mr. John Hamilton; Answer, The Lord Advocate 378

[*March* 24.] *Page*

AFRICA—WEST AFRICAN SETTLEMENT—SIR SAMUEL ROWE—Question, Sir William M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley 379

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—NON-VESTED NATIONAL SCHOOLS—Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 380

NORTH BORNEO COMPANY — LABUAN — Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley 380

NAVY—H.M.S. "GARNET"—Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Caine .. 381

LAW AND JUSTICE—SENTENCE ON HENRY WILLIAMS AT WINCHESTER ASSIZES—Question, Mr. W. Fowler; Answer, Sir William Harcourt .. 381

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN — PENJDEH—Questions, Mr. M'Coan, Mr. Onslow; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 382

EGYPT (FINANCE, &C.)—REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE—Question, Sir John Lubbock; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 383

TURKEY—THE FRANCO-ENGLISH LOAN OF 1855—THE CONVENTION—Questions, Mr. Gibson; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 383

SUEZ CANAL—THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION—Questions, Mr. Gibson, Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 384

EGYPT (FINANCE, &C.)—RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS—Questions, Lord George Hamilton, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 385

EGYPT (THE MILITARY EXPEDITION)—THE NAVAL BRIGADE — Question, Mr. Brett; Answer, Mr. Caine 386

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—THE GRAND JURY AND THE "FREE FORCE," CO. KILKENNY—Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 387

LOCAL TAXATION AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT—LEGISLATION — Question, Sir Baldwyn Leighton; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 387

EGYPT (FINANCE, &C.)—THE NEW LOAN, 1885—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 388

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSO-AFGHAN FRONTIER COMMISSION—Questions, Mr. E. Stanhope, Sir George Campbell, Mr. Onslow, Sir H. Drummond Wolff, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 389

LUNACY LAWS—RECEPTION OF INSANE PERSONS INTO WORKHOUSES—Question, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answer, Mr. George Russell 390

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—GENERAL GRAHAM'S FORCE—ACTIONS ON THE 20TH AND 22ND MARCH—Questions, Sir Walter B. Barttelot, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington 391

EGYPT—THE SLAVE TRADE IN THE SOUDAN—PRISONERS OF THE MAHDI—Question, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 392

PROTECTION OF YOUNG GIRLS—LEGISLATION—Question, Mr. Cropper; Answer, Sir William Harcourt.. 393

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—RIOT AT NEWRY—TRIAL AND ACQUITTAL OF WILLIAM ORR—Questions, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland 393

ORDER OF THE DAY.

—o—

Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 49] [Ninth Night]

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 23rd March*] 394

After long time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

[*March* 24.] *Page*

MOTIONS.

—o—

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS (VOTING)—APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE—

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and Report on the best mode of Voting in School Board Elections,"—(*Sir John Lubbock*) 517

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*.

National Education (Ireland) Bill—

Motion for Leave (*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman*) 518

After debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Mr. Hibbert*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 111.]

Telegraph Acts Amendment Bill—

Motion for Leave (*Mr. Shaw Lefevre*) 537

Debate *adjourned* till *Thursday*.

Police Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Henry H. Fowler, Secretary Sir William Harcourt, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Hibbert*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 113] 537

County Officers and Courts (Ireland) (Pensions) Bill — Resolution [March 23] *reported*, and *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 112] 537

[2.15.]

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

—o—

Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) (*re-committed*) **Bill**— [Bill 49] [Tenth Night]

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 24th March*] 538

After long time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow*.

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—THE NEGOTIATIONS—Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 621

Public Health (Members and Officers) Bill — *Ordered* (*Sir John Kennaway, Mr. Long, Mr. Cowen*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 114] 621

[5.50.]

LORDS, THURSDAY, MARCH 26.

SOUTH AFRICA—BECHUANALAND—Questions, Lord Harris, The Marquess of Salisbury; Answers, The Earl of Derby 621

ARMY AND MILITIA RESERVE FORCES—

Message from the Queen *delivered* by The Earl of Kimberley .. 622

Ordered, That the said Message be taken into consideration *To-morrow*.

Lunacy Acts Amendment Bill—

Bill to amend the Acts relating to Lunatics—*Presented* (*The Lord Chancellor*); read 1ª (No. 60) 623

[*March* 26.] *Page*

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND RUSSIA—ADDRESS FOR PAPERS—
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for any diplomatic correspondence which exists from Her Majesty's Representatives abroad as to the new concert or alliance between the Courts of Germany, of Austria, and of Russia,"—(*The Lord Stratheden and Campbell*) 630
After short debate, Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—GENERAL GRAHAM'S FORCE—ACTION NEAR SUAKIN (MARCH 22)—Question, Observations, Lord Greville, Lord de Ros, Lord Napier of Magdala; Reply, The Earl of Kimberley .. 639
ARMY—THE MILITARY EXPEDITION TO THE SOUDAN—DEFECTIVE AMMUNITION—Question, Observations, Viscount Bury; Reply, The Earl of Morley 642
ARMY—THE ROYAL MILITARY ACADEMY, WOOLWICH—NEW BUILDINGS—Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, The Earl of Morley .. 645

Burgh Police and Health (Scotland) Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Earl of Dalhousie*); read 1ª (No. 57) 646

Criminal Law Amendment Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Earl of Dalhousie*); read 1ª (No. 58) 646

Consolidated Fund (No. 2) Bill—
Read 1ª; and to be read 2ª *To-morrow;* and Standing Order No. XXXV. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with,—(*The Earl Granville*).

Cape of Good Hope (Advance) Bill—
Read 1ª; to be *printed;* and to be read 2ª *To-morrow;* and Standing Order No. XXXV. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with,—(*The Earl Granville.*) (No. 59.)
[7.15.]

COMMONS, THURSDAY, MARCH 26.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

—o—

London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Bill (*by Order*)—
Moved, "That the Second Reading be deferred till Tuesday 14th April,"—(*Sir Charles Forster*) 646
After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Second Reading *deferred* till *Tuesday* 14th April.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE—
Resolved, That, whenever the House meets at Two of the clock, the Sittings of the House shall be held subject to the Resolutions of the House of the 30th of April 1869.—(*Lord Richard Grosvenor.*)

ARMY AND MILITIA RESERVE FORCES—
Message from Her Majesty *brought up*, and read by Mr. Speaker .. 648
Ordered, That Her Majesty's Most Gracious Message be taken into Consideration upon *Monday* next.

QUESTIONS.

—o—

WAYS AND MEANS—THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT—LICENCE DUTIES (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 648
INLAND NAVIGATION AND DRAINAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIVER BANN—Question, Sir Thomas M'Clure; Answer, Mr. Hibbert 649
POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—ACCELERATION OF MAILS TO THE WEST—Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, Mr. Shaw Lefevre .. 650
EGYPT (THE MILITARY EXPEDITION)—THE ROYAL MARINES AT SUAKIN—Question, Colonel North; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey 650

[*March* 26.] *Page*

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—EXTRA PAY FOR ACTING AS INSPECTORS OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES—Question, Mr. M'Coan; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 651
GOLD AND SILVER PLATE—HALL-MARKING—Question, Mr. Slagg; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain 651
LAW AND POLICE (METROPOLIS)—SHAM CLUBS—Question, Mr. Hugh Mason; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 652
NAVY—TROOPSHIPS—Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Caine 652
MERCHANT SHIPPING—REGISTRY OF SHIPPING—Question, Mr. Joseph Cowen; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain 653
POOR LAW (IRELAND)—NIGHT NURSING IN WORKHOUSES—RETURN OF ATTENDANTS—Question, Mr. John Redmond; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 653
BRITISH GUIANA—ALLEGED CESSION OF TERRITORY BY VENEZUELA—Question, Dr. Kinnear; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley 654
THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—BALLYMENA—MR. MALLAGHAN—Question, Mr. Moore; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 655
SOUTH AFRICA (BECHUANALAND)—TRADE OF THE ZAMBESI—Question, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley 656
LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—FALSE CHARGE OF FIRING AT THE PERSON—CASE OF MR. SPUNNER—Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 657
POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—THE MAIL SERVICE TO KERRY—Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre 657
FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—GREYSTONES PIER—Questions, Mr. W. J. Corbet, Colonel Nolan; Answers, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 658
POOR RATES AND PAUPERISM—THE INSANE POOR—Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 658
LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—NENAGH ASSIZES—DR. M. J. CAHALAN'S CLAIM FOR ATTENDING AS A WITNESS—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 659
LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THURLES AND TEMPLEMORE PETTY SESSIONS DISTRICTS—APPOINTMENT OF CLERKS—Question, Mr. John O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 660
WAYS AND MEANS—INLAND REVENUE—STAMPS ON BILLS OF LADING—Question, Mr. Causton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 661
POOR LAW (IRELAND)—EDENDERRY UNION—THE CLERK TO THE GUARDIANS—Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 661
PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS—REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE ACT, 1884—DEPUTY RETURNING OFFICERS—Question, Mr. R. H. Paget; Answer, The Attorney General 662
NAVY—THE BALTIC—PREPARATIONS FOR HOSTILITIES ON BREAKING UP OF THE ICE—Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey 663
NAVY—H.M.S. "CANADA"—Question, Baron Henry De Worms; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey 663
NAVY—EXPERIMENTS AT EASTNEY—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey 664
POST OFFICE—POLITICAL POSTMASTERS—Question, Mr. Whitley; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre 664
LAW AND POLICE—THE RIOTS AT NEWRY—CASE OF WILLIAM ORR—Questions, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland .. 664
ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—SERGEANT DELANEY—Question, Mr. Barry; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 665
WEST INDIA ISLANDS—GRENADA HIGHWAYS, &C. IMPROVEMENT—Question, Mr. M'Lagan; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley 666

[*March* 26.] *Page*

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—GENERAL GRAHAM'S FORCE—ACTIONS ON THE 20TH AND 22ND MARCH—Questions, Captain Maxwell-Heron, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Herbert Maxwell, Lord Elcho; Answers, Mr. Brand 667

CENTRAL ASIA—THE RUSSO-AFGHAN BOUNDARY COMMISSION—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 668

PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—MALIN HEAD PIER — Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Hibbert 669

FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—CULDAFF PIER, CO. DONEGAL —Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Hibbert 669

PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—ARKLOW BREAKWATER—Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, Mr. Hibbert 670

LABOURERS' (IRELAND) ACT, 1883—OPERATION OF THE ACT—Question, Mr. John O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Hibbert 670

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—THE EDUCATION CODE — Questions, Mr. J. G. Talbot, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answers, Mr. Mundella 671

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—GENERAL GRAHAM'S FORCE—THE ZEREBAS —Question, Colonel Dawnay; Answer, Mr. Brand 672

EGYPT—THE ARMY OF OCCUPATION—Question, Mr. M'Coan; Answer, Sir Arthur Hayter 672

TRAWLING (SCOTLAND)—LEGISLATION—Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, The Lord Advocate 672

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS—COUNTY BOUNDARIES (WARWICKSHIRE, &C.)— Question, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke .. 673

TRAMWAYS AND PUBLIC COMPANIES (IRELAND) ACT, 1883—THE PROPOSED CONNEMARA RAILWAY—Question, Colonel Nolan; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 673

FRANCE AND CHINA—HOSTILITIES—CONTRABAND OF WAR—RICE—Question, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 674

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—ADVANCE OF THE RUSSIANS— Questions, Mr. Onslow; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 675

EGYPT (FINANCE, &C.) — THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL AGREEMENT — Question, Mr. M'Coan; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 676

EGYPT (FINANCE, &C.) — THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL AGREEMENT — THE SUEZ CANAL—Questions, Sir H. Drummond Wolff, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Gorst, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 677

WAYS AND MEANS—THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT — Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 679

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (RE-DISTRIBUTION) BILL—Question, Sir R. Assheton Cross; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 680

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—Questions, Mr. Guy Dawnay, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. O'Kelly, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington; Question, Mr. Onslow [no reply].. .. 680

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE QUEEN'S MESSAGE—EMBODIMENT OF THE MILITIA—Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 681

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

EGYPTIAN LOAN—

Considered in Committee 681

Moved, "That Her Majesty be authorised to guarantee the payment of an annuity of three hundred and fifteen thousand pounds sterling for the purpose of a loan, to be raised by the Government of Egypt, in pursuance of the Convention signed at London on the eighteenth day of March 1885, between Her Majesty and the Governments of Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Italy, and Russia, with the authority of Turkey; and that provision be made out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, or the growing produce thereof, for the issue of such sums of money from time to time, as may be required, to pay any sums which may at any time be required to fulfil the guarantee of Her Majesty in respect of such annuity, conformably to the tenor of Her Majesty's engagement as specified in the said Convention,"—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

[*March* 26.] *Page*

EGYPTIAN LOAN—*continued.*

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the proposals for adjusting the finances of Egypt contained in the Convention of March 18th, and the collateral arrangement, indicated in the Papers presented to Parliament, for regulating, without any previous communication to Parliament, the international position of the Suez Canal are unsatisfactory, and do not warrant the agreement into which the Government have provisionally entered," — (*Mr. Thomas Bruce,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After long time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 49]—

Moved, "That the Committee be deferred till Monday next" .. 767

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next.

Army (Annual) Bill [Bill 104]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 767

After some time spent therein, Bill *reported*, without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

Royal Irish Constabulary Redistribution Bill [Bill 105]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman*) 801

After short debate, Motion *agreed to.* [3.30.]

LORDS, FRIDAY, MARCH 27.

PRIVATE AND PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILLS—

Ordered, That Standing Orders Nos. 92. and 93. be suspended; and that the time for depositing petitions praying to be heard against Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills, which would otherwise expire during the adjournment of the House at Easter, be extended from this day to the first day on which the House shall sit after the recess.

PARLIAMENT—WESTMINSTER HALL (RESTORATION)—Question, Lord Norton; Answer, The Earl of Rosebery 802

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—ARTICLES IN THE "TIMES" NEWSPAPER — Observations, Question, The Duke of Marlborough; Reply, Earl Granville 802

CENTRAL ASIA—THE RUSSO-AFGHAN FRONTIER—Questions, Observations, The Marquess of Salisbury, The Duke of Argyll; Reply, Earl Granville 803

Cape of Good Hope (Advance) Bill (No. 59)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl of Morley*) .. 807

Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª; Committee *negatived;* Then Standing Order No. XXXV. *considered* (according to order), and *dispensed with:* Bill read 3ª, and *passed.*

THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE—SECRETARIES OF EMBASSIES — Question, Lord Lamington; Answer, Earl Granville 807

EGYPT (FINANCE, &c.)—THE NEW EGYPTIAN LOAN—THE INTERNATIONAL GUARANTEE—Questions, Observations, The Marquess of Salisbury, The Duke of Marlborough; Replies, Earl Granville, The Earl of Kimberley 808

NAVY—THE CHINA STATION—Question, Observations, Viscount Sidmouth; Reply, The Earl of Northbrook:—Short debate thereon .. 815

INDUSTRIAL AND REFORMATORY SCHOOLS—Question, Observations, The Earl of Harrowby; Reply, The Earl of Dalhousie 820

[*March* 27.] *Page*

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT — HIGHER AND INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION IN WALES—Question, Lord Norton; Answer, Lord Carlingford .. 820

Honorary Freedom of Boroughs Bill [H.L.] — *Presented* (*The Marquess of Ripon*); read 1ª (No. 61) 821

Consolidated Fund (No. 2) Bill—

Read 2ª (according to order): Committee *negatived*: Then Standing Order No. XXXV. *considered* (according to order), and *dispensed with*: Bill read 3ª, and *passed* .. 821

[6.0.]

COMMONS, FRIDAY, MARCH 27.

QUESTIONS.

PRISONS (IRELAND)—LEGISLATION—Questions, Sir R. Assheton Cross, Mr. T. A. Dickson; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 822

INDIA (MADRAS) — OUTBREAK OF MOPLAHS IN THE MALABAR DISTRICT — Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 823

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—MOUNT TEMPLE, Co. WESTMEATH—Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre 824

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—FISHING IRREGULARITY (LISMORE DISTRICT) —Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 824

LIGHTHOUSE ILLUMINANTS—Questions, Mr. Gray; Answers, Mr. Chamberlain 825

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—EXTRA PAY FOR ACTING AS INSPECTORS OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES—Question, Mr. Synan; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 827

BOARD OF WORKS (IRELAND) — PAYMENT OF DRAINAGE INSTALMENTS, LOUGHILL, Co. LIMERICK—Question, Mr. Synan; Answer, Mr. Hibbert 827

FRANCE AND CHINA—HOSTILITIES (INTERNATIONAL LAW) — CONTRABAND OF WAR—RICE—Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 827

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—BALLYSHANNON UNION—APPOINTMENT OF RELIEVING OFFICER—Questions, Viscount Crichton, Mr. John O'Connor; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman; Question, Mr. Harrington [no reply] .. 828

BREWERS, &C., AND BREWERS' LICENCES (PARL. P. 311, 1885)—BEER MANUFACTURE—Question, Mr. Hicks; Answer, Mr. Hibbert .. 829

ARMY (PROMOTION)—THE 82ND REGIMENT—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 829

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (SCOTLAND)—THE CUMNOCK SCHOOL BOARD ELECTION—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Lord Advocate .. 830

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—KILKENNY AND WATERFORD MAIL—Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre 831

ARMY—STAFF APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY COMMISSARY GENERAL — Question, Mr. Greer; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 832

ARMY—THE MILITARY EXPEDITION TO THE SOUDAN — DEFECTIVE AMMUNITION—Question, Sir Henry Wilmot; Answer, Mr. Brand .. 832

EGYPT (THE MILITARY EXPEDITION)—THE BISCUIT STORES AT KORTI— Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington .. 833

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—IRISH NATIONAL LEAGUE MEETING AT ROSSCREA — Question, Mr. John O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 834

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES) — MILITIA OFFICERS SERVING IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN IRREGULAR FORCE UNDER SIR CHARLES WARREN—Questions, Captain Aylmer; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington .. 834

METROPOLIS—THE PARKS—VICTORIA PARK—Question, Mr. Bryce; Answer, Mr. Herbert Gladstone 835

FOREIGN OFFICE—GERMAN COLONIAL POLICY — THE WESTERN PACIFIC — Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 835

[*March* 27.] *Page*

EGYPT—ZEBEHR PASHA—Questions, Sir Henry Holland, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 836

LAW AND JUSTICE (SCOTLAND)—THE MAGISTRACY — COMMISSION OF THE PEACE, DUMFRIES BOROUGH AND COUNTY—Question, Mr. Ernest Noel; Answer, The Lord Advocate 837

THE TRAWLING COMMISSION—THE REPORT—Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Mr. H. H. Fowler 837

CENTRAL ASIA—THE RUSSO-AFGHAN FRONTIER—PENJDEH—Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 838

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882 — ARRESTS IN KILLARNEY — Questions, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 838

ARMY (THE MILITARY EXPEDITION TO THE SOUDAN)—GENERAL GRAHAM'S FORCE—THE TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT—Questions, Viscount Newport; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington 839

ARMY—DEFENCE OF THE COALING STATIONS—THE STRAITS SETTLEMENTS — Question, Mr. Chaplin; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington .. 840

ARMY—SMALL ARMS—THE MARTINI-HENRY RIFLE—DEFECTIVE AMMUNITION—Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. Brand 841

SOUTH AFRICA (BECHUANALAND)—MURDERS OF BRITISH SUBJECTS — Questions, Mr. R. N. Fowler, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answers, Mr. Evelyn Ashley 842

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—GENERAL GRAHAM'S FORCE — THE ACTION NEAR SUAKIN, 22ND MARCH—Questions, Mr. Gourley, Mr. Storey, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Gladstone 843

INDUSTRIES (IRELAND) — THE SELECT COMMITTEE — Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Answer, Lord Richard Grosvenor 844

ALLOTMENTS EXTENSION ACT, 1882—THE CHARITY COMMISSION — FLAWTON CHARITY LAND—Questions, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answers, Mr. Mundella 845

JAMAICA—REVENUE DEPARTMENT—Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley 845

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Questions, Mr. Raikes, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Dr. Cameron, Mr. R. N. Fowler; Answers, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Speaker .. 846

ARMY—THE QUEEN'S MESSAGE—THE RESERVES — Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 848

ORDERS OF THE DAY—RESOLUTION—

Moved, "That the Orders of the Day be postponed until after the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Egyptian Loan,"—(*Mr. Gladstone*) .. 849

After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

EGYPTIAN LOAN [ADJOURNED DEBATE]—

Considered in Committee 849

Question and Amendment [26th March] again proposed: — Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After long time spent therein, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 294, Noes 246; Majority 48.

Division List, Ayes and Noes 953

Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—Resolution to be reported upon *Monday* next.

[*March* 27.] *Page*

Army (Annual) Bill [Bill 104]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*The Marquess of Hartington*) 957
Amendment proposed,
To leave out from the word "be" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "re-committed in respect of a new Clause,"—(*Mr. Kenny,*)—instead thereof.
Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*
Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

MOTIONS.

—o—

COMMONS—APPOINTMENT AND NOMINATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE—
Select Committee *appointed*, "to consider every Report made by the Land Commissioners for England, certifying the expediency of any Provisional Order for the inclosure or regulation of a Common, and presented to the House during the last or present Sessions, before a Bill be brought in for the confirmation of such Order:"—List of the Committee.. 960
Short debate thereon.

Post Office (Acquisition of Sites) Bill [Bill 72]—
Select Committee *nominated*:—List of the Committee 961

Universities (Scotland) Bill—
Ordered (*The Lord Advocate, Secretary Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 115] .. 962
Short debate thereon.

TURNPIKE ACTS CONTINUANCE—
Select Committee *appointed*, "to inquire into the Sixth Schedule of 'The Annual Turnpike Acts Continuance Act, 1884,'"—List of the Committee 962

ADJOURNMENT—
Moved, "That the House, at its rising, do adjourn till To-morrow,"—(*Lord Richard Grosvenor*) 963
Motion *agreed to.*
[2.30.]

LORDS, SATURDAY, MARCH 28.

Army (Annual) Bill—
Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be *printed;* and to be read 2ª on the *first sitting day after the recess at Easter*,—(*The Earl of Morley*) (No. 62.)
[5.15.]

COMMONS, SATURDAY, MARCH 28.

The House met at a quarter before Five of the clock.
Message to attend The LORDS COMMISSIONERS:—The House went; and being returned;—Mr. SPEAKER *reported* the *Royal Assent* to two Bills.
[5.15.]

LORDS, MONDAY, MARCH 30.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Public Health Act) (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord FitzGerald*); read 1ª (No. 63) 964
Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Labourers Act) (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord FitzGerald*); read 1ª (No. 64) 964
[11.30.]

COMMONS, MONDAY, MARCH 30. *Page*

QUESTIONS.

HARBOUR ACCOMMODATION—RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE—Question, Mr. Munro-Ferguson; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain .. 965
CUSTOMS—NORTH SEA FISHERMEN—DUTY-FREE TOBACCO—Question, Mr. Birkbeck; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 966
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—SCIENCE TEACHERS—Question, Mr. Justin Huntly M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Mundella 967
NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS (IRELAND)—CASE OF MRS. SOPHIA HOWE, BALLYCASTLE, CO. MAYO—Question, Mr. Justin Huntly M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 967
POST OFFICE—LETTER CARRIERS—Questions, Sir John Kennaway; Answers, Mr. Shaw Lefevre 967
SCOTLAND—TENURE OF LAND IN THE HIGHLANDS, &C.—LEGISLATION—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Sir William Harcourt .. 968
EGYPT (THE MILITARY EXPEDITION)—CANNED MEAT—Questions, Mr. Ritchie, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answers, Mr. Brand 968
NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—DEGREE QUALIFICATIONS—Question, Mr. Justin Huntly M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 969
THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—BORRIS IN OSSORY PETTY SESSIONS DISTRICT—Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 970
POOR LAW (IRELAND)—ELECTION OF GUARDIANS—DRUMFIN (SLIGO UNION), AND TYHOLLAND DIVISION (MONAGHAN UNION)—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 971
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—SCHOOL BOARD DIVISIONS (METROPOLIS)—Question, Mr. Cubitt; Answer, Mr. Mundella 972
INDIA—THE BANDA AND KIRWEE PRIZE MONEY—Question, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 972
POST OFFICE—LETTER SORTERS ON THE IRISH PACKET BOATS—Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre 974
ARMY—THE FIRST LIFE GUARDS—CATHOLIC SOLDIERS—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 974
ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE CALLING OUT OF THE RESERVES—Questions, Colonel Stanley, Sir R. Assheton Cross; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington, Sir William Harcourt 975
NAVY—PORTSMOUTH DOCKYARD—H.M.S. "MERCURY"—Question, Mr. E. Stanhope; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey 976
ARMY—ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT—REPORT ON MACHINE GUNS AND RIFLES—Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Mr. Brand.. 976
NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS—DELAY OF PAYMENTS—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 977
POOR LAW (IRELAND)—NORTH DUBLIN BOARD OF GUARDIANS—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 977
THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION (SUB-COMMISSIONERS)—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 978
LUNATIC ASYLUMS (IRELAND)—INSUFFICIENT ACCOMMODATION—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 978
TURKEY (EUROPEAN PROVINCES)—DISTURBANCES IN ALBANIA—Question, Mr. Bryce; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 979
SPAIN—THE COMMERCIAL NEGOTIATIONS—Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 979
FRANCE—SHIP BROKERAGE—Question, Mr. Charles Palmer; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 979
EGYPT (EVENTS IN THE SOUDAN)—KASSALA—Questions, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 980

[*March* 30.] *Page*

SUSPENSION OF EVICTIONS (SCOTLAND)—Question, Mr. Macfarlane; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 980
NAVY—H.M.S. "CAMPERDOWN"—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey 980
NAVY—TORPEDOES—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey 981
ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—SPECIAL DRAFT FOR MAGHERA, Co. LONDONDERRY—Question, Mr. Commins; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 981
TENEMENT VALUATION (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 982
LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND)—SURCHARGE ON THE CORPORATION OF DUBLIN FOR EXPENSES IN ATTENDING CORK INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION—Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Gray; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 982
CENTRAL ASIA—ENGLAND AND RUSSIA—PREPARATIONS FOR HOSTILITIES—Questions, Sir George Campbell, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. J. K. Cross .. 983
IRELAND—REGISTRATION OF PARLIAMENTARY VOTERS—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PREPARING THE LISTS—Questions, Mr. T. A. Dickson, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland 985
EGYPT—ZEBEHR PASHA—Questions, Mr. Gorst; Answers, The Attorney General 985
ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE MILITIA RESERVES—Question, Mr. Greer; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 986
THE BOUNDARY COMMISSION—PARLIAMENTARY DIVISIONS OF THE CO. DOWN (IRELAND)—REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER—Question, Lord George Hamilton; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 987
ARMY—ROMAN CATHOLIC CHAPLAINS AT SUAKIN—Questions, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington 987
NAVAL DISCIPLINE ACT—CASES OF ENDERSBY AND QUINN—Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Caine 988
IRELAND—MEETINGS OF THE NATIONAL LEAGUE—ACTION OF THE POLICE AT ROSSCREA—Questions, Mr. Harrington; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 988
LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—CASE OF OWEN PATRICK AND THADY LANG v. PATRICK LYNCH—Question, Mr. Commins; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 989
RELIEF OF DISTRESS (IRELAND) ACT—LOANS TO LANDLORDS FOR PUBLIC WORKS IN DONEGAL—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Hibbert.. 989
PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—GREYSTONES BREAKWATER, Co. WICKLOW—Questions, Mr. W. J. Corbet, Mr. M'Coan; Answers, Mr. Hibbert 990
NORTH SEA FISHERIES—BELGIAN TRAWLERS—Question, Mr. Birkbeck; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey 990
LAW AND JUSTICE—CASE OF H. WILLIAMS, CONVICTED OF PERJURY AT POOLE—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 991
ARMY—THE RESERVE MEN—Question, Colonel Nolan; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 991
EGYPT (THE MILITARY EXPEDITION)—THE CAMEL CORPS—Questions, General Owen Williams; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington .. 992
BOROUGH FUNDS ACT—THE DUBLIN COLLECTOR GENERAL OF RATES—Question, Mr. Dawson; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 992
ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—CASE OF SERGEANT DELANEY—Question, Mr. Barry; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 993
PURCHASE OF LAND (IRELAND) BILL—Question, Mr. T. A. Dickson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 993
CENTRAL ASIA—THE RUSSO-AFGHAN BOUNDARY COMMISSION—Questions, Mr. E. Stanhope, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 994
EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—GENERAL GRAHAM'S FORCE—Question, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 995

[*March* 30.] *Page*

FRANCE AND CHINA—THE HOSTILITIES (INTERNATIONAL LAW)—CONTRABAND OF WAR—RICE—Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 995
ISLANDS OF THE WESTERN PACIFIC—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE—Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 996
ENGLAND AND TURKEY—Question, Mr. J. Lowther; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 997
FRANCE—THE MINISTERIAL CRISIS—Question, Baron Henry De Worms; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 998
INDUSTRIES (IRELAND)—THE SELECT COMMITTEE—Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, Lord Richard Grosvenor 998
ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE MILITIA AND ARMY RESERVES—THE QUEEN'S MESSAGE—Questions, Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Ritchie; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington 998

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—o—

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

PARLIAMENT — THE HOUSE OF COMMONS — THE LADIES' GALLERY — RESOLUTION—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it is advisable to substitute for the present grating of the Ladies' Gallery (or some portion of it) a railing so constructed as not largely to exclude sound, light, and air; and generally, that the accommodation of the gallery should be improved,"—(*Mr. Sydney Buxton,*)—instead thereof .. 999

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 121, Noes 75; Majority 46.—(Div. List, No. 86.)

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," again proposed:—

LAW AND JUSTICE — CONVICTIONS OF INNOCENT MEN—ESTABLISHMENT OF A COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL—Observations, Mr. Hopwood, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Speaker 1008
HELIGOLAND—PROPOSED CESSION TO GERMANY—Observations, Mr. Gorst:—Short debate thereon 1010
ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—DISTRICT INSPECTOR MURPHY—Observations, Mr. Justin Huntly M'Carthy:—Debate thereon 1018

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—

(In the Committee.)

CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £29,057, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for the Maintenance and Repair of Royal Palaces" 1053
Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £28,623, be granted, &c.," — (*Mr. Biggar:*) — The Committee *divided;* Ayes 23, Noes 66; Majority 43.—(Div. List, No. 87.)
Original Question put, and *agreed to.*
(2.) £1,120, Marlborough House.
(3.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £91,369, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for the Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens" 1061
After short debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £90,346, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Dillwyn:*)—After further short debate, Question

[*March* 30.] *Page*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Committee—*continued.*

put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 18, Noes 57; Majority 39.—(Div. List, No. 88.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again:"—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported upon *Thursday* 9th April; Committee to sit again upon *Thursday* 9th April.

Telegraph Acts Amendment Bill—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [24th March], "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Telegraph Acts, 1863 to 1878:"—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* .. 1072

After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Hibbert.*)

Royal Irish Constabulary Redistribution Bill [Bill 105]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 1083

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Monday* 13th April.

EGYPTIAN LOAN—REPORT—Resolution [March 27] *reported*, and *agreed to* .. 1084

Moved, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill upon the said Resolution,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

After short debate, [House counted out] [2.0.]

COMMONS, TUESDAY, MARCH 31.

QUESTIONS.

—o—

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—THE RIOTS AT DERRY—FIRING AT A PROCESSION—Questions, Mr. Lewis, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 1085

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—CLERK OF THE PEACE, CO. DONEGAL—ALLEGED ABSTRACTION OF PUBLIC RECORDS — Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 1086

POST OFFICE—IRREGULAR DELIVERIES AT WEST BROMPTON—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre 1087

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS—Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Biggar; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 1087

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION—APPEALS IN CO. KERRY—Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 1088

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE CROWN SOLICITOR, CO. KILKENNY—Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland 1089

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) BILL — Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Harrington; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 1090

POOR LAW (ENGLAND AND WALES)—SMALL-POX — RE-VACCINATION AS A PREVENTIVE—Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Mr. George Russell 1092

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—MR. HARDMAN, J.P., NEWTOWNSTEWART—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 1093

FISHERIES (IRELAND)—BOARDS OF CONSERVATORS—FREE FISHING LICENCES—Questions, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland; Question, Mr. Callan [no reply] 1094

FISHERY BOARD (IRELAND)—PAYMENT OF COASTGUARDSMEN EMPLOYED ON SPECIAL DUTY—Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 1094

THE NATIONAL GALLERY CATALOGUE—Question, Mr. Joseph Cowen; Answer, Mr. Hibbert 1095

[*March* 31.]

Page

ENGLAND AND TURKEY—THE ANGLO-TURKISH CONVENTION—Questions, Mr. M'Coan, Mr. Raikes; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 1095

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—EDUCATION GRANTS—Question, Mr. Loder; Answer, Mr. Mundella 1096

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND) BILL—Question, Mr. Gibson; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 1096

LAW AND POLICE—BOY ACROBATS—Questions, Sir John Kennaway, Mr. W. H. James; Answers, Sir William Harcourt 1097

ARMY—LONGFORD BARRACKS—Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1098

EGYPT (THE MILITARY EXPEDITION)—THE CAMEL CORPS—Question, General Owen Williams; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington .. 1098

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—BAILIEBOROUGH PETTY SESSIONS—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 1099

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE TUBBERCURRY PRISONERS—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland 1099

EGYPT—ZEBEHR PASHA—Question, Mr. J. W. Lowther; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 1100

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—CASE OF SERGEANT DELANEY—Question, Mr. Barry; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 1100

EGYPT—THE CONVENTION—Question, Mr. M'Coan; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice; Questions, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, Mr. Arthur O'Connor [no reply] 1100

FRANCE AND CHINA—HOSTILITIES (INTERNATIONAL LAW)—CONTRABAND OF WAR—RICE—Questions, Mr. Bourke, Mr. Magniac, Colonel Nolan, Baron Henry De Worms, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Chaplin, Mr. O'Kelly, Sir H. Drummond Wolff, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Mr. Speaker 1101

ARMY—THE ROYAL IRISH FUSILIERS—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1105

PUBLIC OFFICES—THE NEW WAR OFFICE AND ADMIRALTY—Question, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answer, Mr. Hibbert 1106

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—OSMAN DIGNA—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1106

ARMY—THE 82ND REGIMENT—PROMOTION BY PURCHASE—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1107

INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT—EXTRA PAYMENTS—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Hibbert 1108

CENTRAL ASIA—THE RUSSO-AFGHAN FRONTIER—Questions, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 1108

MOTIONS.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 4) Bill — *Ordered* (*Mr. George Russell, Sir Charles Dilke*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 116] .. 1109

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 5) Bill — *Ordered* (*Mr. George Russell, Sir Charles Dilke*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 117] .. 1109

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 6) Bill — *Ordered* (*Mr. George Russell, Sir Charles Dilke*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 118] .. 1109

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 7) Bill — *Ordered* (*Mr. George Russell, Sir Charles Dilke*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 119] .. 1110

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. George Russell, Sir Charles Dilke*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 120] 1110

Egyptian Loan Bill—Resolution [March 30] *reported*, and *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Hibbert*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 122] 1110

[*March* 31.] *Page*

ADJOURNMENT—EASTER RECESS—RESOLUTION—

Moved, "That this House, at its rising, do adjourn till Thursday the 9th of April,"—(*The Marquess of Hartington.*)

CENTRAL ASIA—THE RUSSO-AFGHAN FRONTIER—Question, Observations, Sir Stafford Northcote; Reply, The Marquess of Hartington:—Short debate thereon 1110

LAW AND JUSTICE—CONVICTIONS OF INNOCENT MEN—ESTABLISHMENT OF A COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL—Observations, Mr. Hopwood; Reply, Sir William Harcourt; Observations, Sir Eardley Wilmot .. 1123

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—WITHDRAWAL OF THE FORCES—Observations, Mr. Samuel Smith 1128

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—CASE OF MR. JOHN BOYLE O'REILLY—Observations, Mr. Sexton; Reply, Sir William Harcourt; Observations, Mr. T. P. O'Connor 1131

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—WITHDRAWAL OF THE FORCES—Observations, Mr. W. Fowler:—Short debate thereon 1138

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—PROCLAMATIONS—PROHIBITION OF MEETING AT BURROUGHTOWN, CO. WEXFORD—Observations, Mr. William Redmond; Reply, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman; Observations, Mr. Barry 1144

SEA COAST FISHERIES (IRELAND)—ENCROACHMENTS OF FRENCH FISHERMEN—Observations, Mr. Kenny.. 1146

It being ten minutes before Seven of the clock the Debate stood adjourned till *this day*, at Nine of the clock.

ADJOURNMENT—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question, "That this House, at its rising, do adjourn till Thursday the 9th of April,"—(*The Marquess of Hartington:*)—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed.*

SEA COAST FISHERIES (IRELAND)—ENCROACHMENTS OF FRENCH FISHERMEN—Observations, Mr. Kenny.. 1146

INDUSTRIES (IRELAND)—SELECT COMMITTEE—Personal Explanation, Sir Eardley Wilmot 1147

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE CRAUGHWELL MURDER CASE—COMPENSATION—Question, Observations, Mr. O'Brien:—Short debate thereon 1147

Question put, and *agreed to.* [10.0.]

COMMONS, THURSDAY, APRIL 9.

QUESTIONS.

SAVINGS BANKS ACT—BELFAST (KING STREET) SAVINGS BANK—Questions, Mr. Gray; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1151

IRELAND—SLIGO HARBOUR BOARD—REPAYMENT OF LOAN—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Hibbert 1152

POST OFFICE—POLITICAL POSTMASTERS—MR. A. TURNER, POSTMASTER AT OAKHAM—Question, Mr. E. Stanhope; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre .. 1153

FRANCE AND CHINA—HOSTILITIES (INTERNATIONAL LAW)—CONTRABAND OF WAR—RICE—Question, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 1153

FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—CHECKPOINT PIER, CO. WATERFORD—Question, Mr. Healy; Answer, Mr. Hibbert 1153

FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—CLEGGAN PIER, CO. GALWAY—Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Hibbert 1154

[*April* 9.] Page

CIVIL SERVICE (PARLIAMENTARY CANDIDATURE)—SIR WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON—Questions, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1155

THE TREATY OF PARIS, 1856—THE DECLARATION OF APRIL 16—Question, Mr. M'Coan; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 1155

FRANCE AND CHINA — HOSTILITIES — THE ENGLISH MAILS — Question, Baron Henry De Worms; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 1156

EGYPT (FINANCE, &c.) — THE PORTE—THE CONVENTION OF LONDON, MARCH 18, 1885—Question, Mr. Raikes; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 1157

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE EGYPTIAN LOAN BILL—Questions, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Gladstone 1157

CENTRAL ASIA — RUSSIAN ATTACK ON THE AFGHANS AT PENJDEH — MINISTERIAL STATEMENT — Questions, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. O'Kelly, Mr. Norwood, Sir George Campbell, Mr. Macfarlane, Mr. Onslow; Answers, Mr. Gladstone, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice; Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor [no reply] 1158

EGYPT — SUPPRESSION OF THE "BOSPHORE EGYPTIEN" — Questions, Mr. O'Donnell, Mr. O'Kelly; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 1166

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—

(In the Committee.)

CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

(1.) £129,088, to complete the sum for Public Buildings, Great Britain.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1166

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £7,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for preliminary expenses in connection with the erection of the New Admiralty and War Office, under the provisions of 'The Public Offices Site Act, 1882'" .. 1167

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,000, be ganted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Beresford Hope:*)—After long debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 26, Noes 45; Majority 19—(Div. List, No. 89.)

Original Question again proposed 1214

After short debate, Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(3.) £15,120, to complete the sum for the Furniture of Public Offices, Great Britain.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1216

(4.) £227,373, to complete the sum for the Revenue Department Buildings, Great Britain.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1225

(5.) £26,210, to complete the sum for County Court Buildings.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1229

(6.) £5,012, to complete the sum for Metropolitan Police Court Buildings.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1240

(7.) £8,000, to complete the sum for Sheriff Court Houses, Scotland.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1244

(8.) £210,506, to complete the sum for Surveys of the United Kingdom.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1249

(9.) £14,363, to complete the sum for Science and Art Department Buildings.

(10.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £7,446, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for the Maintenance and Repair of the British Museum and Natural History Museum Buildings, for Rents of Premises, supply of Water, Fuel, &c. and other Charges attendant thereon" 1260

After short debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,446, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Molloy:*)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(11.) £13,002, to complete the sum for Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1274

[*April* 9.] *Page*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Committee—*continued.*

(12.) £135,985, to complete the sum for Rates on Government Property.
(13.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £7,500, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for the Contribution towards the Funds for the Establishment and Maintenance of a Fire Brigade in the Metropolis" 1277
After short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 65, Noes 11; Majority 54.—(Div. List, No. 90.)

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again:"—

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIAN ATTACK ON THE AFGHANS AT PENJDEH—Question, Sir R. Assheton Cross; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1286

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

Egyptian Loan Bill [Bill 122]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) 1287
After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday* next.

MOTIONS.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders Bill — *Ordered* (*Mr. Holms, Mr. Chamberlain*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 123] 1297

Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Provisional Order Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Holms, Mr. Chamberlain*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 124] 1297

East India (Unclaimed Stocks) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Kynaston Cross, Mr. Hibbert*) .. 1297

INDUSTRIES (IRELAND)—NOMINATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE—
Moved, "That the Select Committee on Industries (Ireland) do consist of Twenty-one Members,"—(*Sir Eardley Wilmot*) 1297
Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "Twenty-one," in order to insert the words "Twenty-three,"—(*Mr. John Redmond,*)—instead thereof.
Question proposed, "That the words 'Twenty-one' stand part of the Question" [House counted out] [12.45.]

COMMONS, FRIDAY, APRIL 10.

QUESTIONS.

FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—CLOGHER HEAD, CO. LOUTH—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Hibbert 1299
FRANCE AND CHINA—HOSTILITIES—RIGHT OF SEARCH FOR CONTRABAND OF WAR—Question, Mr. Coleridge Kennard; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 1300
FRANCE AND CHINA—THE TREATY OF PEACE—CONTRABAND OF WAR—RICE—Questions, Mr. Gourley; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 1300
NAVY—PROTECTION OF THE BLACK SEA AND BALTIC—Questions, Mr. Norwood; Answers, Sir Thomas Brassey 1301
ARMY—EXTRA WORK—THE ROYAL ARSENAL, WOOLWICH—Question, Mr Boord; Answer, Mr. Brand 1301
NAVY—MERCHANT STEAMERS AS TRANSPORT CRUISERS—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey 1302

[*April* 10.] *Page*

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACTS—IMPORTATION FROM GERMANY—FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE—Questions, Mr. Birkbeck; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan 1302

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (SCOTLAND)—KIRKINTILLOCH SCHOOL BOARD—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. Mundella 1303

TRADE AND COMMERCE—CHINESE DUTIES ON TEA—THE "LI-KIN DUES"—Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 1304

EGYPT — SUPPRESSION OF THE "BOSPHORE EGYPTIEN"—Question, Mr. O'Kelly; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 1304

EGYPT (AFFAIRS OF THE SOUDAN)—GENERAL GORDON'S MISSION—Questions, Mr. Baxter, Mr. O'Kelly; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 1305

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—THE CAMEL CORPS—Question, General Alexander; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1308

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIAN ATTACK ON THE AFGHANS AT PENJDEH—Questions, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. O'Kelly, Sir George Campbell; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 1308

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—o—

Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) (*re-committed*) Bill—[Bill 49] [Eleventh Night]—

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 25th March*] 1310

After long time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Monday* next.

SUPPLY—REPORT—Resolutions [9th April] *reported* 1431

First Resolution *agreed to.*

Second Resolution read a second time:—After short debate, Resolution *agreed to.*

Remaining Resolutions *agreed to.*

Local Authorities (Expenses of Conferences) Bill [Bill 88]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved*, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Leake*) 1432

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Healy:*)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *considered* in Committee .. 1434

After short time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Thursday* next. [1.15.]

LORDS, MONDAY, APRIL 13.

HOUSE OF LORDS—THE LATE EARL CAIRNS—Observations, Earl Granville:—Short debate thereon 1435

Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 58)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl of Dalhousie*) .. 1439

After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday* the 28*th instant.*

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—RUSSIAN ATTACK ON THE AFGHANS AT PENJDEH—THE NEGOTIATIONS—Question, The Marquess of Salisbury; Answer, Earl Granville 1442

Tramways (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord FitzGerald*); read 1ª; and *referred* to the Examiners (No. 65.)

[5.30.]

COMMONS, MONDAY, APRIL 13. *Page*

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

—o—

North British Railway Bill (by Order)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Sir Charles Forster*) 1443

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months,"—(*Mr. Waddy:*)—Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill read a second time, and *committed.*

QUESTIONS.

—o—

Law and Justice (Ireland)—Claim for Malicious Burning—Trial at Wicklow Assizes—Questions, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 1450

Post Office—Clothing Contracts—Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, Mr. Brand .. 1451

Navy (Ships)—Building and Repairs—Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey .. 1452

The Prince and Princess of Wales—The Royal Visit to Ireland—Offensive Speeches—Question, Mr. Lewis; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 1452

Royal Irish Constabulary—Mr. Fleury, District Inspector of Lisburn—Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 1453

Charges against Irish Officials—Case of James Ellis French—Colonel Bruce—Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 1454

Government Officials (Ireland)—Questions, Mr. Lalor, Mr. Sexton; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 1456

Army—Dress of the Army—The Highland Feather Bonnet—Question, General Alexander; Answer, Mr. Brand .. 1456

Colonial Defences—The Colonial Naval Forces—Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey .. 1457

The Electric Lighting Act—Legislation—Question, Mr. E. Stanhope; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain .. 1457

The Egyptian Loan—Messrs. Rothschild—Question, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 1457

Law and Justice (Ireland)—Industrial School of Saint Joseph, Dundalk—Questions, Mr. Biggar; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 1458

Post Office (Contracts)—The Irish Mails—Question, Colonel Nolan; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre.. 1458

The Irish Land Commission (Sub-Commissioners)—Mr. Greer—Question, Mr. Tottenham; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 1459

Representation of the People Act, 1884—Registration of Parliamentary Electors (Ireland)—Question, Mr. Healy; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland .. 1459

Industrial Schools (Ireland) Act—Female Schools—Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 1460

Law and Justice (Ireland)—Charge of Assault against George Barker (Grange Petty Sessions)—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 1461

Poor Law (Ireland)—North Dublin Board of Guardians—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 1462

Sea Coast Fisheries (Ireland)—Encroachments of French Fishermen—Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 1463

Law and Police (Ireland)—The Detective Department—Mr. Jenkinson—Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 1463

Law and Justice (Ireland) — Ligoneil Petty Sessions, Co. Antrim — Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 1464

Crime and Outrage (Ireland) — The Catholic Chapel, Hillsborough, Co. Down—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 1464

Egypt (Finance, &c.) — Egyptian Preference and Unified Debts — Deductions from the Coupons—Question, Mr. M'Coan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1464

Highways (Ireland)—Payment of Road Contractors, Co. Galway — Question, Colonel Nolan; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 1465

Army List—Officers of Colonial Forces — Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1465

Gibraltar—The Post Office—Question, Captain Aylmer; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley 1466

Local Taxation—Questions, Sir Baldwyn Leighton, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1466

Law and Justice — The Office of Sheriff—Question, Sir Baldwyn Leighton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1467

Education Department—The Revised Code, 1885—Question, Mr. R. H. Paget; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1467

Trade and Commerce—Chinese Duties on Tea—The "Li-kin Dues" —Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 1468

Egypt — Suppression of the "Bosphore Egyptien" — Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 1468

Venezuela — Revolutionary Expedition against the Government — Questions, Mr. Kenny; Answers, Sir William Harcourt, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 1469

Central Asia—Russia and Afghanistan — Russian Attack on the Afghans at Penjdeh—The Negotiations — Questions, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, Mr. O'Kelly, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. E. Stanhope, Mr. Onslow, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. O'Donnell, Baron Henry De Worms, Mr. Gray; Answers, Mr. Gladstone, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 1469

Egypt (Finance, &c.) — Deductions from the Coupons — Question, Mr. M'Coan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1476

Admiralty Retirement—Question, Mr. Stuart-Wortley; Answer, Mr. Hibbert 1476

Egypt (The Expedition up the Nile) — Sir Charles Wilson's Voyage from Metemneh to Khartoum—Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1477

Army—Non-Commissioned Officers' Pensions — Question, Mr. Stewart Macliver; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1478

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Army and Militia Reserve Forces—

Her Majesty's Most Gracious Message *considered*:—Message again read 1478

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, thanking Her Majesty for Her Most Gracious Message communicating to this House that Her Majesty was about to cause Her Reserve Force, and Her Militia Reserve Force, or such part thereof, as Her Majesty shall, from time to time, think necessary, to be called out for permanent Service,"—(*The Marquess of Hartington.*)

After short debate, Amendment proposed,

To add, at the end of the Question, the words "and at the same time expressing a hope that the available forces of Her Majesty will be speedily strengthened by the prompt withdrawal of the troops from the Soudan,"—(*Mr. Labouchere.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added:"—After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 39, Noes 148; Majority 109. —(Div. List, No. 95.)

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—To be presented by Privy Councillors.

[*April* 13.] *Page*

Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 49] [Twelfth Night]—

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 10th April*] 1500

After long time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

MOTION.

—o—

Elementary Education—Revised Code, 1885—Motion for an Address—

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty that She will be graciously pleased to withhold Her consent from the Education Code in respect of Article 109 (a), with a view of providing that a larger proportion of the grant now given to public elementary schools should be allotted in the form of a fixed payment on average attendance,"—(*Mr. J. G. Talbot*) 1569

After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 53, Noes 117; Majority 64.—(Div. List, No. 99.) [1.45.]

LORDS, TUESDAY, APRIL 14.

Central Asia—Russia and Afghanistan—Russian Advances on the Murghab—Questions, Earl De La Warr, The Marquess of Salisbury; Answers, Earl Granville, The Earl of Kimberley 1600

Army and Militia Reserve Forces—

Order of the Day for the consideration of the Queen's Message of the 26th of March last, read:—Message *considered* accordingly .. 1600

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, thanking Her Majesty for informing this House that the present state of public affairs and the extent of the demands on the military forces of Her Majesty for the protection of the interests of the Empire having constituted, in the opinion of Her Majesty, a case of great emergency within the meaning of the Acts of Parliament in that behalf, Her Majesty deems it proper to provide additional means for Her Military service, and that, therefore, in pursuance of those Acts, Her Majesty has thought it right to communicate to the House of Lords that Her Majesty is about to cause Her Reserve Force and Her Militia Reserve Force, or such part thereof as Her Majesty shall from time to time think necessary, to be called out for permanent service,"—(*The Earl Granville.*)

After short debate, Motion *agreed to, nemine dissentiente.*

Ordered. That the said Address be presented to Her Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

Navy (Administration)—The Accountant General of the Navy—Question, Lord Oranmore and Browne; Answer, The Earl of Northbrook 1601

Foreign and Colonial Telegraphs—Telegraphic Communication with Hong Kong—Question, Observations, Viscount Sidmouth; Reply, The Earl of Derby:—Short debate thereon 1603

[5.15.]

COMMONS, TUESDAY, APRIL 14.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

—o—

London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Bill (*by Order*)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*) 1608

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House declines to assent to the Second Reading of a Private Bill which proposes to set aside the provisions of 'The Disused Burial Grounds Act, 1884,'" —(*Mr. Ritchie,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put:—Bill read a second time, and *committed.*

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE

Sixth Session OF THE *Twenty-Second Parliament* OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF *Great Britain* AND *Ireland*, APPOINTED TO MEET 29 APRIL, 1880, IN THE FORTY-THIRD YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

FOURTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1884-5.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 20*th March*, 1885.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILL—*Select Committee*—Water Companies (Regulation of Powers) * (56), *nominated*.

PARLIAMENT—ADJOURNMENT—THE EASTER RECESS.

STATEMENT.

EARL GRANVILLE: My Lords, we propose that your Lordships, as far as the Business of the House is concerned, shall adjourn for the Easter Holidays on Friday next, and meet again on Monday, the 13th of April. The Motion on Friday, however, will be made for an Adjournment during pleasure, as it may be necessary to have a Royal Commission on the day following.

EGYPT (FINANCE, &c.)—COST OF THE ARMY OF OCCUPATION.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF JERSEY rose to ask the noble Earl the Under Secretary of State for War a Question of which he had given him private Notice. It was, Whether Her Majesty's Government estimate that the annual cost of the Army of Occupation in Egypt will not exceed £200,000; and, if so, on what basis such calculation rests; also, whether it is proposed that any extra cost shall fall solely on the English Exchequer; and, if so, why? Their Lordships were aware that under the International Agreement just laid before Parliament the annual cost of the Army of Occupation was put down at £200,000; but in the Reports of Sir Evelyn Baring and his Colleagues, presented last June, the cost was estimated at £293,000. In the Conference which followed that estimate was accepted without demur; and in all

the French and English proposals it was never suggested that there should be any diminution of the sum of £293,000. He wished to know what had induced Her Majesty's Government to agree to such a large diminution of what must be the obvious cost of the Army of Occupation, as the extra charge would be thrown entirely on the English Exchequer? They had now about 16,000 men in Egypt, and had spent in the last two months £200,000 extra, and there was a prospect of our spending a great deal more.

THE EARL OF MORLEY: I must certainly object to the course pursued by the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Jersey) in bringing forward a subject of this kind without public, instead of private, Notice. The answer I have to give to the Question is this—When the Force which was to form the garrison of Egypt—and which is entirely distinct from the Expeditionary Forces in the Soudan—was first sent to that country it was found that the extra cost—that is to say, the difference between the cost of maintaining the troops in Egypt and at home—was, as nearly as the Government could ascertain it, at the rate of £4 per man per month, or £48 a-year. Taking the garrison at a strength of 4,000 men, which was the number anticipated to be necessary, at that rate £200,000 would cover the extra yearly cost to this country. Whether the garrison be reduced to this strength or not, the Government has agreed to charge no more to the Egyptian Government. This is the part of the bargain under which £200,000 a-year is to be deducted from the interest on the bonds. The extra sums asked for are for the Expeditionary Forces in the Soudan and at Suakin, which have nothing to do with the garrisons in Egypt.

OPENING OF MUSEUMS ON SUNDAYS—THE NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM, SOUTH KENSINGTON.

RESOLUTION.

LORD THURLOW, who had given Notice of a Motion respecting the Resolution of the Trustees of the British Museum, in favour of opening the Natural History Museum at South Kensington on Sundays, said, he would not detain their Lordships many minutes, but would state his case as briefly as possible. On former occasions, he had had opportunities of explaining at length the motives by which he was actuated and the arguments by which he was supported. Neither would he weary their Lordships with pages of statistics, as the thing had passed beyond the region of statistics, and had entered the more healthy sphere of practical politics. The same principle was involved in the Resolution of that evening as in those of former years, only with the difference that that night the application was narrowed to one great national institution, the Natural History Museum at South Kensington, a building of great beauty and attractions, well fitted, in his opinion, to be used as a test of the success of Sunday opening in London. His position that night was much strengthened by the recent growth of public opinion on this question. What he advocated was now advocated by every daily paper in London that he knew of—papers representing all shades of political opinion. He was equally supported by *The Morning Post* as by *The Daily Telegraph*, and by the great arbiter of events, *The Times*. This growth of public opinion had evidently not passed unnoticed by the Trustees of the British Museum, and had borne fruit, as might have been expected. On the 17th of January last, a special meeting of Trustees was held to consider the question. The proposal to open the South Kensington Natural History Museum was, he believed, moved by one of the ecclesiastical Trustees, and practically passed unopposed by an overwhelming majority. The first question one asked one's self, when one heard that a thing had been done by a body of men, was to inquire into the constitution of that Body, in order to ascertain to what extent it was influential and representative. He proposed to take that course, and it would be seen that no more influential Body could be found—that it comprised men of every shade of politics, of every school of thought, men of different creeds, and many of the most illustrious ecclesiastics and laymen of the day. The British Museum had 49 Trustees. Of these 24 were official. One was appointed by the Queen. Nine represented the Sloane, Cotton, Harley, Townley, Elgin, and Knight families and bequests, the remaining 15 being chosen by the former 34. The official Trustees were the Arch-

bishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor, the Speaker of the House of Commons, the Lord President of the Council, the First Lord of the Treasury, the Lord Privy Seal, the First Lord of the Admiralty, the Lord Steward, the Lord Chamberlain, the five Secretaries of State, the Bishop of London, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Lord Chief Justice, the Master of the Rolls, the Attorney General, the Solicitor General, the Presidents of the Royal Society, of the College of Physicians, of the Society of Antiquaries, and of the Royal Academy. The Trustee appointed by the Queen was the Dean of Windsor. The family Trustees were the Earl of Derby, Earl Cadogan, the Rev. Frederick Annesley, the Rev. Sir G. H. Cornwall, Lord Henry Lennox, Mr. George Cavendish Bentinck, the Earl of Elgin, Mr. F. W. Knight, and one vacancy caused by the death of Lord O'Hagan. The elected Trustees were the Prince of Wales, Mr. Spencer Walpole, Viscount Eversley, Viscount Sherbrooke, the Duke of Argyll, Lord Acton, the Duke of Devonshire, Lord Walsingham, Sir Henry Rawlinson, Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Beresford Hope, Lord Houghton, the Dean of Christ Church, the Earl of Rosebery, and Professor Huxley. Any recommendation coming from such a body as that deserved every consideration, and especially careful consideration, before it was rejected. Now they came to the Amendment of the noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury). He had no fault to find with it whatever, except that it did not deal in a straightforward way with the matter in hand. It dealt with electric lighting and week-day evening opening, two things he (Lord Thurlow) entirely approved, and it bristled with statistics, of which he was very fond. It was almost identical with last year's Amendment, and challenged a division on the same false issue. Two or three weeks ago, he noticed an excellent leading article on Sunday opening in one of the great London daily papers. It said—

"The importance of the decision taken by the Trustees of the British Museum cannot be over-estimated. Now, for the first time, working men will have, on their one whole holiday in the week, an alternative to the public-house, whose doors yawn open to receive them and their weekly earnings. Licensed victuallers are the only caterers of entertainments allowed to take and to make money on the Lord's Day. Pictures may not be seen, mummies are tabooed, but a working man may enter a gin palace and drink and smoke under cover and protection of the law. The temples of Bacchus are the only ones open to those who seek recreation on the Sabbath Day."

All this was perfectly true. It had been said that the poor people had the Parks and public gardens to go to; but the Parks, although they might be valuable for well-fed and rich men, who had a good dinner to go to, and wanted a constitutional, were not very attractive places in a biting East wind for poor people. A working man, working hard all the week, did not want a constitutional to whet his appetite for his Sunday dinner. Besides, they must not forget that keeping the Parks open on Sunday required a much larger staff of working people than the keeping open of Museums, Picture Galleries, and Libraries would. Then he would ask, once more, what could a poor man do on Sunday if, as often happened, it was wet and cold? He was shut up in one room with a large family, perhaps some of them ill. What could he do? It might be suggested that he should go to Hampton Court or Kew; but that cost money, which he could ill spare, and encouraged Sunday traffic of omnibuses and railways. But he might not go into those spacious and well-warmed halls close to him filled with the most beautiful creations of God and man, and objects illustrative of Christian history—all built and maintained by taxation to which he contributed in no small degree, as he was now becoming daily more aware, and as we might now more easily realize, by the knowledge that it was the third-class fares more than the first-class fares that enabled Railway Companies to pay a dividend. Look at the inconsistency of the thing. If he lived in Manchester or Birmingham, Stoke or Wigan, he might go to Libraries, Galleries, and Museums on Sundays; but if he lived in London, where he was further from the green fields, he might not. So much for the inconsistency of locality; now let them look at the social inconsistency. Rich men had, to a greater or less degree, their libraries, their galleries, their luxurious clubs, their carriages and horses; and was it to be said that that was exactly the reason why the Museums should not be opened on Sundays? He knew that their Lordships

would not say that, but it was what the poor said and thought. If their Lordships voted to-night for the noble Earl's Amendment, that would not be the odious reason, but because they were carried away on the wrong scent. No doubt, he would be told of the Continental Sunday; but the day for that argument was past and gone. Working men in our days were powerful enough, he rejoiced to say, to protect themselves against overwork. It was they that prescribed, not only how many days in the week, but how many hours in the day they would work. This was not a new question; the only new feature was the action taken by the Trustees of the British Museum, and it was that he asked their Lordships to support. The mist and cloud that had long obscured the view of the public upon this matter had now passed away, dispelled by the force of a more enlightened public opinion; and he was sanguine enough to believe the majority of their Lordships would go into the Lobby with him upon this subject. They saw from the police returns the good results achieved elsewhere, in Birmingham and in Manchester, and other towns—how there sobriety had increased, and how there crime had diminished. Then, would they still refuse to try this thing in London, where it was most required, and would they again be led away by the unreal Amendment of the noble Earl? He did not believe that they would be. He believed that their Lordships would show their sympathy with the Trustees, who had shown their appreciation of the spirit of the age we lived in, who had shown that they possessed the courage of their opinions; and he believed their Lordships would support their endeavours to contribute their quota to the sum of human happiness of the working classes of this great City. In conclusion, he begged to move the Resolution of which he had given Notice.

Moved to resolve, "That whereas a considerable majority of the Trustees of the British Museum present at a general meeting on the 17th of January last specially called to consider the question, voted in favour of opening the Natural History Museum at South Kensington on Sunday afternoons; and whereas it is desirable to afford the working classes of London such further opportunities of instruction, recreation, and enjoyment as they would obtain thereby, and as are already conceded in Manchester, Birmingham, Stoke-upon-Trent, Dublin, Newcastle, Middlesboro', and other centres of industry; that, for the above and for other reasons affecting the health and happiness, the morality and sobriety, of the working classes of London, this House is of opinion that the time has now come to support the decision taken by the Trustees of the British Museum in regard to this question."—(*The Lord Thurlow.*)

EARL CAIRNS said, that he was sure their Lordships would join him in an expression of regret at the absence that evening of his noble Friend (the Earl of Shaftesbury) through indisposition, which he hoped would be but of slight duration. He hoped that their Lordships, instead of agreeing to the Motion of the noble Lord opposite (Lord Thurlow), would accept the Amendment to that Motion which stood upon the Paper in the name of his noble Friend, and which he (Earl Cairns) would now take upon himself to submit to the House. It ran as follows:—

"To leave out all the words after 'That' and to insert 'the Trustees of the British Museum having applied to the Treasury for the funds necessary to light up the Natural History Museum with the electric light, and having lighted up the Reading Room of the British Museum with the electric light till eight o'clock at night for several years with 'very satisfactory results,' and having obtained estimates for lighting the whole of the British Museum at night with electricity, and bearing in mind that the South Kensington Museum has been opened till ten o'clock at night for twenty-eight years, and been visited at night by 6,885,722 persons, and that the Bethnal Green Museum has been opened at night for twelve years, and been visited in the evenings by 3,567,278 persons, and that a Parliamentary Committee has recommended 'That the British Museum and National Gallery should be opened on week day evenings between the hours of seven and ten in the evening at least three days in the week,' this House is of opinion that the time has arrived when this recommendation should be carried into effect, and the national collections opened on week day evenings, but not on Sundays."

Now, he had always looked upon this question as a question for working men alone; and he knew no one in that House, or out of it, who was better qualified to gauge the temper and wishes, or to speak upon questions affecting the working men of London than his noble Friend, because, owing to his philanthropy and benevolence, he had been brought into immediate contact with them for a long period. The noble Lord opposite (Lord Thurlow) had said that this proposal had often been before the House. No doubt, in a certain degree that was the case; but he (Earl Cairns) now remarked that

there was a change in the Resolution, for whereas, on former occasions, those bringing forward the proposal had sought to throw open on Sundays all the Museums and Galleries supported by the State in the Metropolis, it was now proposed only to open the Natural History Museum at South Kensington. The noble Lord's argument, he quite admitted, went much further. He had told them, correctly, that the Board of Trustees of the British Museum was composed of 49 Noblemen and Gentlemen, and the impression he seemed to leave was, that the decision arrived at represented the opinions of the whole number; whereas the Resolution itself was decided only by a majority of a meeting composed of 16 Noblemen and Gentlemen. The Trustees, however, purposely abstained from making any recommendation that the British Museum should be opened on Sunday, and simply confined their motion to the South Kensington Museum of Natural History. There was not a word in their Resolution that the great building in Bloomsbury should be opened on Sunday. He desired to speak with the greatest possible respect of the Trustees of the British Museum; and while he would take their opinion on what would be safe or unsafe as regarded matters connected with the keeping and exhibition of our valuable treasures of Nature and Art, he was not disposed to accept as conclusive any opinion they might express or the religious view they might take with regard to the propriety of opening our National Museums and Galleries on Sundays. He did not think they were the Body to apply to on a question involving social, political, or religious considerations. Of course they had heard much of the public-house argument in this matter—of how, if these Museums were opened, the public-houses would be emptied. But it was an argument which broke down the moment they touched it, and upon this matter he could not but recall the remarkable speech made by Mr. Broadhurst in the other House upon this question. That Gentleman, himself a working man and thoroughly qualified to express the views of the working men, had ridiculed the idea that there could ever be any competition between the Museums and Galleries and the public-houses for two reasons—the first being that the people who would go to the Museums and the Galleries were not those who frequented the public-houses on Sunday; and the next being that those who frequented the public-houses would not go to the Museums and Galleries on Sunday if they had the opportunity of doing so. It was also said that it was proposed by those who advocated the opening of the Museums on Sunday that they should be opened on Sunday afternoons between 3 and 6 o'clock, which was exactly the time during which the public-houses were closed. But what would happen if they were closed at the latter hour? The East India Docks, Stepney, and the Tower Hamlets were a long way from South Kensington; and would working men come from these distant places, spend two or three hours in the fatiguing operation of walking about the Galleries, without requiring, when 6 o'clock came, some refreshment—something to eat and something to drink? Then, at 6, the Galleries would be closed, and the crowds would pour out into the public-houses. In this fact they would find a complete explanation of the desire of publicans for the opening of Museums on Sunday. The proposal of the noble Lord involved a question of money, which must come from the House of Commons. That was a technical objection; but there was a stronger one. Why were their Lordships so constantly appealed to in this matter? It was, as he had said, a question eminently affecting the working class, and one upon which the other House might be thought to be more competent to speak. Therefore, it was to the other House of Parliament in an eminent degree that we must look for the representation of that class, and for the expression of their views. What were the Petitions which had been presented to that House on this subject? It seemed that the noble Lord had entirely everlooked this matter. He had not given the slightest proof, or made the slightest assertion, to show that the working men of the country desired the change. Nay, he (Earl Cairns) went further, and said that they did not like it, they did not desire it, and were anxious that the proposal should not succeed. What did they find in the House of Commons as the result of 10 years' petitioning on both sides of

the question? On the one side, they had 3,886 Petitions with 524,000 signatures against the proposal; and, on the other side, 158 Petitions with 79,900 signatures in favour. Therefore, so far as petitioning went, there was no comparison between the numbers of those who desired, and those who did not wish for the change. Then, what was the result of the last division in the House of Commons on the point in 1882? Against opening 208, in support 83. In the year 1877, the previous occasion when a division was taken, the minority was 87, so that in the course of five years the minority in favour had fallen off. On the last occasion on which the subject was before the House of Commons, Mr. Broadhurst made the very admirable speech to which he had before referred. He must say that he had never read a speech more remarkable for its conciseness and the cogency of its reasoning, and he admired the Representative whom the working classes had secured for themselves in the person of Mr. Broadhurst. Sitting for Stoke, a working man's borough, Mr. Broadhurst spoke as a Trade Unionist of 25 years, not in the interest of any Society, or with any theological view of his own. He stated that he simply desired to speak as a Representative of working men what he knew they would desire. One observation of Mr. Broadhurst struck him very much. He said—

"You are proposing to open Museums and Galleries on Sunday; but the Trade Unions for the last 20 years have been trying to better the working classes of the country, and the traditions of the country with regard to labour. One of the privileges that the working man values most is to have the seventh day his own, and not to be interfered with. We have gone on that principle, and we have agitated for, and to some extent secured, early closing, and we want to secure it more. We have secured the Saturday half-holiday, and we want to maintain that. On what principle do we agitate for these things? That that is the time working men want to improve their minds and to look at Galleries and Museums."

He further said—

"If you make a change and throw these places open on Sunday and make that the day for looking at your Collections of Art, you cut the ground from under our feet for early closing on Saturday. Therefore, the one thing we desire is that you will not offer an alternative for early closing on Saturday by opening Museums and Galleries on Sunday."

He (Earl Cairns) was not surprised at this view being taken by the working men. Mr. Mundella, the Minister superintending the education and culture of the country, also strongly opposed the Motion. He told this remarkable fact—he said that there were 154 Municipalities throughout the country which had provided and supported Museums from the public rates. These Municipalities were the true representatives of the working men of their neighbourhoods; and it appeared that out of these 154 Municipalities, four only opened their Museums on Sunday, and 150 did not. Mr. Mundella also referred to the case of Nottingham, which had provided a splendid Museum and Free Library out of the rates. In 1879 there was a difference of opinion in the Town Council as to whether they should open their Museum and Library on Sunday or not; they had a division, and there were 25 for opening, and 28 against. Then, said Mr. Mundella, in 1881, a test election was taken — the municipal election turned on the question of whether the Museum was to be opened on Sunday or not. After the election, the voting in the Town Council was eight in favour of the opening, and 34 against. It might be said that these boroughs were at some distance from London, that the working men in the neighbourhood of London might have a different opinion, and that, therefore, they ought to consider what the working men in London would say. He did not suppose that there was any division of the Metropolis which was so completely a locality of intelligent, skilled working men as the Tower Hamlets. Well, at the last Election there was a prominent working-man candidate—Mr. Lucraft—for that constituency, and he was asked what he thought about the opening of Museums and Galleries on Sundays, and he said he looked upon it purely from a working man's point of view, and that he should not like to work seven days a-week instead of six. Therefore, he could not vote for their opening. That announcement was received with great cheering, and although Mr. Lucraft was not returned, yet when the question came again before the House of Commons, and a division was taken, the Members for the Tower Hamlets voted against the proposal. To take the case of other towns—Worcester, in 1884, resolved, by eight against four, to open its Museum on Sunday; but, after a month's expe-

rience, the decision was reversed, and the Museum was closed. Maidstone, in February, 1881, decided to open its Museum; but, after an experience of three years, decided, by 16 votes against three, to close it again. In September, 1884, Chester resolved to open its public Library on Sunday; but, after three months' experience, it was closed, three members of the Town Council only dissenting from that course. The most deliberate appeal had been made to organizations representing working men for their opinion on this question. Organizations representing 500,000 working men decided, by a large majority, in favour of the view taken by Mr. Broadhurst as against that of the noble Lord. And what had the noble Lord urged against these arguments? Nothing whatever. Upon the religious aspect of the question, he (Earl Cairns) would point out that the Wesleyan Body, as well as a great many other religions, had presented their opinions against the proposal, and it was opposed by a great number of working men from a different view. They were opposed to it on conscientious grounds; they held that the seventh day was one they ought to have free from labour—that it was their privilege to have that day, and that it was a blessing to them morally; they had experienced the value of it as such, and they were jealous of anything which would even have the appearance of depriving them of it. He had been much struck by the Report of the Royal Commission which last year inquired into the question of instruction to the industrial classes in foreign countries. The Commission originated from the impression that this country was behind foreign countries, and that something was required to help us in the severe competition with foreigners. That Commission practically recommended that Museums should be opened on Sundays for that purpose, so that the working man might get instruction similar to what was obtained in certain Sunday Schools in France, Belgium, and Germany. It was not, however, by gazing at the objects exhibited in the Museums that this technical instruction was to be acquired. It would be necessary that qualified persons should be employed to give them lectures, and teach them the meaning of what they saw. What the Commissioners did was, in fact, to advise the setting up of schools of technical education in this country like those abroad, although they had not the boldness to recommend it in so many words. He repeated that it was not only that these Museums were to be thrown open to the public to gaze on Collections and articles of Art. Some persons must go with them and explain those Collections, and give practical instruction; and the consequence would be they would have, no doubt, in a very short time, what was so universal on the Continent. He had said that this was a workman's question, and that the opinion of working men would more naturally be looked for in the other House of Parliament, and he would remind their Lordships that they were now on the eve of a great and material change which would give the working men of London an opportunity of expressing their views which they never had before. He forgot the number of new Members which were to be given to London; but when that change took place the working man would be able to speak out, and then they would see whether the opinions which he and others held, or whether those of the noble Lord who introduced the Motion, were correct. The noble Lord said there was no connection between the Amendment on the Paper in the name of his noble Friend (the Earl of Shaftesbury) and the Motion; but there was both an affirmative and a negative part, and he would see that the latter part deprecated the opening of Museums on Sundays. That was entirely germane to the proposal. Let him (Earl Cairns) say a few words on the affirmative part of the Amendment. He owned he could not understand why the object in view should not be met by the opening of some of these great stores of Art on certain evenings of week-days. The objection as to the injury to exhibits from gaslight could be obviated by the use of the electric light, and he did not see why that should not be taken advantage of for the purpose. Why should not the National Gallery be made available in this way? He did not believe the cost would be very great, and the existing facts disproved the theory that the working man was too fatigued in the evening to attend; and the records of South Kensington and Bethnal Green showed that they were able and glad to visit such places in the evening. These

were the views which he ventured to put forward as the views, so far as he could ascertain them, entertained on the subject by working men. He believed that a very large number of them were convinced that Sunday was a Divine institution, and that it had conferred incalculable blessings of every kind upon those human races who had known it and observed it. There was a very large number who were anxious on higher grounds to resist the proposal of the noble Lord. He hoped it would be resisted. They regulated trade on Sunday by legislation; and he believed they could maintain that legislation if they were consistent; but if once they departed from the general principle thus laid down, and if, with regard to their own Collections of Art and places of amusement, they set the example of opening them on Sunday, he maintained that they could not expect to support legislation for the purpose of curtailing the liberties of other persons. If they began that they must make the one rule for the institutions supported by the State and those not so supported, and he believed it would be a great mistake to agree to the Motion. He begged to move the Amendment of which Notice had been given.

Amendment *moved*,

To leave out all the words after ("That") and insert ("the Trustees of the British Museum having applied to the Treasury for the funds necessary to light up the Natural History Museum with the electric light, and having lighted up the Reading Room of the British Museum with the electric light till eight o'clock at night for several years with 'very satisfactory results,' and having obtained estimates for lighting the whole of the British Museum at night with electricity, and bearing in mind that the South Kensington Museum has been opened till ten o'clock at night for twenty-eight years and been visited at night by 6,885,722 persons, and that the Bethnal Green Museum has been opened at night for twelve years, and been visited in the evenings by 3,567,278 persons, and that a Parliamentary Committee has recommended 'That the British Museum and National Gallery should be opened on week-day evenings between the hours of seven and ten in the evening at least three days in the week,' this House is of opinion that the time has arrived when this recommendation should be carried into effect, and the national collections opened on week-day evenings but not on Sundays.")—(*The Earl Cairns.*)

LORD BRAMWELL said, he should be most sorry if the Sunday was not kept as a day of rest. Even if it were looked upon as a mere human institution, he thought it would be much to be lamented if it were not kept as a day of abstinence from labour. He spoke with a strong personal feeling of the immense advantage of the day; having had, in the course of his life, a great deal of work to do, he felt the absolute necessity of the rest he got from the Sunday. He should be sorry to see it kept as the Continental Sunday was kept. He should like to see it kept gravely and decorously, and he should not like to see upon it horse-racing or anything else which brought about the sort of scandal which attached to that and some other kinds of amusement; but while he felt this most strongly, he did think, on the other hand, that the day ought to be kept—in part, at least—as a day of recreation and reasonable amusement for the body and for the mind. And he was afraid it was neither, but was now kept in such a way as to be positively mischievous. What was the English notion of keeping the Sunday? He did not say that everybody thought so; but the majority of the English people—the Anglo-Saxons, he might say—thought there ought to be no amusement on the Sunday. If people played chess they were to be reprimanded, and he had heard that even a walk, taken for the purpose of recreation, was regarded as a wrong thing. In his judgment, it was a mischievous mistake to insist that there should be no rational amusement. What was to be done if people were not to amuse themselves in the innocent way he had mentioned? It was said that their minds should be entirely given up to devotional practices and devotional thoughts. That was an impossibility. He did not say that there were not strong-minded and religious-minded people who were capable of so employing themselves; but the majority of mankind were quite incapable of following out that way of keeping Sunday, and the only consequence of enforcing such an observance of the day was to make people break what they supposed was the Commandment. If they wished to avoid the Continental Sunday they must give people the opportunity of reasonable, decent, and quiet enjoyment. Of all the sins that man or child could commit, the one that went least against his conscience was to do what was called breaking the Sabbath.

If you told a child not to spin a top on Sunday, the child would see no harm in it, either to itself or the top, and it probably went and played. He declared, on his conscience, that the present way in which Sunday was spent in England might, in his opinion, be called an easy introduction to sin. Once the law had been broken, the next step was much easier; and, in his opinion, it was a most mischievous thing that a feeling should obtain that a Commandment should have been given of such a character that the majority of people had not the strength of mind to obey it—that people should be told in the same way not to steal, and to keep the Sunday in a way they could not keep it. He wished earnestly, therefore, that some alteration should be made. He had often wondered what possible argument there was for the present notion of the way in which Sunday ought to be kept. It was, comparatively, quite a modern innovation, since up to the time of Charles I. there had been no such notion, but games and sports had been indulged in; and in the Reign of James I. a book had been published setting out certain sports which were lawful for Sundays. At that time the day was treated rationally, and was eminently a day of rest, and it was not until the time of the Puritans that an alteration was made. If they looked throughout Christendom — except in this country, and he believed in America, where they had got many of our ways—they would see no notion of spending Sunday in the way in which it was spent here. On the Continent, whether in a Catholic, a Protestant, or a Greek Church country, reasonable and proper enjoyment was to be obtained, and the day was treated, as he could not help saying, as a day of recreation. He could not help thinking that the Commandment had been misinterpreted. They were to work six days and to keep holy the seventh—how? By doing no manner of work; but there was no prohibition in this, either direct or by implication, of reasonable and proper enjoyment. He had received a letter on the subject from a very eminent gentleman of the Jewish persuasion, in which the writer said that there was a great misapprehension abroad as to the manner of observing the Sabbath among the Jews; that it was not the day of gloom and inanity that some supposed; on the contrary, that it was the happiest and most joyous day. They rigidly abstained from work, or anything implying or leading to work. After the religious offices of the day, it was passed in social intercourse and recreations, among which the writer mentioned visits to Museums and Picture Galleries, concerts, and even theatres. Card playing, however, would not be considered proper, and lawn tennis and such like games would come within the definition of work, involving bodily labour and fatigue. Their Lordships might take that to be a true expression of the way in which the Jews interpreted the Commandment; and they might surely be supposed to know the meaning of their own law better than anyone else. As to the argument that the opening of Museums would be the beginning of general work on Sundays, the whole course of things in the 30 years had been in an opposite direction. He was glad of it, and it was most useful with reference to both social and political considerations; but it was undoubtedly the case that the working men had got the Saturday half-holiday, and shortened the hours of labour in every direction, while a great many of them took a holiday on Monday. He was not blaming them if they could earn their subsistence by working only four days a week—they had a right to work only that amount; but so it was, and yet they were now told that the working men were afraid of being set to work on Sunday. Those who liked to stay away from Museums on Sunday could do so; but the argument put forward was that those who liked to go should not, because there was a fear of the working man being set to work on Sunday. He thought Mr. Broadhurst's argument a very bad one, for he had divided mankind into two classes—those who went, and those who did not go to places of recreation. Those who did not go to such places went to the public-house; but if they were to give them an opportunity of going to Galleries on Sunday it would prevent their going to the public-house. If they wanted a good use made of the Sunday, if they wanted to prevent people from becoming unwilling hypocrites, if they wanted not to lead into temptation, and to prevent the introduction of the Continental Sunday, then they should do their best to introduce

a rational, decent, and quiet mode of enjoyment for that day.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY said, he was rather at a loss to imagine in what society the noble and learned Lord who had just sat down (Lord Bramwell) had lived, when he spoke, as he had done, of the gloomy and miserable manner in which Sunday was spent in this country. The noble and learned Lord seemed to think that all those who opposed the Motion were not only against looking at a picture on Sunday, but had conscientious objections to allowing a working man to look at a picture, or take a turn in the park on that day. Therefore, the spirited attack of the noble and learned Lord, based on the assumption that such doctrines were enforced on this question, appeared to be a clever legal device to throw disrepute upon his opponents by putting into their mouths arguments which they would never have thought of using for a moment. He did not know where the noble and learned Lord found those who entertained the extraordinary views he had described now-a-days; and though they might have been held many years ago in some remote parts of Scotland, he (the Earl of Harrowby) did not know that they had ever prevailed in England. The whole of the question had been argued from the point of view of the working man. It was not the doing of the opponents of the Motion, but the noble Lord who introduced the subject (Lord Thurlow). He supported its action by stating it would greatly benefit the working man. He (the Earl of Harrowby) claimed to know something about the working man, having to within a very recent period represented in Parliament one of the largest working class constituencies in this country; and having been brought into close relations with those men he was able to speak as to their feelings on that Sunday question. He did not claim for them any superiority in virtue over other classes; but he said that the more anyone went among the skilled artizans and working men of England the more would he be convinced of the deep-seated reverence for the Sunday which existed in their minds quite distinct from other motives. He quite appreciated the motives of those noble Lords who wished to open those Galleries on Sundays to the working classes; and he was quite sure that it was due to the generous feeling that surrounded as they were by all sorts of useful or curious objects in their own homes, which they could enjoy on Sunday, noble Lords earnestly desired that the working man should be placed as far as possible in a similar position. That was a noble and generous sentiment; but surely they should seriously consider the reasonable and well thought out objections to that Motion of the class on whose behalf they acted. The noble and learned Earl near him (Earl Cairns) had completely disposed of the argument that that was a working class movement. There was no proof of it; indeed, the number of Petitions to Parliament against it, and the action of Municipalities, completely did away with the argument. There was not a single fact in support of it, and the more it was investigated the less it would be found a working class movement. What, he asked, happened a few years ago in Bethnal Green? The late Sir Charles Reed, the Chairman of the London School Board, had told him (the Earl of Harrowby) that the Bethnal Green Museum was largely prized by the working men of that neighbourhood; but when it was proposed to open that Museum on Sunday the feeling of the people of the district on the subject was taken, and 80,000 signatures were appended to a protest against the opening of the institution on Sunday. Instead of the current of feeling now running, as the noble Lord (Lord Thurlow) had said, in favour of the opening of Museums on Sundays, the fact was just the other way, and there had been a decided movement in the matter of late years. He ventured to say that, far from the tendency being in favour of Sunday amusements, it was all the other way, and that public opinion was in favour of tightening the law with regard to Sunday occupation rather than of loosening it. Many of their Lordships would remember that not very long ago all Royal receptions were on Sundays, and those and other similar things were deferred to week days in deference to the popular wish. Again, it was not so long since there was a postal delivery in London on Sundays; but public feeling had stopped that practice—a somewhat remarkable fact in the case of so great a commercial centre. The noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Bram-

well) seemed to think they might have a decorous Sunday with the Museums and Picture Galleries opened without a corresponding increase of work. On that point the working people had made up their minds. They had sent their representatives to visit France, Germany, and other countries, in which those places were opened on Sunday, and they had reported that wherever Picture Galleries, Museums, and Libraries were open on Sunday its certain concomitant was such an amount of additional work for the mass of the people that that fact had finally sealed the judgment of our working classes on that question. Surely, then, noble Lords who pressed the Motion ought to show some extraordinarily good results from the opening of Museums where it had taken place. Was it possible to say that Paris, Berlin, Vienna, Rome, or Naples were more moral or more pure than London? There was no proof that the opening of these institutions in these Continental cities had led to the moral elevation of their working populations. He defied any man to bring forward a single city abroad in which the working classes were higher in the tone of their moral and family life than they were in London. He was proud to think that drinking habits in England were now steadily going down; but he was sorry to say that abroad they were, unhappily, increasing. Again, if noble Lords were so anxious upon the subject, there were many much more hopeful means of promoting the health, happiness, and sobriety of our working classes than by the adoption of that Motion. He trusted that their Lordships would encourage every effort which those classes were now making to shorten the hours of labour, particularly of the young, and that they would think of the miserable lives of shop assistants, and help to ameliorate their lot. He trusted also that they would, by their social influence at least, seek to aid the masses of the people who were now overworked on Sundays. It was well known that it was one of the great cries of the whole of the railway service in England that they were dreadfully overworked on Sundays. Again, there was the case of the men employed in omnibuses, tramcars, and in similar occupations, such as cabmen and others, while country postmen and such trades as bakers and others suffered greatly from the same cause. A bitter feeling existed among those classes as to their overwork on Sunday, and a strong desire animated them to emancipate themselves from that curse. Again, their Lordships might assist in promoting the establishment of parks all round the increasing population of London; and if they wished to go farther in that direction, nothing could be more conducive to the welfare of the working classes than the improvement of their dwellings in our large towns. Those were points in which they could wisely, and with the full consent of the whole class affected, assist them in mending their condition, instead of embarking in that most delicate and most disastrous endeavour, by introducing the thin end of the wedge, and opening the Museums and Galleries, to increase Sunday work among the people. He trusted, however, that the Government would consider whether those Galleries could not be opened on week nights. It would be better even to knock off a few grants for fresh purchases of pictures, in order to introduce the electric light into those institutions, so as to throw them open on several week nights to the people. He asked their Lordships to reject this reactionary proposal, which would, as it were, put back the hand of the clock. It would rob the working classes of the rest which they now valued more than they did 30 years ago, and which they needed more now, because the pressure of their work was far heavier than it used to be. The simple result of adopting the Motion would be that their Lordships would do their best to increase the amusement of the rich, who had plenty of amusement already, while they would add to the burden of those who had too much work already. He begged them, therefore, to refuse their assent to that fatal proposal—fatal not only to England and these Islands, but fatal in its example on the Anglo-Saxon race, who, he was proud to think, cared most for the Sunday, revered its sacred obligations, and prized its most blessed results. In the last words uttered on the subject in that House by the late Lord Beaconsfield, he now asked their Lordships steadily to refuse to destroy "that most Divine of all Divine institutions which secures a day of rest for man."

LORD MOUNT-TEMPLE said, that if the proposal before the House involved any new departure, and an alteration in the mode of observing Sunday, which was characteristic of the nation, he should oppose it. No legislation was proposed, but only a definite expression of opinion in favour of extending the existing practice to another Museum. At the present moment, under the authority of Departments of the Government, the Picture Galleries of Hampton Court and the Botanical Collections at Kew were open to the public on Sunday; and that opinion, if given, could not be quoted in support of the opinion of the National Sunday League, that each man's observance be regulated by his own convictions, and be freed from ascetic restraint. The ultimate designs of the National League would be less likely to prevail if this reasonable change were granted than if the closing of Museums were to drive those who would be content with it into alliance with the Sunday National League for fundamental changes. The Jewish mode of employing their Sabbath had been alluded to. A day of rest was of incalculable importance to the whole community. There were, however, two forms of rest. It must be remembered that the Sabbath of the Jews came at the end of the week—at the close of six days of toil and labour; but the Sunday of the Christians was the first day of a week of work. The day of rest of the Jews was a day of rest in outward, material, formal ways; but that of Christians was a rest of preparation, and of the acquisition of fresh energy for the six days which were to follow. The day of rest assisted the rising out of the troubles and worries of daily life, and the development of the higher faculties of soul, heart, and mind. For the soul there was religious contemplation, for the heart domestic, family companionship, for the mind intellectual occupation, such as might be found in studying the works of the Creator through the instructive collections of the Natural History Museum. There was a large number of young men in London who had had education enough to appreciate a place of that kind, and in their interests he trusted that their Lordships would agree to the Motion. There were many persons of both sexes who had only bed rooms in London; when they were tired of walking about or wished for shelter on Sundays, when they had nothing to do, their choice lay between two places of public resort—either to go to church or chapel or to the public-house. A Museum of the kind to which they referred would, in spacious and comfortable Halls, if opened, afford shelter from cold and rain. Assistants in shops, messengers, and young men of the ordinary degree of education might meet friends, and obtain a considerable amount of intellectual recreation.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY said, he would not detain their Lordships many moments. He thought it was, in many ways, desirable that those plain arguments—for such he was persuaded they were—should be addressed to the House by Lay Peers. It was possibly with a certain amount of professional deduction that Spiritual Peers might be listened to on this subject; but he must say that, if he were an entirely independent listener, he could not doubt up to this moment on which side had lain the balance and the force of argument. The arguments on one side had been precise, clear, distinct, critical, and numerical; on the other side they had been, he must say, vague and anticipatory. The question at this time came before their Lordships in a very ingenious and very attractive form. It was a kind of bijou presentation of the argument. It came in the form in which he himself would have been most likely to admit it, and had been urged in a spirit which he could wholly accept. But while it was an application to open the doors of a single Museum on Sunday, none of them believed that that could be the end of the movement. While it was felt on both sides that it was undesirable to produce a Continental Sunday, a movement of this kind was known to be a change in the English Sunday. If it were believed that no change was coming on or expected, it would not have been so keenly urged. The English Sunday, as now observed, was no Puritan observance. They knew very well what a Puritanical Sunday was, and an English Sunday might be put in strong contrast with it. They knew historically how the present Sunday came into England. They knew that very early in the Plantagenet period it was pressed, preached, moved by re-

ligious and earnest people, just as temperance and other movements are pressed now; and the chroniclers told how this point of social improvement for the people was urged and gained ground, and gradually public opinion was affected, and then law became the expression of the public feeling of the riper and better heart of the community. It was originally promoted by all who wished the people well. There was no superstition about it. There was no superstition, he believed, about its observance in England; it was, indeed, part of the organized life of the Church, but it was also part of the civilized life of England. It belonged to the whole Church; the Roman Catholic portion of the Christian world and the Nonconformist portion of the Christian world took no different view. The memoirs of old France before the Revolution showed them that the old French Sunday was as like the Sunday in England as possible in its manner of observance. From that early beginning it had grown to what it was now as they found it; it was the sweetener of the toiling life of the nation. For masses of people it rendered the hard week's work tolerable; in many men's feelings it recompensed what would be otherwise too severe. The English Sunday rendered many lives quite happy which would otherwise be miserable; and, most of all, among the poorest and most hard-worked of the population. The noble and learned Lord (Lord Bramwell) had told them two years ago that he knew no more of theology than he did of astrology. He must congratulate the noble and learned Lord on the progress which he had made in his theological studies since that time. In his (the Archbishop of Canterbury's) own experience, Sunday was as different a day as possible from that which was described by the noble and learned Lord. He knew no families which did not enjoy it. Children liked Sunday better than any other day in the week. As for walking, which the noble and learned Lord held to be prohibited, the Sunday walk was an English institution. The noble and learned Lord went into historical as well as theological quotations. He reminded them of *The Book of Sports* of the Reigns of James I. and Charles I. But he forgot that it was *The Book of Sports*, as much as any single thing, which brought down the opposition of the people upon the Royalist Party. He believed that if Museums were opened there must be an increased pressure upon the poorest class of the people, who were least able to protect themselves. Promoters of Sunday opening expressed themselves as tired of hearing of cabmen, tramcar and omnibus drivers, conductors, porters, barmen, and barwomen; but these existed, a very vast and very defenceless class, more without holiday or change than any class, and least able to claim them. And when they considered that the South Kensington Museum was as far as possible from the very people whom it was proposed to benefit, it was hopeless to imagine that there would not be a great increase of traffic and a largely increased amount of labour. Those poor people, constituting a large bulk of our poorest population, were already at the pitch of despair with regard to their religious opportunities and their social advantages. He agreed with the noble and learned Earl (Earl Cairns) that Sunday traffic at the present time inflicted a serious grievance upon them, and he was quite convinced that that grievance would be much heavier if the Museums were opened. They could not have Mondays or Saturdays allowed them instead. The masters could not do it. The noble and learned Earl had quoted, to the clearest purpose, the state of things in foreign towns. In those towns, moreover, the average amount of labour in the week, as ascertained by the Commission, was 72 hours; and, in addition to that, they had their Sunday morning's technical school-work. Their Lordships ought to pay the greatest heed to the prospects of the lowest class among us, who, he feared, were being depressed to a constantly lower and lower point. We should have among us a class of people who could be only called white slaves. He desired the deliverance of those people, and not their further oppression. There was among the higher class of artizans an instinctive dread of the proposed change. It was said that the class of clerks and shop assistants would benefit by this change. But that very class had as great a dread of these changes as any class; because they also thought that they would lead to additional work. There was no proof that any class of the community desired this change. No

evidence had been produced. It was a patron's change. As regarded the opinion of that House, it was not to be desired, in a people's question, that it should be set in special contrast to that of the Representatives of the people. That was a delicate question, upon which he would say no more. With regard to the British Museum, it had been said that an overwhelming majority of the Trustees were in favour of opening the Museum on Sundays. But, as the noble and learned Earl had said, there were not a third of the Trustees present when that resolution was arrived at. The term, therefore, "overwhelming majority," was scarcely applicable to such a state of things. He was himself one of the Trustees of the Museum, and he must protest against its being supposed that, of their own authority, they had proposed to originate any such measure. Their proper wish was not to put any hindrance in the way if Parliament should desire the Museum to be opened on Sunday. He was sure that no such proposition could be properly said to have originated with the Trustees, and that they would wish to do no more than be prepared to follow the decision of Parliament.

EARL COWPER said, in supporting the Resolution, he wished to refer to the question of public-houses. Some stress had been laid on the argument that the public-houses and the Museums would not be opened at the same time. But how were those working men, who did not desire of themselves to go to public-houses, to get through 16 hours of a Sunday with nothing to do but either to sit in their own squalid dens, or wander about the dismal streets? It was obvious that if an opportunity of going to public exhibitions were presented to them the dreariness of the day would be broken, and many of them would be saved from going to the public-house. Then it was said that the matter ought to be left to the House of Commons to deal with, because it was one involving more or less the question of money; but if they admitted that consideration to affect them, they would be cut off from the consideration of a great many subjects, for there were few important questions which did not turn upon money—the question of peace or war, for example. If that argument was to hold good, their Lordships ought not to discuss the occupation of the Soudan, which would probably cost millions. But the money involved in this question was almost infinitesimal, and he believed the additional amount of work at South Kensington caused by its operation would be very small. Again, it was argued that it ought to be left entirely to the working men to decide that question for themselves. He had as high an opinion of working men as any of their Lordships, and was, perhaps, more anxious that they should be fully represented in Parliament than some of those who brought forward that argument. But he was not inclined to form his opinion of any question affecting working men on the number of Petitions presented for or against such questions. If they did so, they would be entering upon a dangerous principle. One of the main duties of that House was to protect minorities against the tyranny of majorities; and, before accepting them, he should like to inquire into the ground upon which these working men founded their opinions. In the present case it seemed to be almost entirely based on the assumption, involving a dread on their part, that the opening of public places on Sunday would gradually lead to their being obliged to work on Sundays; and it was that dread which led them to oppose that measure. But the amount of work which would be occasioned would be infinitesimal, and he failed to see how the opening of innocent places of amusement could perceptibly increase it. It was, therefore, in his opinion, a groundless fear. There were already the trains and omnibuses, and other forms of Sunday labour, which it would be much more reasonable to stop than to prevent the opening of Museums. But nobody would venture to stop those forms of labour on the Sunday. He desired, by all means, that theatres and music halls, and other places where money was paid, should not be opened on Sundays. He was, at all events, very glad that no attempt had been made on this occasion to maintain the old Puritanical idea of the Sabbath in that House, such as had been denounced by the noble and learned Lord (Lord Bramwell), and that no one had ventured to oppose that proposal on the ground that it was wrong to visit Museums on Sunday. With regard to the counter-proposition, they never heard of it at all, except

The Archbishop of Canterbury

when this Motion was brought forward. He hoped, however, that if it were passed again it would not be allowed to drop, but that something would be done to carry it into effect. He remained of the same opinion as last year, and should vote for the Motion.

EARL GRANVILLE said, he believed this to be a social, and not a political question. He did not agree that it was undesirable that this House should discuss and vote honestly upon social questions of this sort, more especially when the discussion was conducted in the spirit which had been shown on both sides of the House during this conversation. He had listened to the noble and learned Earl (Earl Cairns) with the greatest attention; but he had not heard a single argument which he had not heard before. The most rev. Primate (the Archbishop of Canterbury) objected to bringing out the worn-out argument about the cabs; but he immediately proceeded to adduce that argument. He did not see why it should be harder for a cabman, or for his horse, to take him a mile to Hyde Park Corner than it was to take him to Hampton Court or Kew. He did not desire, however, to raise that question now. He found himself in rather an anomalous position; for, on the one hand, he had to justify the Government for not having given their sanction to the resolution passed by the Trustees of the British Museum; while, on the other hand, he had to state why he should give the same vote to-night which he had formerly given. Up to the present time, the Government had not thought it right to take any action in regard to a social question the merits of which very much depended on the public feeling and the public opinion which existed. The celebrated opinion of the 500,000 working men in the Metropolis had been elicited, he would not say in an unfair way, but in the most unjudicial manner which it was possible to imagine. The working men were not simply asked whether they would have Museums or not opened on Sundays; but the question was mixed up with that of Sunday labour. The Government did not think they ought to take the initiative and responsibility of the vote passed by the Trustees of the British Museum; but, as regarded himself, he adhered to his former opinion, and when that opinion was asked for by the House of Lords he would give it in the way which his conscience had dictated to him up to the present time.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL said, he wished to refer, in the first place, to the speech of his noble Friend behind him (Lord Mount-Temple), who had put the matter on ground which it was hardly safe to stand upon. His noble Friend had said that this was a small matter, and that it was not a matter for legislation, as it was only carrying a little further a principle which was fully acknowledged—namely, that certain Museums and Exhibitions should be opened to the public on Sundays. What were the examples to which his noble Friend referred? He (the Duke of Argyll) believed there were only two—namely, the Museum in Kew Gardens and the Palace at Hampton Court; and these were not really cases in point. Both places were essentially Parks, and he did not suppose there was any Member of that House who was not in favour of all Parks and Gardens being open to the public. The Museum at Kew was but a small adjunct to the Gardens, and the same was the case with the Palace at Hampton Court. In his opinion, however, the vote they were asked to give that evening was one of very serious import. There was no use disguising the fact that it was a vote of considerable meaning and significance. That importance arose from the whole facts of the case, and from the previous transactions. The subject had been debated for several years in both Houses of Parliament, divisions had been taken, and in the other House especially large majorities—to a great extent representing the working classes—had always been against the opening of Museums on Sundays. Therefore, it was a serious vote which their Lordships were asked to give. And now he came to his noble and learned Friend the theologian (Lord Bramwell), with whom he could not agree. [*Laughter.*] Well, his noble and learned Friend might certainly be called so, for he was pre-eminently in that House the legal theologian. But although he did not agree with him, he acknowledged that the noble and learned Lord always came to the point; and in this case, by attacking the Puritan view of the Sunday, he had given the key to the movement which the Motion before

them was intended to serve. ["Hear, hear!"] From the cheers just given, it was plain that that was the view which prevailed among those who were in favour of the Motion. In attacking the Puritan view of the Sunday, his noble and learned Friend gave a description of the Sunday in England which, he confessed, was wholly new to him. Even in the Lowlands of Scotland, where the Sabbatical view was very strong, he had never heard so violent a view taken of the Sunday that the noble and learned Lord alleged was taken in London. Possibly, it might be heard of in the West of Ross-shire and some of the neighbouring isles; but, certainly, it was not the view of the Sunday that was taken in the more civilized parts of the country, and he was very much struck to hear it stated that such strong Sabbatical views obtained in England, and he thought it had even been suggested that the remark applied to London. This struck him as very strange, because it so happened that, about 30 years ago, there was a very remarkable book, published by a Scotchman, about a pedestrian tour which he took into England. It was called *First Impressions of England and its People.* It was written by a very remarkable man, whose powers of composition, and of expressing himself clearly, were second to none in the literature of this country—he referred to a man who was well-known in Scotland, though, perhaps, he might not be equally well-known to all their Lordships — namely, Hugh Miller, a man who began as a stonemason, having been educated in one of the parish schools, and became one of the leading scientific men of the day, and wrote books on Geology, which became standard works on that branch of natural science. He recommended noble Lords to read that book, and assured them they would nowhere find more graphic descriptions of English scenery, or of the historical incidents connected with places that were associated with the names of distinguished men. In the course of his work, Hugh Miller had, of course, to express his views in regard to the English Sunday, and though a Lowlander, and not a Highlander, he observed on the immense contrast it presented to the Sunday to which he had been accustomed. To him it appeared that in England the Sunday was not observed at all. He said—

"It is roast beef day; it is plum pudding day; it is clean shirt day; but it is not Sunday at all."

That was Hugh Miller's view of Sunday in England, and he (the Duke of Argyll) dared say he saw more of how it was observed than his noble and learned Friend was in the habit of doing. As to the origin of the British view of the Sunday, the most rev. Primate (the Archbishop of Canterbury) had told them that it was not true that the stricter view came in, as was supposed, with the Puritans, and that, as a matter of fact, it could be traced back to the Church of the Plantagenets. It was a curious fact that the observance of Sunday in Scotland, which was commonly supposed to be connected with Puritanism and Presbyterianism, was a peculiarity of the old Catholic Church of Scotland when it was a branch of the Western Church. If any historical fact had been more clearly ascertained than another with regard to those days, it was that the strictest view of the Sunday came in with the great religious revival effected in the time of William the Conqueror by a Saxon Princess, who married the son of Malcolm Canmore. It was not true, therefore, to say that the strict observance of the Sunday, either in England or in Scotland, was due to the peculiar views or doctrines of the Puritans. If the view prevalent in England were the extreme fanatical and superstitious view it was represented to be by his noble and learned Friend, he would agree with him that this Motion ought to be supported. He, however, took a very different view of the observance of Sunday in England from that of the noble and learned Lord. Of course there might be differences of opinion with reference to the historical account of the Jewish Sabbath; but he agreed with those who held that it was impossible to doubt that the setting apart of the Sabbath Day had a moral and social as well as a ceremonial significance. Taking it, however, in its social aspect, he supposed that they were now all agreed that the institution of the Seventh Day as a day of rest had been an immense blessing to man. His noble and learned Friend said he valued the day of rest himself; but he should bear in mind that his labours during the

week were of a mental character, and that a day of active life might, therefore, be a sort of rest to him; whereas it would not be a day of rest to a working man who had been engaged in hard physical labour all the week. Working men valued the Sunday as being a day of absolute cessation from physical labour; and he believed they looked with great jealousy and suspicion upon any innovation that would tend to impair their privileges in the matter, and which would throw open the door to a larger and larger share of Sunday labour being imposed upon them. His own feeling was that the working classes were right in taking this view of the matter. In his opinion a great deal of nonsense—pure nonsense—had been talked about the advantages that were to be obtained, in the way of improving the mind, from simply walking through Museums. Why, even if their Lordships themselves, who were better educated, went into a department of a Museum with the objects of which they were unacquainted, they could do nothing but stare and gaze; they could only take an interest in subjects of which they had some knowledge; and therefore he agreed with the noble and learned Earl when he said that, unless lectures involving great labour to the lecturers were delivered, the working classes would derive very little amusement or instruction from their visits to Museums on Sundays. It was said that Museums and Art Galleries were better than public-houses; but if they were once to open the doors of Museums on Sundays, it would be difficult to draw the line and to prevent theatres, aquariums, dancing halls, and other places of which the same might be said being also opened on those days. In these circumstances he thought that it would be better not to admit the thin end of the wedge; and he should, therefore, refuse his assent to the Motion of the noble Lord (Lord Thurlow).

THE EARL OF DENBIGH said, that, while he most heartily sympathized with the feeling of the noble Lord (Lord Thurlow) in favour of affording more wholesome amusement to the working classes, he valued still more the character of the Lord's Day in this country, which was always a pleasing contrast in his eyes when he returned from Paris and saw how little it was regarded there. It made him proud of being an Englishman. He did not support the views of those who looked upon it as the Jewish Sabbath. That was swept away, with all its obligations, when the Jewish Church ceased to exist. The nascent Catholic Church, which then, as now, had full power of legislation in all that constituted religious observances, changed the seventh day as the day of rest ordained by God to the first day of the week on which our Lord rose, and the conditions of its observance were declared to be public worship and rest from servile work. Now, no one could suppose for a moment that the proposal now before their Lordships to keep open one Museum for a few hours on Sunday would stop there. It would soon include all places of public amusement, where much servile work would necessarily be done; and he agreed with the noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) that it was the thin end of the wedge which was now endeavoured to be thrust in, and a door would be opened over which they could have no control. For that reason he would vote against the Motion.

On Question, whether the words proposed to be left out shall stand part of the Motion?

Their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 64; Not-Contents 64.

CONTENTS.

Beaufort, D.	Aberdare, L.
Wellington, D.	Ashford, L. (*V. Bury.*)
	Blantyre, L.
Ailesbury, M.	Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Bristol, M.	Bramwell, L.
Northampton, M.	Carlingford, L.
Ripon, M.	Castletown, L.
	Clanwilliam, L. (*E. Clanwilliam.*)
Brownlow, E.	Clifford of Chudleigh, L.
Caledon, E.	De L'Isle and Dudley L.
Camperdown, E.	Elgin, L. (*E. Elgin an Kincardine.*)
Cowper, E.	Ettrick, L. (*L. Napier*
Dartrey, E.	FitzGerald, L.
Ellesmere, E.	Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*)
Fortescue, E.	Greville, L.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)	Harris, L.
Granville, E.	Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Hardwicke, E.	Hawke, L.
Kimberley, E.	Hothfield, L.
Lathom, E.	Lovat, L.
Milltown, E.	Meldrum, L. (*M. Huntly.*)
Minto, E.	Monk Bretton, L.
Morley, E.	Monson, L.
Northesk, E.	
Onslow, E.	
Sydney, E.	
Sherbrooke, V.	
Torrington, V.	

Montcagle of Brandon, L.
Mount-Temple, L.
Napier, L.
Ramsay, L. (*E. Dalhousie.*)
Romilly, L.
Saltoun, L.
Sefton, L. (*E. Sefton.*)
Somerton, L. (*E. Normanton.*)
Strafford, L. (*V. Enfield.*) [*Teller.*]
Stratheden and Campbell, L.
Sudeley, L.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)
Thurlow, L. [*Teller.*]
Wigan, L. (*E. Crawford and Balcarres.*)
Windsor, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Canterbury, L. Archp.
Selborne, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)
York, L. Archp.

Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Norfolk, D.
Richmond, D.

Salisbury, M.
Winchester, M.

Beauchamp, E.
Bradford, E.
Cairns, E. [*Teller.*]
De La Warr, E.
Denbigh, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Effingham, E.
Feversham, E.
Fitzwilliam, E.
Harrowby, E.
Jersey, E.
Manvers, E.
Orkney, E.
Ravensworth, E.
Redesdale, E.
Rosslyn, E.
Sondes, E.
Stanhope, E.
Tankerville, E.

Eversley, V.
Hardinge, V.
Hood, V.
Melville, V.
Sidmouth, V.
Strathallan, V.
Templetown, V.

Carlisle, L. Bp.
Chichester, L. Bp.
Newcastle, L. Bp.
Norwich, L. Bp.
Oxford, L. Bp.
St. Albans, L. Bp.
Winchester, L. Bp.

Amherst, L. (*V. Holmesdale.*)
Braye, L.
Colville of Culross, L.
Congleton, L.
de Ros, L. [*Teller.*]
De Saumarez, L.
Delamere, L.
Donington, L.
Ebury, L.
Egerton, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Forester, L.
Harlech, L.
Hylton, L.
Kinnaird, L.
Northbourne, L.
Norton, L.
Ormathwaite, L.
Plunket, L.
Shute, L. (*V. Barrington.*)
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*)
Teynham, L.
Wimborne, L.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR : The Contents being 64 and the Not-Contents also 64, according to the established Rule of this House, *semper presumitur pro negante*, the Not-Contents have it.

Then it was *moved* to resolve—

"That the Trustees of the British Museum having applied to the Treasury for the funds necessary to light up the Natural History Museum with the electric light, and having lighted up the reading room of the British Museum with the electric light till eight o'clock at night for several years with 'very satisfactory results,' and having obtained estimates for lighting the whole of the British Museum at night with electricity, and bearing in mind that the South Kensington Museum has been opened till ten o'clock at night for twenty-eight years, and been visited at night by 6,885,722 persons, and that the Bethnal Green Museum has been opened at night for twelve years and been visited in the evenings by 3,567,278 persons, and that a Parliamentary Committee has recommended 'That the British Museum and National Gallery should be opened on week-day evenings between the hours of seven and ten in the evening at least three days in the week,' this House is of opinion that the time has arrived when this recommendation should be carried into effect, and the national collections opened on week-day evenings but not on Sundays."

The said Motion (on question) *agreed to.*

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS—CORRECTION.—QUESTION.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON asked the Lord President of the Council, Whether there is not an error made on page 12 of the recent Return of the Estimated Produce of the Crops of 1884, by the statement that the last wheat crop showed a deficiency of 7,756,000 bushels as compared with the estimated yearly average of the previous ten years?

LORD CARLINGFORD (LORD PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL): There is an error in a sentence of the introductory remarks upon the Return which is really inconsistent with the statistics. The tables do not show a deficiency of the wheat crop of 1884, as compared with the average of the previous 10 years, (nearly all of which fall below the ordinary average), but with the average estimated for a much longer period.

INDIA—BENGAL TENANCY ACT—THE BENGAL LANDLORDS.

OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS, in rising to call attention to a telegram from the President of the Committee of the Landlords of Bengal, said, he was desirous that there should be no misunderstanding on this matter, and the landlords were anxious that there should be no mistake as to the views they held. The noble Earl, after reading the telegram which he had received, said it protested in their name against the Tenancy Bill as being unjust in principle and contrary to the policy laid down by Her Majesty to her Indian subjects, by which she agreed to perpetuate their rights. It further protested against the Bill as proceeding on entirely untrue allegations, and on the assumption that the Zemin-

dars were rack-renting and oppressive landlords, whereas the general opinion was, that they had exercised their rights in a conspicuously moderate manner. They alleged that while the Bill would deprive the Zemindars of their rights, it would reduce the actual cultivators to the position of mere cottier tenants rack-rented by usurers, as in the Deccan. They further alleged that the Bill had been passed by persons who had no interest in its provisions, but who were forcing it upon 60,000,000 of unwilling people. Out of 20 Members of the Council which had passed the Bill, 15 were in the service of the Government. Moreover, the Bill had been entirely recast; but, notwithstanding the great changes which had been made in it, it had been passed without being republished. They therefore humbly prayed Her Majesty not to allow the Act to remain on the Statute Book. He might add that he had received a letter from Mr. Miller, an Englishman, and the Vice President of the Indian Constitutional Association. In that letter he said that there had been already introduced into the Indian Council two Bills supplementary to the Bengal Tenancy Act. That sort of legislation was bearing the same fruit as the Irish Land Act. It was earnestly hoped by the Committee to which he had referred that the Royal Assent would be withheld from the measure which had just been passed by the Legislative Council.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, he wished to say that he had received a telegram from the same quarter of very much the same purport as that read by the noble Earl (the Earl of Wemyss). He did not wish to make any observation upon it; but he could not think it a convenient arrangement that communications should take place by telegram between Natives of India and Members of the two Houses of Parliament having for their object the modification of the action of the Government in India. Whether this action on the present occasion was right or not he did not know; but the noble Earl the Secretary of State for India (the Earl of Kimberley) would, doubtless, have an opportunity of considering the measure, and determining whether it was his duty to advise Her Majesty to disallow it. The noble Earl stated the other night that the Act would become law without any further action on his part, unless within a certain time he advised Her Majesty to disallow it.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY said, that while he fully concurred in what had fallen from the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Salisbury) respecting the undesirability of communications taking place between Natives of India and Members of that House with regard to legislation in India, he had nothing to add to what he stated the other night—namely, that the Bill had not yet reached him, and that it could not do so for a certain time. When it did come before him he had no reason to believe he should look upon it unfavourably; but there was not the least probability that any action would be taken in the matter before all the Memorials on the subject had been received and considered. He wished to take that opportunity of correcting a slight error in the telegram from Lord Dufferin which he read on the previous occasion. In the words of Lord Dufferin's telegram of March 11, instead of—

"First Motion in Council was for suspension by Zemindar Representatives, which was lost by a majority of 18 to 2,"

it should have been "17 to 2."

SCIENCE AND ART—THE NATIONAL GALLERY—THE ANNUAL GRANT.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS, in rising to ask Her Majesty's Government, Whether it had been intimated to the Trustees of the National Gallery that the annual grant is to be taken away for a term of years to repay the purchase of the Raphael and Vandyck recently bought; whether the Trustees were given any option in the matter; and, whether they had made any representation on the subject? said, he did not contend that £70,000 was too large a sum to pay for these remarkable pictures. Unquestionably, if we had not given the money for them, someone else would. The question was, what course was to be pursued in consequence of the purchase of these pictures? He was informed that the annual grant was to be withdrawn from the Trustees of the National Gallery for a term of years, and that they had written to the Treasury strongly remonstrating. He would supplement his Question by asking whether the Government would have any

objection to lay this Correspondence on the Table?

LORD THURLOW, in replying to the Question on behalf of the Treasury, said, that, as in the case of the Peel Collection, the Treasury had come to the conclusion, after mature consideration, that they would not be justified in including any sum for the purchase of pictures for the National Gallery in the Estimates, in consequence of the very large expenditure recently incurred in the purchase of the Raphael and Vandyck from the Blenheim Collection. In making that communication to the Trustees of the National Gallery, the Treasury accompanied it with the expression of their readiness at any time seriously to consider any special opportunity that might occur to the Trustees of making any favourable purchase of works of art that might be in the market of any school, or characteristic of any school, now held not to be sufficiently represented in our Collections. In such an event, the Treasury would be quite prepared to consider the advisability of a special grant. He was not aware of the Correspondence to which the noble Earl referred; but he would remind the noble Earl that in matters of finance the Trustees of the National Gallery were subject to the control of the Treasury.

VISCOUNT HARDINGE said, that, as one of the Trustees of the National Gallery, he could state that they most earnestly deprecated the course which the Treasury had thought it their duty to adopt on the present occasion. They felt that their hands would be considerably hampered when pictures came suddenly into the market, and that there would be great difficulty in inducing the Treasury to purchase these pictures. They had accordingly made strong remonstrances to the Treasury on the subject; and he hoped that the Government would see fit to publish those remonstrances, and that they would reconsider their decision upon the matter, for it could not be said to be finally settled, seeing that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had consented to receive a deputation respecting it.

EARL GRANVILLE said, that he entirely sympathized with both the noble Lords in their desire to make this magnificent Collection as perfect as possible. He thought, however, that they would not strengthen, but would rather weaken the hands of the Government, in pressing them not to show the same solicitude for the public purse with regard to works of art as was observed with respect to other things.

WATER COMPANIES (REGULATION OF POWERS) BILL.

NOMINATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN, in moving the appointment of the following as Members of the Select Committee on the Bill:—The Earl of Jersey, Earl Stanhope, the Earl of Camperdown, the Earl of Elgin, the Earl of Normanton, Viscount Barrington, and Lord Bramwell, said, that the Committee would meet on Monday next at 2.30, to appoint their Chairman, and that they would be willing to hear such Representatives of the Water Companies as might choose to attend. They would also be prepared to receive such Petitioners as might present themselves.

Motion *agreed to.*

The Committee to meet on *Monday* next at half past Two o'clock, and to appoint their own Chairman: All petitions *referred* to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard against the Bill to be heard by themselves or their agents.

House adjourned at half past Seven o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 20th March, 1885.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — Postal Service (Great Britain and North America), *appointed.*

SUPPLY—*considered in Committee — Resolutions* [March 19] *reported.*

WAYS AND MEANS—*considered in Committee — Resolutions* [March 19] *reported.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered—First Reading*—Army (Annual) * [104]; Consolidated Fund (No. 2)*; Royal Irish Constabulary Redistribution * [105]; Burial Boards (Contested Elections) * [106].

First Reading—Marriages Validity * [103].

Second Reading—Referred to Select Committee—Post Office Sites * [72].

Select Committee — Registration (Occupation Voters) *[63], *nominated.*

Committee—Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) (*re-comm.*) [49]—R.P. [*Seventh Night.*]

QUESTIONS.

—o—

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—COLONEL FORBES, R.M., BELFAST.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he will issue a Special Commission, on an early date, for the examination of five or six independent witnesses, in Belfast (whose names shall be furnished), who are prepared to controvert and disprove, on oath, the statements made by Colonel Forbes when his magisterial conduct and character were impeached in a recent Police Court prosecution in his district; and, if so, would the Commission be authorised to receive general evidence as to his alleged partisanship on the occasion in question?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Government see no necessity to issue any such Commission.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—COOTEHILL UNION—ROBERT GRAHAM, CLERK TO THE GUARDIANS.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What is the result of his inquiry to the Poor Law Guardians of Cootehill regarding the conduct of their clerk, Robert Graham; what action will the Local Government Board take with regard to the tenure of his office by Graham; and, whether he will order a prosecution for perjury against Graham irrespective of the decision of the Local Government Board?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Guardians have fixed the 3rd proximo as the day on which they will take into consideration the conduct of Mr. Graham. Any further action must await the result of their deliberations.

IRELAND—REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS AND DEATHS, BELFAST.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is a fact that the registrar of deaths in Belfast keeps his office open only after seven o'clock in the evening, consequently the burial societies do not pay amounts insured of parties who die on Friday till the following Monday, and the relatives, in many cases, have not the means to pay the funeral expenses; and, whether he will try to have cause of complaint removed?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I directed a letter to be written to the hon. Member on the 15th instant, informing him that there are 10 registration districts in Belfast, and that before inquiries could be made it would be necessary that he should specify the name of the particular district or of the particular registrar to whom his Question referred. The hon. Member has not since replied, nor has he amended his Question. I am, therefore, unable to answer it.

MR. BIGGAR: Might I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the clerks in the Local Government Offices in Dublin are so very hard worked that they really could not find time to write 10 letters in order to get important information?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The hon. Member first put down his Question without saying what part of Ireland it was in which this registration had been misconducted. I then elicited from him that it was in Belfast. There are 10 registrars in Belfast, and I asked him which was the registrar he referred to.

PHARMACY AND POISONS ACTS (IRELAND)—LEGISLATION.

MR. GIBSON asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether Her Majesty's Government intend, this Session, to introduce a Bill embodying the suggestions of the Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland for the amendment of the Pharmacy Act (Ireland) and the Poisons Act (Ireland)?

MR. MUNDELLA: A Bill has already been introduced in the House of Lords dealing with the sale of poisons, and it was read a second time last night. The recommendations of the Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland relate to two subjects—namely, some changes in the constitution of the society, and some in the law affecting the sale of poisons. The Government have thought it right to limit the Bill they have introduced to the latter branch of the subject, and it will be found that some of the recommendations of the society have been adopted. The draft Bill was referred to the Irish Government, and the clauses

applying it to Ireland were prepared by them.

MR. WARTON asked whether the Bill included poisons contained in patent medicines as well as other poisons?

MR. MUNDELLA said, he must refer the hon. and learned Gentleman to the Bill itself.

MR. WARTON wished to know, in that case, when the Government intended to redeem the pledge they made last year upon the subject?

[No reply.]

THE ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—FISHING IRREGULARITY, LISBURN DISTRICT.

MR. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is a fact that the Killavullen (county Cork) policemen, or any of them, have received anglers' salmon licences gratis from the Fishery Conservators or their inspector, on condition of prosecuting poor fishermen fishing for salmon without the written authority of the riparian proprietors; and, if so, whether such a practice is legal?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is the fact that some sergeants and constables in the Lismore district have received free licences from the Fishery Conservators in consideration of their services in protecting salmon during the annual close season. No condition such as mentioned in the Question, nor any condition has been imposed, and the Constabulary do not, and could not, prosecute for fishery trespasses. I am advised that the licence may protect the person fishing, but that it is questionable whether the Conservators are not bound to charge themselves with the licence duty. That, however, is a matter between them and those interested in the funds derived from licences.

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—OFFERS OF MILITARY CO-OPERATION BY INDIAN PRINCES.

DR. CAMERON asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether he would inform the House of the answer returned to the mediatized Indian Princes who offered troops to the British Government for employment in the Soudan; or if, as has been done in the case of similar offers from the Colonies, he would lay the Correspondence on the subject upon the Table?

MR. J. K. CROSS: We have not yet received from the Government of India any despatch on this subject; but, as I stated the other night to the House, the Nizam of Hyderabad, the Begum of Bhopal, and the Rajahs of Patiala and Jhind, have most loyally offered military assistance to the British Government. These offers have already been cordially acknowledged in both Houses of Parliament.

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—THE INDIAN CONTINGENT—VETERINARY ARRANGEMENTS.

DR. CAMERON asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether any remonstrance was received by the Indian Government as to the inadequacy of the veterinary establishment sent with the Indian Contingent to Egypt in 1882, and the dangers thereby entailed upon the British Forces with which it co-operated; and, whether any arrangement has been made, in connection with the Indian Contingent about to be despatched to the Soudan, to prevent the disregard of veterinary superintendence, characteristic of Indian Army administration, from neutralising the elaborate system of veterinary superintendence characteristic of the administration of a British Army in the field?

MR. J. K. CROSS: The Correspondence which passed between the War Office and the India Office on the subject referred to by my hon. Friend was forwarded to the Government of India for such action as might be necessary; and the Commander-in-Chief issued instructions for such periodical veterinary inspection as would guard against the possibility of the recurrence of an oversight such as that which took place in 1882. To make this quite sure, the precaution was taken of telegraphing to the Government of India to remind them of their Regulation, which required the veterinary inspection of all animals before embarking them for Suakin. A first-class veterinary surgeon accompanies the Force in charge of the brigade transport mules. The regiment of Cavalry has its own Native Establishment. I cannot admit the sweeping charge brought by my hon. Friend that a dangerous disregard of veterinary superintendence

is a characteristic of Indian military administration. On the contrary, I believe that in this, as in all other branches of the equipment and administration of an Army in the field, the Government of India have attained a high degree of efficiency.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—ELECTION OF PETTY SESSIONS CLERK, TOOME BRIDGE DISTRICT, CO. ANTRIM—MR. KELLY.

MR. SMALL asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he is aware that, on the 4th February, the magistrates of the Toome Bridge District, county Antrim, appointed as Petty Sessions clerk, notwithstanding that there were several suitable candidates, a Mr. Kelly, who is non-resident in the district, who is believed to be over forty years of age (the limit fixed by the regulations), and who is insolvent; whether, notwithstanding that, at the time of the election, Mr. Kelly undertook, if elected, to take up his residence in the district, he has not done so; whether Mr. Kelly gave any evidence of his age, and what was the character of the evidence; and, whether it is intended to sanction the appointment of a person to whom these objections lie?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Mr. Kelly has been appointed on the condition that he resides within the prescribed distance—1½ miles—of the Court House. He has made arrangements for doing so in May next. Mr. Kelly was not disqualified by any act of insolvency, and he submitted evidence of his being within the limit of age. His appointment has been approved by the Lord Lieutenant on the condition I have stated.

INLAND REVENUE (IRELAND) — MR. RICHARD HARVEY, STAMP DISTRIBUTOR AT DROGHEDA.

MR. SEXTON asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the Government are aware that Mr. Richard Harvey, Stamp Distributor at Drogheda, has been appointed Secretary to the Board of Conservators of Fisheries of the Drogheda District; whether the district in question extends from Drogheda to the most distant part of the county of Meath; whether the performance of the duties of the office of Secretary to the Board will require Mr. Harvey's frequent presence at places distant from Drogheda; whether the performance of the duties of the office of Stamp Distributor at Drogheda requires Mr. Harvey's daily attendance at the stamp office in that town; and, whether Mr. Harvey will be permitted to hold both offices?

MR. HIBBERT: I believe Mr. Harvey has accepted the office in question. It is not under the control of any Government Department. This is not contrary to the Regulations of the Service as long as his duties as Head Distributor of Stamps are properly performed. The hon. Member may rest assured that the Board of Inland Revenue will take good care that they are attended to. The Board of Inland Revenue are aware of the case.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES (IRELAND)—DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.

MR. SEXTON asked the President of the Board of Trade, If he is aware that the fund remaining, after the dissolution of the Great Southern and Western (of Ireland) Railway Company Friendly Society, has not yet been distributed; whether, as the notice of dissolution was published on the 25th of June 1884, the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies was bound by law to proceed to distribute the fund at the end of last December; why the delay has occurred; and, whether the fund will now be at once distributed?

MR. HIBBERT: The delay in this case is due to the difficulty which has been experienced in obtaining the necessary particulars as to the ages and dates of entry and the contributions of the various classes of Members. These particulars are essential to an equitable division of the funds amongst the members; and in order to deal justly with the interests of all concerned, every effort has been made to obtain these particulars as soon as possible as a basis for apportionment. The delay is not due to any Government Department.

THE ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—SERGEANT M'CANLEY AND OTHERS.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, in a letter written in July 1883, the Lord Lieutenant highly commended the conduct of Sergeant M'Canley

and Constables Cronin, Grey, and Minogue, of the Doocastle (county Sligo) Constabulary Station, who, finding that a girl named Margaret Raftery was lying ill of an infectious fever, with no one to attend upon her, "attended her at the risk of catching the infection, ministered to her wants, and used their utmost exertions to save her life;" whether, although the Lord Lieutenant caused to be conveyed to the men the expression of his satisfaction and commendation, they had not received a favourable record in recognition of their humanity and courage; and, whether a favourable record will now be made in their regard?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is quite true that the Lord Lieutenant did, in September, 1883, express high commendation of the humanity and courage displayed by these four men in the circumstances set forth in the Question, and such commendations have always been regarded as distinguished marks of approval for those who receive them. I believe it is usual for the recipients of such communications, or for their immediate officers, to take the steps necessary to bring the case under the notice of the Board who adjudge favourable records, and that this has not been done in the present instance.

INTERNATIONAL LAW—HOSTILITIES BETWEEN FRANCE AND CHINA—THE RIGHT OF SEARCH.

MR. GORST asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government have recognized the right of French ships of war to detain and search on the high seas British ships bound to Chinese ports and to Hong Kong; whether the German Government has, on the contrary, abstained from recognising similar rights in reference to German ships; and, whether the different action in this respect of the British and German Governments is having the effect of transferring Chinese trade from the British to the German flag? He also wished to ask a further Question of which he had given the noble Lord private Notice—whether he had observed in *The Times* of yesterday a telegram from Hong Kong as follows:—

"The right of search interferes seriously with the natural flow of trade. Several English lines discharge at Singapore everything which possibly may be considered contraband destined for Hong Kong. British steamowners fear the Courts at Saigon, but the German do not. German bottoms are rapidly supplanting the English."

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Her Majesty's Government have recognized the belligerent right of France to search neutral vessels on the high seas for contraband of war destined for China during the existing hostilities. The German Government have made no public notification to the effect stated by the hon. and learned Gentleman, and Her Majesty's Government are not aware that such is their intention. Her Majesty's Government are unable to return an answer to the third Question put by the hon. and learned Gentleman, as they have no information on the points referred to.

MR. GORST: Does Her Majesty's Government recognize the same rights on the part of the Chinese to search English vessels?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The question has not arisen. There has been no public notification.

MR. BOURKE: Will the noble Lord ascertain from the French Government whether that Government has given the same instructions to their officers with respect to German ships as they have with respect to English ships? I do not expect that the noble Lord can give me an answer now. I only ask him to make inquiry.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I will be glad if the right hon. Member will put his Question on the Paper.

THE NEWSPAPER PRESS (IRELAND)—THE "UNITED IRELAND"—OFFENSIVE CARTOONS.

MR. BERESFORD asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to a cartoon representing the death of Earl Spencer, published in the last weekly edition of *United Ireland;* whether he is aware that the proprietors of this newspaper are Members of the House of Commons; and, whether, in view of the prevalence of crime in Ireland in recent years, he proposes to take any steps to check attacks of such a character upon Her Majesty's representative in Ireland?

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: Before the right hon. Gentleman answers that

Question, I would like to ask him whether his attention has been called to the cartoon in *The St. Stephen's Review* representing the death of the Prime Minister, with the ghosts of General Gordon and others accusing him of murder; whether the Conservative Press has not accused the Prime Minister of this and other crimes; if the gentlemen who are the proprietors of these journals are not Members of the House of Commons; and, whether any steps will be taken to prevent attacks of such a character upon the First Minister of the Crown?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have not seen the publication to which the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) alludes; but I have seen the cartoon referred to by the hon. Member for Armagh (Mr. Beresford). It is entitled "A Political Deathbed Scene." Even when viewed in the comparatively favourable light suggested by the title, it would be condemned by most people as offending against good taste and decent feeling. On the general question, however, of the treatment of publications of this sort, I can only refer the hon. Gentleman to the reply I gave to a Question of the hon. Member for Wicklow County (Mr. M'Coan) on the 4th of December last.

MR. SEXTON: I would ask the right hon. Gentleman, whether he is aware that English journals are constantly in the habit of representing the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) wearing a mask and engaged in acts of arson and assassination?

[No reply.]

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—EXAMINATIONS.

LORD ARTHUR HILL asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is a fact that, at an examination in tactics for Officers of the Auxiliary Forces, held in January last at Chelsea Barracks, Officers were directed to bring their own pens, ink, and blotting paper; whether it is a fact that no arrangements for the examination had been made; whether the Officers were kept waiting in the barrack yard for more than an hour; and, whether they were finally huddled into a cold building, which was without fire or any suitable arrangement?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: On the occasion referred to officers were required to bring pens and blotting-paper, but not ink. Arrangements for the examination had been made; but a misunderstanding arose as to the hour when the room would be required. As a result, the officers were kept waiting for 40 minutes, which time was not deducted from that allowed for the examination. During the interval the candidates were, it is believed, invited into the officers' quarters; and ultimately the examination took place in a room duly prepared, with fire, &c.

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL asked whether the noble Marquess could inform the House what amount of saving was effected by compelling the officers to provide their own stationery?

[No reply.]

ARMY—THE 5TH ROYAL IRISH LANCERS.

SIR JOSEPH BAILEY asked the Secretary of State for War, If any of the twenty-five men of the 5th Royal Irish Lancers, who were reported to have deserted at Kingstown on the embarkation of the regiment for the Soudan, have been apprehended, and what was their nationality?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: There were no desertions on the occasion referred to.

POST OFFICE—THE PARCEL POST HORSES.

MR. ONSLOW asked the Postmaster General, If his attention has been called to the bad condition of a large number of the horses used in the Parcel Post vans; and, what is the system employed by the Post Office for a proper periodical inspection of these horses?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: In reply to the Question of the hon. Member I beg to state that the horses employed in the Parcel Post vans are the property of the contractors for the conveyance of parcel mails in the Metropolis; and I am not aware that there is anything in the condition of the horses which prevents the service from being conducted efficiently, and would justify the Department in making a complaint.

NAVY—THE ERICSON TORPEDO BOAT.

SIR JOHN HAY asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, If an officer has been sent to inspect the torpedo boat of Cap-

tain Ericson; and, if the Report, when received, will be submitted to the House?

MR. CAINE: A naval officer has been ordered to make inquiry on the spot respecting Captain Ericson's submarine gun and the torpedo boat in which it is fitted. It is not desirable in the public interest to lay Reports in cases such as this on the Table of the House.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (REDISTRIBUTION) BILL—THE BOUNDARY MAPS.

MR. FRANCIS BUXTON asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether the maps and reports of the Boundary Commissioners under the Seats Bill, which he promised to have prepared separately for each county division and borough, are yet ready; and, when they will be obtainable?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE, in reply, said, he was informed that a considerable number of the maps and Reports for separate counties and boroughs of the Boundary Commissioners had been prepared.

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIAN MISSION TO CABUL—M. LESSAR.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the M. Lessar, now acting in London on behalf of the Russian Government, is the same M. Lessar who was with General Stolieteff's secret Mission to the late Amir Shir Ali at Kabul in 1878?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: There is no reason for supposing that any gentleman of the name of Lessar accompanied General Stolieteff on his Mission to Cabul; but if the hon. Member will kindly furnish me with his authority for his supposition, I will take steps to ascertain whether it is correct.

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—PRISONERS OF THE MAHDI.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he has received confirmation of the following statements made by the Correspondent of *The Daily Telegraph*:—

"A messenger from Omdurman, a suburb of Khartoum, which he left on February 10th, has just reached Dongola. This messenger brings the following news:—'Slatin Bey (formerly Governor of Darfur) is in chains at Omdurman. The misfortunes of those in his (the Mahdi's) toils, the writer declares, have reached an unfathomable depth.' The closing sentences of the letter are as follows:—'Khartoum has been sacked, and its people massacred. We calculate the number of victims at over 2,000. The Consul Hansal was murdered, with all the Europeans and General Gordon. This account of the massacre bears out what George, Sir Charles Wilson, and others have told me of having seen Europeans and other bodies floating down the river, some corpses being tied back to back;"

and, whether Her Majesty's Government have taken any steps to ransom Slatin Bey, and M. Cuzzi, General Gordon's agent at Berber, and the women and children of the loyal inhabitants of Berber and Khartoum, who were sold into slavery after the sack of those cities?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: All the information in the possession of Her Majesty's Government with regard to Slatin Bey and Khartoum has been laid before Parliament. Her Majesty's Government have taken no steps to ransom Slatin Bey or M. Cuzzi; but one of the main objects of Lord Wolseley's Expedition will be to secure the safety of those who have remained loyal to the Egyptian Government, and he will take every step which is likely to secure that object.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked whether Lord Wolseley had been authorized to offer any ransom for those unfortunate prisoners who, according to his information, were now in great suffering?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Lord Wolseley has received full powers to take whatever steps he considers desirable.

THE DYNAMITE EXPLOSIONS AT WESTMINSTER HALL—CONSTABLES COLE AND COX.

MR. FAY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is the intention of the Government to at once put Constables Cole and Cox upon full pay pensions, and make some provision for those depending upon them for support, having regard to the fact that in consequence of the injuries sustained by them in the dynamite explosions within this House, their lives have been rendered miserable; the result of their having been loyal and true to their trust?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I am happy to say that Constables Cole and Cox have left the hospital, and they are

now promoted to the rank of sergeant, besides receiving pecuniary rewards. I am also happy to say that there is no question of pension, because I hope that with advanced rank they will soon be able to return to their duty. I have heard that they have received leave of absence on full pay for three months, to enable them to go to a convalescent home.

SOUTH AFRICA—SIR CHARLES WARREN'S MISSION.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether Her Majesty's Government have any further information with respect to Sir C. Warren's Mission in South Africa; and, whether the Government have any information as to the likelihood of a peaceable understanding being come to with the Boers about the disputed territory?

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY: From the latest information received, it appears that Sir Charles Warren, after having established a satisfactory state of things in Stellaland, has reached Rooi Grond, in the Land of Goschen; and there seems good reason to hope that he will be able to settle matters there peacefully.

CENTRAL ASIA—THE RUSSIAN RAILWAY FROM THE CASPIAN TO SARAKHS.

Mr. ONSLOW asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he could not obtain reliable information from our Minister at Teheran as to how far the Railway from the Caspian to Sarakhs has been completed; and, how soon it is probable that the whole line will be made?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Her Majesty's Minister at Teheran has informed Her Majesty's Government that the railway, as I stated on Tuesday, is being pushed on to Askabad, and that his correspondents on the frontier report that it is not open beyond Kizil Arvat, the point up to which I some time ago informed the House it was finished. I have, however, seen other statements to the effect that it was open to Bami.

CENTRAL ASIA — THE RUSSO-AFGHAN BOUNDARY.

Mr. ONSLOW asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government communicated, as soon as it was made, the substance of the new agreement to Sir Peter Lumsden, with instructions that he should inform the Ameer without delay that such an agreement had been arrived at?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The assurances received from the Russian Government were communicated to Sir Peter Lumsden, and he has been instructed to inform the Ameer's Representative that the policy of the Afghans should be to maintain the *status quo* pending the negotiations which are still proceeding with the Russian Government.

Mr. ONSLOW: When was that notification sent to General Lumsden?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: All important communications are at once telegraphed to Sir Peter Lumsden.

Mr. ONSLOW: Was it sent on March 10, the day the Agreement was made?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: If not on March 10 it was sent immediately afterwards.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: May I ask the noble Lord whether this Agreement with Russia will be embodied in a formal document, to be signed by any responsible Representative of the Russian Government?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: That does not arise out of the Question on the Paper.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: Then I will ask it on Monday.

EGYPT (AFFAIRS OF THE SOUDAN)—LORD WOLSELEY AND THE SOUDAN.

Mr. PULESTON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is a fact, as telegraphed from Cairo, that it has been proposed that Lord Wolseley should be made Governor General of the Soudan, in place of the late General Gordon, and that Lord Wolseley himself approves of this plan, and that the necessity of adopting it has been urged upon Her Majesty's Government?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Lord Wolseley has not been appointed Governor General of the Soudan. It is not consistent with the public interest that I should enter into the confidential communications which may have passed

between him and Her Majesty's Government.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (REDISTRIBUTION) BILL—REPRESENTATION OF THE CITY OF LONDON.

MR. J. G. HUBBARD asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether his attention has been drawn to recent Returns giving the rateable values of the newly-proposed boroughs, in some cases equal only to £3 per head of the population, showing that the population as a whole is liable neither to House Duty nor Income Tax; whether he would consider if the difficulty of providing four Members for the City of London, assessed at £38,000,000 to the Income Tax and having a rateable value of £4,000,000, might not be overcome by taking the second Member from boroughs to which two have been assigned, whose population is not one-half of the waking working population of the City, and whose rateable value is from £300,000 to £360,000; and, whether he will also consider if the consideration shown to the Universities, in deviation from a strict night population basis, might not be extended to the City of London, concentrating the important interests of Manufactures, Commerce, Colonies, Shipping, and Finance?

MR. GLADSTONE, in reply, said, that the purport of the Question of his right hon. Friend would seem to be an investigation as to the state of his mind and the extent of his information; but this 19th century was the century of examinations. He did not intend to enter upon the merits of the case as to the Redistribution of Seats Bill. He understood the Question of his right hon. Friend as one which invited discussion upon a matter which had been decided by the House.

MR. J. G. HUBBARD said, that the information to which the Question referred was only issued on Saturday last, and subsequent to the discussion on the subject, and therefore could not have been in the mind of the House when it came to its decision.

MR. GLADSTONE said, that the case cited was an extreme one, and could not possibly be made the basis of any general conclusion with regard to the structure of the measure of redistribution. And, further, even if it were the fact that in any particular borough the rateable value did not amount to £3 per head of the population, it would not at all follow that there were not a great many persons in that population who were liable to House Duty and Income Tax. In fact, the answer to this Question would lead him simply into a renewal of discussion upon a multitude of points which had been already discussed; and he hoped his right hon. Friend would accept the assurance that Her Majesty's Government were not prepared to re-open the question with respect to the representation of the City of London. His right hon. Friend, however, might re-open it, and then it would be the duty of the Government to answer him. As to the injustice of the night Census of which his right hon. Friend complained, he had only to point out that the Government had not taken that as the basis, but that they had given the City double the representation to which it was entitled on that ground.

MR. J. G. HUBBARD gave Notice that he should raise the question again when the Fourth Schedule of the Seats Bill should be under discussion.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—QUESTIONS TO MINISTERS.

MR. LEAKE asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he can inform the House if there is any indisposition on the part of the Heads of Government Departments, when applied to, to give full and direct information to Members of the House who, in the performance of what they conceive to be their duty, may seek such information; and, whether, if there be no such indisposition on their part, he will recommend his Colleagues to discountenance the consumption of public time in putting questions on local, personal, and trivial matters, during the Sitting of the House by declining to answer them, and trusting to the sense of the House to support them in their action?

MR. GLADSTONE: The permanent Heads of Departments, I can assure my hon. Friend—and the experience of Members generally will confirm me—are very much disposed to give information to Members who seek for it in the prosecution of what they deem to be their public duty; and undoubtedly, as far as the political Heads of Departments are concerned, they have every

disposition to encourage that method of action, which, it is evident, if it were more largely followed—it is often followed, but if it were more largely followed it would very considerably save the time of the House and increase its opportunities for the transaction of Public Business. Beyond saying that I will not go, because I think it would be too strong a measure on the part of Members of the Government to decline to answer Questions on the ground that such refusal was the most convenient course.

THE WESTERN PACIFIC—NEW GUINEA.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether Her Majesty's Government have agreed to the annexation by Germany of certain portions of the island of New Guinea, and whether the Colony of Queensland was anxious to obtain possession of these same portions of that island; and, whether Her Majesty's Government, in the negotiations with Germany about this matter, consulted the wishes and views of the Government of Queensland?

Mr. GLADSTONE: The Question of the hon. Member invites some verbal criticism. There has been no annexations by Germany in New Guinea, and Germany has not declared its intention of proceeding in that method. They have proceeded rather by the proclamation of a Protectorate. The Question assumes that the Colony of Queensland has indicated, in some particular manner, a desire to obtain those portions of New Guinea which have been made the subject of a Protectorate by Germany. But Queensland did not indicate any such intention. What has happened is this—that the Government authorities did contemplate and did what lay in them to proclaim the annexation of the whole of the non-Dutch portion of New Guinea, without distinguishing between one part and another. Then the hon. Member asks whether, in their negotiations with Germany, Her Majesty's Government consulted the wishes and views of the Government of Queensland? My answer is that there have been communications between the Colonial Office and the authorities connected with the different Colonies, and not with the Government of Queensland exclusively, which has no peculiar or exclusive title to be heard in the matter. But it is impossible, as the hon. Member will perceive, to do more than consult the wishes of these Governments. In our transactions with foreign countries we must endeavour to act for the best, securing the interests of the Colonies as well as we can, and with regard to New Guinea we have endeavoured to secure every fair consideration for them.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND asked whether, before further annexations by Germany, the Government would undertake to consult the views of the Governments of the interested Australian Colonies?

Mr. GLADSTONE replied, that it would not be possible to give an undertaking of that kind.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND gave Notice, that in consequence of the extreme dissatisfaction that existed in many parts of Australia in consequence of the action of Her Majesty's Government, he should on the first opportunity call the attention of the House to the extreme injustice that had been done to the Australian Colonies by the Government in allowing Germany to hoist her flag over a portion of New Guinea, to which Queensland had made previous claim.

EGYPT (FINANCE, &c.)—THE INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENT.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury what will be the course of Business next week; and also whether he is now able to state when he will proceed to the discussion of the Financial Arrangement for Egypt?

Mr. GLADSTONE: We propose to proceed on Monday and on the following days, Tuesday and Wednesday, with the Seats Bill. We have thought that, on the whole, that would probably be the course most convenient to the House. With regard to the question of the Egyptian Agreement, I have considered the matter, and have had an opportunity of consulting my Colleagues upon it; and I have to say that if this were a matter simply between the Government and the House of Commons, or between the Government and the Opposition, our duty and desire would be to comply with every request that was made, because I have more than once expressed my sense

of the great forbearance of the House and of the Opposition in accepting what, after all, were but dilatory answers, when we could not expedite the matter as we could have desired. But, unfortunately, I am not in that position, but am obliged to say that we shall feel ourselves compelled to ask a definite judgment of the House. There are various stages when the House may reopen a subject of that kind. But we must ask a definite judgment of the House before the Easter Recess. The state of the case stands thus. We are able either to ask for that judgment on Thursday next, or, if three days are thought too short a period for the examination of the Papers, we should be compelled to ask for it on Monday week. In the latter case, we shall have to take two preliminary stages on Thursday and Friday next, and not to take the definite vote until the Monday immediately before the Recess, with the intention if the discussion should go beyond Monday, of asking the House to continue it in lieu, I am afraid, of commencing the Easter Recess. Although it has not happened within recent memory, there are cases when the House has sat in Passion Week till Thursday. Having made this declaration with reluctance, but after full consideration, I must point out to the House how the case stands. Practically it is a question between taking the first stage of the Bill, say, on Thursday, and a definite decision not later than the Monday following, and putting that decision off until April 13. It may seem that, in ordinary circumstances, it would be a very unhandsome proceeding to make a difficulty about such a delay, but the difficulties in this case are of the severest and most practical kind. In the first place, I have ascertained, beyond all doubt, that the proceedings of other Legislatures will depend upon the definitive vote in the House of Commons, and that no arrangements will be made until that vote has been come to. That is a very serious fact in itself; and any considerable postponement of the consideration of the question by the House of Commons would not only insure additional delay in other countries, but might have an undesirable result in producing a disagreeable effect upon the public mind in those countries. But what I have to look to especially is the state of things in Egypt. It has been frequently remarked that, during the last Session of Parliament, we represented, from time to time, the urgency of the financial condition of Egypt as being even then extreme. That was no exaggeration, it was extreme; and what has since happened is, first of all, that a large sum has been obtained by the diversion of the Sinking Fund; and, secondly, that another considerable sum has been obtained by the withholding of payments which were due to the Exchequer of this country. In that way Egyptian finance has been able to limp along, and there has been no absolute scandal or mischief, though there has been a great deal of hardship in consequence of the great prolongation of the period during which people entitled to indemnities have been kept out of their money. But now those expedients are quite exhausted, and very early in April, I am in a position to say, unless the judgment of this House has been given, which I have no doubt will produce quite a sufficient degree of confidence to enable arrangements of a temporary kind to be made, that there will accrue demands of a high character, which there will not be the means of meeting. These are the circumstances in which the Government have arrived at the conclusion which they think to be fair, and so strongly has the condition of persons entitled to indemnities been felt that it is arranged in the Agreement that payments to them shall rank as the first charge. They will be taken preferentially in order of time, so far as circumstances may permit. The right hon. Gentleman, I am sure, will see that I have not announced this conclusion of the Government upon any light or trivial grounds; and I hope he will be disposed to consider—though, of course, he can exercise a free choice—the question whether the vote of the House shall be asked for on Thursday next or on the Monday following.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Everything which the right hon. Gentleman has now said seems to me to greatly strengthen the case for delay—for allowing a sufficient time in which to consider this most important question. What the right hon. Gentleman has told us shows that not only the action of this country, but that the action of other countries also, depends largely upon the

nature of the first vote to be given in this House. Though he says there will be other stages of the Bill, it is perfectly obvious from the manner in which he referred to the first vote that the result of that would be of the first importance.

MR. GLADSTONE: I referred to the vote that is understood to be the first substantive vote, not necessarily to the first vote.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Quite so. I do not stick at words. What I mean is that I understand from the Prime Minister that the first vote of a substantial character that is given in this House will have great influence in determining the action of other countries as well as of Egypt. I also recognize the very great importance of the decision to which we shall come. That being so, I cannot be satisfied with the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, or with the offer which he makes. I regret extremely that there should be any inconvenient delay in connection with this matter; but if there should be, it will not be the fault of the House of Commons. The right hon. Gentleman himself bears testimony that we have been studiously careful not to worry the Government about this matter. We were prevented from discussing it in the summer, and we have never been able to go thoroughly into it. I, therefore, trust that the right hon. Gentleman will see, on reconsideration, that it is all important that in a matter of this character we should have more time given us. I will repeat my Question on Monday in the hope of getting a better answer.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am bound to say that the belief of the Government is that if the Papers are produced on Monday, hon. Gentlemen will by the Monday following have had sufficient time to make themselves acquainted with them. In view of the prospect of what can be called nothing less than financial confusion in Egypt the Government think the course which I have sketched to be imperative, and that the question is practically closed.

MR. CHAPLIN: I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, when he speaks of the inconvenience of postponing the consideration of this question and of the necessity of its being settled before Easter, he has not omitted to take this fact into consideration—that the sanction of Parliament has yet to be obtained, and that it is quite possible that that sanction may be refused altogether?

MR. GLADSTONE: That is the reason why we wish to take the discussion before Easter. We want to ascertain as soon as possible whether the assent of Parliament will be given or not.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I wish to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer a Question, of which I have given him private Notice—that is, whether the statement that he made on Wednesday that the proposed international guarantee does not involve international interference with the affairs of Egypt rests on any statement made or assented to by the Great Powers, because nothing upon the subject appears in the Papers; secondly, I wish to ask whether the Papers which are to be circulated next week will contain an explanation of that reservation on the part of Russia, to which he also referred, as to which there is nothing in the Papers circulated this morning; and, thirdly, whether the Papers will contain the Report of Lord Northbrook?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): I have only received a minute or two ago across the Table the Questions which the right hon. Gentleman has asked. The third Question has been already answered by my noble Friend the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs. As to the other Questions, I should be glad if the right hon. Gentleman would be so good as to ask them again on Monday with Notice after he has read the Papers.

MR. ONSLOW: Are we to understand that we are to get Lord Northbrook's Report in full, or only an expurgated edition of it?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): It is not my business to give an answer in explanation of my noble Friend's answer as to Papers which are Foreign Office Papers, as I have nothing to do with them; but if the hon. Gentleman will be good enough to wait till Monday, he will see that the answer given by my noble Friend is confirmed by the Papers.

ISLANDS OF THE PACIFIC—SAMOA.

MR. GORST asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he could contradict a statement

which appeared in some of the papers that morning that the Germans had hoisted their flag in the Island of Samoa?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: No such information has reached the Foreign Office.

SUPPLY—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES—WAYS AND MEANS.

MR. W. H. SMITH asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it was his intention to make any statement as to the mode in which the money was to be found for the Estimates that had been voted?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): No, Sir; it is perfectly plain that between this day and the end of the financial year it would be impossible to impose fresh taxes, and no one knows that better than the right hon. Gentleman. I shall, therefore, certainly not make any statement at present; but in my Financial Statement, after the holidays, I shall give full information on the subject.

MR. W. H. SMITH: Will these payments be provided for by taxation this year?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): As far as taxation between this and the 31st of March is concerned it is quite out of the question. I am not to be drawn now into any explanation of the Budget.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—IRISH BILLS.

MR. LEWIS: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary, How it is that the Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill, which was on the Paper last night, is not down for to-day?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is a clerical error. I will put it down for Monday.

MR. SEXTON: I beg to give Notice that, on the Report of Ways and Means, I will call attention to the course pursued in recent Sittings of the House by the Chief Secretary with regard to Notices of Motion standing in his name to bring in Bills relating to Irish affairs.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I can make an explanation now, and save the hon. Member the trouble of putting down this Notice. There were three Bills on Irish matters last night, and one of them I found was a Money Bill, which should be introduced in Committee, and so I put that down for to-night. There were two Bills on the Paper; but the hon. Members maintained a pretty active discussion until past 3 o'clock this morning, and, when it came to that hour, I thought the best thing we could do was to go home to bed. The two Bills were to be put down for to-night; but by a clerical error this was not done. They will be put down for Monday.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the Irish Members could not at any time for an hour and a-half last night have counted out the House, but that, partly with a view not to inconvenience the Government by rendering the vote of the Report of Supply futile, and partly to enable the Chief Secretary to bring in these Irish Bills in which they were interested, they did not do so; and why, under these circumstances, after promising to bring in the Bills, the right hon. Gentleman deliberately left the House the moment before Mr. Speaker would call on him to move them?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have already explained that I intended to bring forward the Bills; but the hon. Members, as I have said, kept up a pretty long discussion, principally amongst themselves, upon various Irish subjects, on which discussion was impossible, for everyone who could reply had long previously exhautsed his power of debate, and by the Rules of the House could not speak again. After that was over, I thought everyone would be anxious to go home to bed. The hon. Members were not kept waiting for these Bills, as they had provided themselves with abundant other matters for discussion.

EGYPT (EVENTS IN THE SOUDAN)—MR. FRANK POWER.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND asked the Prime Minister, Whether it was under the consideration of the Government to make some provision for a recognition to the family of the late Mr. Frank Power, who had died standing by General Gordon in Khartoum, and who, he thought, the House had generally agreed, was quite as worthy as General Gordon?

[No reply.]

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE EAST INDIA (LOAN) BILL.

MR. E. STANHOPE asked the Under Secretary of State for India, If he would undertake that a proper opportunity should be given to the House on the Second Reading of the East India Loan Bill of discussing the whole subject?

MR. J. K. CROSS said, he quite agreed that it would be very necessary to discuss the subject properly, and he would undertake that a proper opportunity should be afforded after Easter.

NAVY—H.M.S. "INFLEXIBLE"—THE 81-TON GUN.

MR. FRENCH-BREWSTER asked the Surveyor General of the Ordnance, Whether the statement in *The Times* newspaper of the 18th instant, with reference to the proposed removal of one of the 81-ton guns on board H.M.S. *Inflexible* for the purpose of re-tubing, is correct; if so, whether it is considered that it would be dangerous to use the gun in question in its present state; how long the gun referred to has been in the Service, and how many rounds has it fired; what will be the expense of the proposed repairs, including the cost of dismounting the gun, its carriage to and from Woolwich, and its remounting on board H.M.S. *Inflexible;* what time must elapse before the repairs are completed and the gun remounted; what was the original cost of the gun; and, whether the remaining three 81-ton guns on board H.M.S. *Inflexible* are, at the present time, considered to be in good order and thoroughly fit for service?

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER: The statement in *The Times* as to the removal of one of the 81-ton guns of the *Inflexible* is correct. A few rounds might be fired from the gun in its present condition without risk, but it is not considered serviceable. The gun has been in the Service since 1880, and has fired 86 rounds. It is estimated that it will take about four months to repair the gun. It will be replaced at once on board the *Inflexible* by the reserve gun. The original cost of the gun was £10,075. The remaining guns on board the *Inflexible* are considered to be in good order, and thoroughly fit for service. We have the spare tube, and the cost of the repair of the gun is estimated at a few hundred pounds; we cannot at present exactly state the sum. The transport to and fro will be by Government store steamer.

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE CAPE OF GOOD HOPE (ADVANCE) BILL.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH asked when the Cape of Good Hope Advance Bill would be taken?

MR. HIBBERT stated that the Bill was printed, and when he put it down for to-night he had hoped that it would have been distributed this morning; but owing to the very late hour to which the House sat last night that was impossible. He therefore thought it would be more convenient to the House that it should be postponed until Monday.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (REDISTRIBUTION) (*re-committed*) BILL.—[BILL 49.]

(*Mr. Gladstone, The Marquess of Hartington, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Attorney General, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 18th March.*]

[SEVENTH NIGHT.]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

FIRST SCHEDULE.

PART I.

BOROUGHS TO CEASE AS SUCH.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR), who had a number of Amendments upon the Paper, said, he wished to explain to the Committee in a few sentences the course which he proposed to take. It must have been observed by hon. Members that the principle underlying the whole arrangement upon which the Amendments proceeded was that certain boroughs with a population of less than 1,000, and also a certain number with a population above that limit, should be taken from the groups to which they at present belonged and merged in the counties, under a plan of re-arrangement proposed in another Schedule. From communications, however, which had been received, it appeared that some of the Leaders of the Party opposite considered that the Amendments were not in accordance

with the spirit, at all events, of the arrangement which had been come to. That was certainly not the view of that (the Ministerial) side of the House, and he was sure that right hon. Gentlemen opposite would accept his assurance that there was no such intention on their part. If they had violated in any way the spirit of the agreement, they had certainly not failed to carry out the terms of the agreement. It had been the desire of the Government to carry the arrangement out in the most complete manner; not to introduce any provisions that were likely to be open to objection; but to make the Bill, as between the two Parties, acceptable to the House, and not to press anything in regard to which an adverse opinion was expressed by right hon. Gentlemen opposite. The discussions and divisions which took place on Wednesday last indicated, undoubtedly, that there was considerable difference of opinion in the Committee as to the merging of the smaller burghs. That being so, it might be inferred that as regarded the proposal to merge some of the larger burghs, the feeling would be still more unfavourable. It was in deference to an indication of opinion that it was desirable to undertake a re-arrangement of the burgh groups, that the Government had submitted the scheme contained in the Schedules to the Committee. It was well known to hon. Members that that scheme was put forward to give effect to what was believed to be a prevalent desire, altogether apart from the agreement not to introduce anything that was likely to lead to contention or serious difference of opinion between the two sides of the House, or among Gentlemen sitting in different parts of the House. It was, practically, a "consent" Bill. Moved by these considerations, the Government had resolved — indeed, they had no other alternative but to resolve—not to press any Amendment that involved the merging of any burgh in the counties. As that resolve would really take away a large part of the basis on which the scheme was framed, and leave exceedingly little further for the consideration of the Committee, they thought it would be hardly worth while, or that they would be justified in, occupying the time of the House with the consideration of anything that would be left. In point of fact, nothing would remain except the re-arrangement of the Stirling and Falkirk groups. That might be done without merging any burgh in the county, but it might involve proposals which would give rise to a difference of opinion. Accordingly, it was not the intention of the Government to detain the Committee by moving any of the other Amendments which stood on the Paper in his name; and as regarded the Amendments which had already been moved, and which would now be upset by the course the Government proposed to take when the Bill came up on Report, they would be withdrawn, and the Bill would be restored, as far as the Government were concerned, to the position in which it stood when it was introduced. He believed that this course would meet with the general approval of the Committee. The Government regretted, themselves, that they had found it necessary to take it; but he hoped the Committee would be satisfied that it was their desire to make no proposal that was not likely to meet with general assent.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: As there is no Question before the Committee, it is only by the indulgence of the Committee that I can be allowed to say a few words. I do not for a moment doubt the *bona fides* of the Government and the Lord Advocate in placing the Amendments on the Paper; but I certainly think that, having regard to the proceedings of last Wednesday, and looking at the matter in the light and spirit of the arrangement with regard to this Bill, the Lord Advocate has put a correct interpretation upon the understanding, and is right in withdrawing the Amendments.

MR. A. R. D. ELLIOT rose to continue the discussion, and was received with cries of "Order!" He said, that if he were out of Order he would move the adjournment of the House.

THE CHAIRMAN: At present there is no Question before the Committee, and if the hon. and learned Member moves the adjournment of the House, he must confine himself to the Question of Adjournment.

MR. A. R. D. ELLIOT said, he would move to report Progress, in order to enable him to call attention to the very remarkable statement which had been made by the right hon. and learned

Gentleman the Lord Advocate in reference to the Amendments now standing in his name upon the Paper. He had listened to the statement of the Lord Advocate with the greatest astonishment and apprehension. It was hardly conceivable, after what had happened, that the right hon. and learned Gentleman, on behalf of the Government, should now come down to the Committee and tell them it was the deliberate intention of the Government to give up all the Amendments which they had met there to discuss that very evening. The Lord Advocate had, at some little length, entered into an explanation. He had told them that the Bill was substantially a "consent" Bill, and that he, in putting the Amendments upon the Paper, had, to some extent, gone beyond the arrangement. If that were so—and as the Lord Advocate said that it was, no doubt it was so—why, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Devon (Sir Stafford Northcote) had pointed out, had the Lord Advocate brought down the Scotch Members to discuss Amendments which were contrary to the spirit of the arrangement between the Leaders of the two sides of the House? Scotland and the Scotch Members had been treated with very scant respect. They had been invited, for two days together, to consider the very elaborate scheme which had been submitted by the Lord Advocate. The scheme itself had been prepared by the right hon. and learned Gentleman after great trouble and consideration. It had been published in all the Scotch papers, circulated among all the Scotch Members, and published all over Scotland. A copy must have been addressed to the Prime Minister, as a Scotch Member; it must have been before the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Border Burghs (Mr. Trevelyan), the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman), and the hon. Member for Banffshire (Mr. R. W. Duff). These Gentlemen were all of them Members of the Government and Scotch Representatives, and must have been fully aware of the scheme of the Lord Advocate. The manner in which the Scotch Members had been dealt with in the matter was, upon every ground, much to be regretted. They had been brought down to discuss certain proposals which had already been discussed in all the Scotch newspapers, and which were allowed to be put before the Scotch Representatives by a Member of the Government who was responsible for them. They were now told, at the last moment, without any word of explanation whatever, that the Government proposals were contrary to the stipulations of the compact between the Leaders of the two sides of the House. Why was that circumstance not stated last Wednesday, when the Scotch Members were allowed to discuss, without restraint, the Amendments brought forward by the Lord Advocate? He much regretted that it should have become necessary to make strong and disagreeable remarks upon the conduct of the Government; but he felt keenly that the Scotch Members had been trifled with in the matter. They were now told that the whole scheme of the Government was to be given up, notwithstanding the discussions and divisions which took place on Wednesday last. Scotland and the Scotch Members ought not to be treated with so little respect. It would be out of Order to enter into the merits of the question upon a Motion to report Progress; but he regretted that the Scotch Members, as a sort of Grand Council, had not been taken into the confidence of the Government by those who were responsible for that part of the Bill which dealt with Scotland, before it was originally submitted. He much regretted the course which had been taken by the Lord Advocate in the matter—in dropping his scheme. He was sorry that the right hon. and learned Gentleman had introduced the Bill, so far as Scotland was concerned, without having placed it, in the first instance, upon a firm and settled basis. He begged to move that the Chairman report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. A. R. D. Elliot.*)

MR. BUCHANAN said, he joined in the protest which had been made by his hon. and learned Friend as to the conduct of the Government in the matter. The Amendments of the Lord Advocate were intended for the practical improvement of the Bill, and it was upon the ground that the door was open for the practical improvement of the distribution of Scottish representation that these

and other similar Amendments had been proposed. Only a few days ago the Committee were told by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Devon, replying to the speech of the Chancellor of the Duchy, that the question of the arrangement of the Scotch burgh groups was not included in the compact, but was left open as far as this—that there was no obligation, no agreement, no compact, which in any way bound the Government or the Committee or anybody else. The first intimation that the re-arrangement of the Scotch burghs was to come under the terms of the compact had just been made by the Lord Advocate. The Scotch Members had, therefore, a great grievance against the Leaders of the Opposition for withholding that information, and a still greater grievance against Her Majesty's Government for the course they had pursued in the matter. He was surprised that the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill, the President of the Local Government Board, was not not in his place, because he would recollect that on the second reading, when the hon. and learned Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. A. R. D. Elliot) drew attention to this subject, it was by him that the Scotch Members were invited to explain their views, in order that the Bill might, if necessary, be amended in this regard. It was distinctly stated at that time by the right hon. Gentleman that the question of the burgh grouping was wholly outside the compact. Consequently, during the Recess a variety of suggestions were made in the Press and on the platform by Scotch Members and others, by which a considerable concensus of opinion on certain points was elicited. Afterwards, on the 28th of January, the Scotch Members received an intimation from the Lord Advocate that he had drafted a scheme, and a copy of it was at once circulated and published all over Scotland. On the 19th of February, the day on which the House re-assembled after the Christmas Recess, the Scotch Members met upstairs to consider the Government scheme; they deliberated upon it for two days, and, to a large extent, it was accepted. On the 5th of March attention was called by his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. A. R. D. Elliot) to the fact that no Amendments had as yet been put on the Paper with a view to carrying out the Government scheme. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy (Mr. Trevelyan) thereupon informed the House that the Government had found themselves compelled to abandon part of the scheme, but that they would put down Amendments to carry out the remainder. Last week the proposals of the Lord Advocate, in compliance with that intimation, were placed on the Paper, and the discussion of them was commenced on Wednesday; yet they now found that the whole of these Amendments—the last remnant of the scheme—were now to be withdrawn. He did not think that this was the way in which the Scotch Business should be conducted in that House, and he was convinced that the course pursued by the Government would give rise to grave dissatisfaction throughout the country. It was not only the Scotch Members, but the House of Commons, that had been treated disrespectfully in the matter. It was a perfect farce to require hon. Members to come down to consider Amendments, imagining that they were at liberty to discuss them and to endeavour to get an impartial opinion upon them from the House, and then, after they had devoted a considerable amount of attention to them, the right hon. and learned Gentleman in charge of them was to get up and say that as the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Lords looked upon them as not forming part of the compact, they must not be pressed. He cordially joined in the protest of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. A. R. D. Elliot).

SIR JOHN HAY said, he was more astonished than he could express at the statement which had been made by the Lord Advocate. Was he to understand that all the Amendments now on the Paper in the name of the right hon. and learned Gentleman would be withdrawn?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR): Yes.

SIR JOHN HAY: Then in what position would those Amendments be which had already been discussed and adopted?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR): When the Report is brought up they will be withdrawn.

SIR JOHN HAY said, he understood now, from the statement of the right hon. and learned Gentleman, that the

small burghs were not now to be merged in the counties. He was very glad that that should be so; but he wished to know what course was to be taken with regard to the large burghs in Haddingtonshire and the Wigtown Burghs, which he had the honour to represent? He could not understand how the Lord Advocate proposed to deal with them. In Wales, the town of Pembroke, with a population of 17,000, was grouped, by the provisions of the Bill, with another Parliamentary borough with a population of 6,000 or 7,000—namely, Haverfordwest. In that case there was to be a re-arrangement of boundaries, and both boroughs would remain as contributories. He could not understand how small towns like Stranraer and Fortrose were to remain merged in the counties in Scotland, while towns of a precisely similar character in Wales were to form part of borough groups. He had proposed to the House, on a former occasion, to add Stranraer to the Dumfries District of Burghs. By this arrangement the population would be raised from 25,000 to nearly 40,000, thus forming a most respectable group of burghs. The Lord Advocate declined to accept the proposal on the ground that he was asked to make an arrangement by which all the smaller boroughs were to be dissolved and merged in the counties. But as he found that a distinction was now to be drawn between the Scotch and the Welsh boroughs, he wanted to know how the Lord Advocate proposed to deal with the question of the smaller burghs in Scotland? He wished to know how it was that a considerable town like Stranraer was going to be dealt with differently from Fortrose, and that boroughs in Wales, such as Pembroke and Haverfordwest, which were in an identical position with the Dumfries Burghs, were going to be treated in a different way? He thought he had a right to ask whether Her Majesty's Government would not reconsider this decision?

DR. CAMERON said, that though he did not care very much about the abandonment of this part of the scheme, for it was a very small matter and scarcely worth talking about, he must complain most bitterly of the way in which the whole matter had been managed. The Scotch Members were asked by the Lord Advocate, at the invitation of the President of the Local Government Board, to meet and discuss the question of the arrangement of the grouped burghs. They were further invited to draw up schemes for themselves, suggesting any Amendments they might think proper to make in the matter of these groups of burghs. Luckily, they did not take the trouble to draw up any scheme, and it was evident that if they had done so they would have found that they had wasted their labour. They had a discussion, and agreed to ask the Government to formulate its proposals, and submit them to their criticism. The Lord Advocate prepared a very much more elaborate and extensive scheme than was put on the Paper. That scheme was widely circulated throughout Scotland and discussed. The Scotch Members were then asked to come up to the House of Commons on the first day of the Session, and hold a meeting to consider the question. They did so, and he was bound to say that at that meeting of the Scotch Members an amount of unamiability was called into evidence which was not at all pleasant. His hon. and learned Friend the Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. A. R. D. Elliot) fell foul of the hon. Member for Wigton (Sir Herbert Maxwell), whom he was perfectly ready and willing to sacrifice, and he believed his hon. and learned Friend had been at loggerheads with the hon. Member for St. Andrews (Mr. Williamson) ever since. Even on Wednesday last they had the unusual picture of the amiable Member for the Border Burghs (Mr. Trevelyan) tempted into applying the most savage lines to the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell). After having wasted all this time, the Wednesday before last was devoted to a discussion of the important principle whether any populous places in counties were to be added to these groups of burghs. The whole Wednesday was wasted upon that matter. Then they resumed last Wednesday, when they had the principle again discussed at great length, and the outcome of it all was whether two wretched burghs under 1,000 population each should be merged in the county population of Scotland, or retained in their anomalous burgh system. He did not care much about these burghs. It seemed to him the only principle worth talking about would be to apply to each

of the undivided burghs the 15,000 population principle, and to say that if any burgh did not come up to that it should be merged in the counties. But since it was determined to leave them as they were, he did not think it made much difference. It would leave an anomaly which would be got rid of at some future day. He believed they were in a fair way in the direction of equal electoral districts, and the fact that some glaring anomalies were left in the present scheme would not at all impede the onward march towards equal electoral districts. But if anything could show the lack of consideration which Scotland enjoyed in that House, it was the manner in which they had been treated upon this subject. Two days' discussion had been wasted on the matter in Committee, and when the Lord Advocate proposed to restore those interesting burghs of Fortrose and Kintore, they might have another discussion and a fight as to whether they should be restored or not. He again emphatically protested, not against the abandonment of the scheme, but against the very improper manner in which Scotland and its Representatives had been treated.

MR. DICK-PEDDIE wished to express his entire concurrence in the expression of disappointment on the part of his hon. Friends at the action taken by the Government in this matter. He felt more than astonishment, he felt indignation, at the conduct of the Government towards the Scotch Members. He differed entirely from the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron), who said he did not care about the grouping. He represented a group of burghs (Kilmarnock, &c.), and his constituents felt strongly the gross way in which their interests were neglected. The hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. Buchanan) had quoted some words which fell from the Leader of the Opposition on Wednesday last, indicating that he, at least, was not indisposed to consider the question of the re-arrangement of groups. But he might have quoted still stronger words used by the right hon. Gentleman, in which he distinctly stated—

"That the arrangements of the Scottish burghs was deliberately excluded from the Bill in order that it might be considered afterwards;"

and the whole action of the Government, up to this moment, went to show that that also was their sense of it. This was a matter of very great consequence. The Lord Advocate wanted to get rid of the inconvenience of getting into the counties two burghs like Fortrose and Kintore, and for that small reason he had come down and wished to set aside the arrangement in regard to grouping. What he complained of was, that after the scheme had been before his constituents—and they were entirely satisfied with it—after it had been accepted by everybody except, perhaps, the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell), for some altogether trifling reason, the Government now came down and withdrew it. In point of fact, the Scotch Liberal Members, who numbered 50, were really sacrificed to the nine Scotch Tory Members; and for the convenience of three Members, the Government consented to withdraw a scheme that was entirely satisfactory to the 50 Liberals, and not only to them, but to the general community of Scotland. He trusted the Lord Advocate would reconsider this matter. As regarded his (Mr. Dick-Peddie's) own burghs, if the right hon. and learned Gentleman did not propose the Amendment which stood in his name, he should do so himself, and, though there was no chance of carrying it, he should press it on the Committee as a protest on behalf of his constituents against the extraordinary conduct of the Government.

MR. RAIKES said, that as he was the only Member on that (the Conservative) side of the House who supported the Government in the last division on Wednesday—[An hon. MEMBER: No!]—well, nearly the only one, he felt bound to join in the protest made by hon. Members opposite. He had listened with nothing short of amazement to the statement of the Lord Advocate, and the extraordinary course he proposed to take. The Government had invited the House to enter into the consideration of the question of the redistribution of the Scotch burghs, and it had engaged the attention of the Committee for nearly two Sittings. They had half gone through the scheme, and now the Government turned round and discarded it altogether. Even in the case of the burghs which the Lord Advocate had already obtained the sanction of the Committee to place in the Schedule, they were on the Report to be struck out, and the only

question left would be the fate of two burghs—two of the smallest groups—which were to be left in the cruel position of being thrown into the counties. Their case, however, was of infinitely less importance than that of the remaining burghs. For his own part, he was bound to say that, of all parts of the United Kingdom, the Scotch groups of burghs seemed to him to imperatively require a redistribution scheme. Yet they were going to leave them, as they were, absolutely undealt with. By leaving such a chaos, such a scandal, and such an anomaly as was afforded by the Scotch system of grouping, they would invite a re-opening of this question at the very earliest possible time, and would strike a fatal blow at the settlement which both sides of the House were committed to.

MR. TREVELYAN said, he frankly owned that he expected that protests would be made in consequence of the statement of his right hon. and learned Friend; but he was not prepared altogether for the quarters from which those protests had come. The hon. Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Dick-Peddie), the last Gentleman who had spoken from that side of the House, had expressed his general satisfaction at the proposals of the Government, and had stated that he could understand an objection coming from the other side of the House to the merging of small burghs. Now, they had only had the opportunity of taking one division on the merging of small burghs, and that was on Wednesday afternoon, but in that division the hon. Gentleman himself voted against the merging of small burghs. The same was the case with the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron), though he did not observe the same inconsistency in that hon. Member's speech. The hon. Member put the practical side of the question very plainly when he said that what remained of the original scheme was not worth fighting for, or words to that effect. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Raikes) who had just sat down talked of the extremely anomalous character of the Scottish burgh system, and of the very great importance of reforming it; but his right hon. Friend had altogether exaggerated the machinery of that Scotch burgh system which was being given up. What it had now come down to was, that there were at present three groups of burghs—one of 31,000 population, another of 49,000, and a third of 49,000; and those three groups were going to be re-arranged in such a manner as to turn them into three groups—one of 43,000, another of 49,000, and a third of 29,000. He thought it was impossible that any hon. Member could describe this as fulfilling the needs of Scottish burgh reform which the right hon. Gentleman desired. He thought the hon. and learned Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. A. R. D. Elliot) and the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. Buchanan) had been rather hard on the Lord Advocate. He could not but recollect that those two Gentlemen, when speaking of this scheme, which they now described as so desirable, had damned it with faint praise. The hon. and learned Member for Roxburghshire said it was cut down until it was comparatively insignificant; and he remembered the hon. Member for Edinburgh making an attack on the scheme, in which he said it was sacrificing the single burghs to the groups of burghs in a most unjustifiable manner. The fact of the matter was, that in a great Bill of this sort, for the purpose of getting it through the House in a satisfactory shape, or perhaps in getting it through the House at all, from time to time certain alterations must be made in minor matters of detail, and this alteration had now come to a very small one. The original scheme which was brought before the Scotch Members was—he must speak plainly—a scheme which it was impossible to carry out without the consent of hon. Members opposite. The main and prominent features of that scheme were the giving of a Member to the Western Isles, the junction of Bute with Argyllshire, and the junction of Caithness with Sutherland. It was absolutely necessary to get the consent of hon. Members opposite to this arrangement, and that consent could not be obtained; and when that was lost, most of what was valuable and what was worth fighting for in the scheme disappeared. Then came the question whether they could carry the scheme through the House in its mutilated form? He thought they could not. It was quite evident to anyone who had followed the debates and divisions on Wednesday that they could not. It was quite true that there was a certain sort of languid consent on the

part of hon. Members to the general principle of merging the small burghs, of which there were 10; but when it came to the particular burghs, that languid consent turned into the most ardent opposition, and out of the faithful phalanx of Scotch Liberal Members who always stood by the Government in their troubles, no less than 10, he thought, on the very first opportunity for considering this question of merging the burghs, voted against the Government. He would ask the Committee whether, upon this Bill, the importance of the passing of which was beyond words, when such opposition was given on a preliminary stage of the first of these moderate propositions, there would be any chance that the opposition, increasing as the Bill went on, would not have hampered the Government to a very serious degree? He put that before the Committee, not expecting that it would satisfy those Gentlemen who had an ardent and disinterested desire to reform the burgh system of Scotland, but in the hope that it would excuse the Government to the great body of Members. He would only add that he thought hon. Members exaggerated very much the time that had been wasted. On Wednesday week there was very little time spent over the Scotch burghs; and though, last Wednesday, a good deal of time was spent over them, yet it was spent very much over the question whether considerable towns like Jedburgh and the fragments of the Wigtown constituency should be added to other groups. That was a question which was well worth discussing and threshing out, because the Government had an opportunity of saying that they were absolutely opposed to such a proposition. The time spent upon that part of the scheme which was abandoned had been very little. He was very sorry that the Government could not carry it through, and thereby gratify hon. Gentleman who took an interest in the question; but he was convinced they had taken the wisest course.

MR. ORR-EWING said, he thought the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy (Mr. Trevelyan) had been somewhat severe on the Scotch Members in regard to that portion of the redistribution of seats which had been brought before the House. He did not think the way in which the Scotch Members had been treated by the Government was at all fair, seeing that they would have been content with the smallest concessions, and would then have allowed the provisions of the Bill to be passed. The Government complained of the opposition which had been raised to their proposals; but it must be remembered that they had laid down extraordinary principles, which were not at all part of the Bill, and which, of course, created the greatest opposition from this side of the House, and did not give entire satisfaction to their own supporters. He was sure that in regard to the only things upon which they had made a stand they had had justice on their side. He thought it was most unfair that the Government declined to entertain proposals to include populous places or burghs in any old group. They did not ask for the formation of any new group; but still the Government would not allow any burgh that was not previously enfranchised to be included in any group. That was a most astounding principle, and he should like to inquire why it was adopted? He had not the slightest doubt that the Government desired to follow the same course as that which they had pursued in Ireland—namely, to weaken the Conservative Party and strengthen their own. He should like to ask why Scotland was exempted from the arrangement between the two Front Benches as to the redistribution of seats only? Why was it not dealt with in the same way as England, Ireland, and Wales? It surely must be for some reason. It certainly could not have been to enable the Government to deal less fairly with the Conservatives of Scotland. Then what was the reason? It must be acknowledged by both Parties that the system of grouping burghs, which only existed in Scotland to any extent, was so peculiar that it required to be differently arranged in order to carry out those strong professions, so frequently made by the Prime Minister on the part of the Government, that every care should be taken to separate the urban from the rural popolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman is now discussing the Amendments to the Bill, and not the Question of reporting Progress, which is now before the Committee. Of course, some latitude is allowed to an hon. Member in giving

the reasons why he thinks it is desirable to report Progress.

MR. ORR-EWING said, he understood that he was discussing the Amendments on the Paper.

THE CHAIRMAN: No; the Question before the Committee is the Motion to report Progress.

MR. ORR-EWING said, he would apologize, but he had been under a misapprehension. He would probably be able to find another opportunity for alluding to this subject.

MR. R. PRESTON BRUCE said, he was not very much surprised at what had occurred that day, and at the abortive result which had followed all the trouble and discussion which had taken place in Scotland during the Recess, and during the early part of this Session among the Scotch Members; but he was sure his hon. Friends the Members for Edinburgh (Mr. Buchanan) and Roxburghshire (Mr. A. R. D. Elliot) never intended to convey what the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy (Mr. Trevelyan) had stated—namely, blame to the Lord Advocate personally for what had happened. Blame, in his opinion—and, he believed, in the opinion of others—most distinctly fell upon the Government. It fell upon the Government, because, in the first instance, they neglected to deal in their Bill with this matter of the grouping of burghs. It was quite true, as was said by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Raikes), that these groups of burghs in Scotland presented some of the most extraordinary anomalies, or rather absurdities, which could be found in the electoral system of this country; but the Government neglected to take up this question, and to propose any reform on the subject in their original Bill. But that was not all. If they had told hon. Members frankly that they did not intend to deal with this subject, and that they must be content with the very substantial and much more important advantages which they acknowledged were conferred by this Bill upon Scotland—if they had been told that, as practical men they would have accepted the position. But that was not what the Government did. They invited the Scotch Members to attempt to deal with and make suggestions in regard to the grouping of burghs, and they allowed their Law Officer (the Lord Advocate) to make proposals, which, of course, were accepted by the Scotch Members and accepted in Scotland as practically the proposals of the Government, although he must say that these proposals had received extremely little advocacy from the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) who was in charge of the Bill. The scheme certainly had been reduced to very small dimensions. Nevertheless, he believed it was such as would make a substantial improvement upon the existing state of affairs. But because a little difficulty had been found in pressing this matter, because a little local feeling was excited here and there, which no doubt accounted for one or two of those votes of Liberal Members which had been referred to—because that happened, the Government were at once prepared to throw the scheme over altogether. The plain fact was, that they did not care to devote the little time that would be necessary to enable them to carry out these proposals. Therefore, he must say that he thought the protest which had been made by his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Roxburghshire was perfectly justifiable; and if his hon. and learned Friend went to a division he should certainly vote with him.

MR. MACFARLANE said, he did not rise to enter into a discussion of the grievances of the Scotch Members, but to express his personal satisfaction at the state of matters which had arisen. He did so on this ground. On the Wednesday before last, when this question was first discussed, the Government appropriated the favourable opportunity which he would have had for bringing on the second reading of the Suspension of Evictions (Scotland) Bill. The Government took that day away from him with the silent acquiescence of all the Scotch Members—a day set apart for a very important purpose. The consequence was that they went on discussing and dividing upon critical Amendments which the Lord Advocate had thrust into the Bill, and he supposed they would now have the satisfaction of supporting the right hon. and learned Gentleman when he moved to get rid of them on the Report. It certainly was a most profitable way of spending the time of the House, and he hoped that it would be fully appreciated by the Scotch Members. For himself, personally, he

enjoyed a certain malicious satisfaction at the whole business.

MR. CRAIG-SELLAR said, that as one of the phalanx of Scotch Liberal Members who usually supported the Government at a pinch, and who had been spoken of somewhat cavalierly by his right hon. Friend (Mr. Trevelyan)——

MR. TREVELYAN asked what it was he had said that was objectionable?

MR. CRAIG-SELLAR remarked, that the right hon. Gentleman had spoken of the Scotch Members on that side of the House as a phalanx of Liberal Members who always supported the Government on a pinch. He had thought that the right hon. Gentleman by his tone seemed to treat them with less respect than they were entitled to. But, be that as it might, he begged to add his protest to that of the hon. and learned Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. A. R. D. Elliot) against the manner in which, not the Lord Advocate, but the Government, had treated the Scotch Members and the whole House. From the moment this transaction of compromise in secret conclave was entered into, the Scotch representation had been disregarded. No attention had been paid to it from the beginning. His own burgh (Haddington) and that represented by the right hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite (Sir John Hay)—Wigtown—were struck out and merged in the counties; but, with that single exception, not a moment's attention was given to Scotch affairs at all in this matter. He wished to join his protest with that of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Raikes) against the manner in which the small burghs, such as those which were talked of the other day, were to be retained, and large, influential, important, and growing burghs, such as Stranraer and Dunbar, were to be merged in the counties without any reason given. But his main reason for rising was to ask the hon. and learned Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. A. R. D. Elliot) to mark his protest against the manner in which the Government had treated the Scotch Members and the House by going to a division. If he did so, he (Mr. Craig-Sellar) would certainly support him.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he wished hon. Members would say in public what they had said in private. Did the hon. Gentleman deny that he had said that the scheme should be withdrawn?

MR. CRAIG-SELLAR: I made no such statement. I have not requested the right hon. Gentleman to withdraw the scheme. I never cared for the scheme, but I certainly did not ask him to withdraw it.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I am very much astonished at the statement of the hon. Member. I was certainly under that impression.

MR. SEXTON said, he thought that it was not the Scotch Members alone who had a right to complain upon that occasion of the course which the Government had pursued. Their conduct was certainly most extraordinary. The Lord Advocate, whatever his desire might have been, had succeeded with most admirable completeness in offending everybody concerned. Every Whig and Tory Scotch Member seemed to be competing as to which had been most offended by the Government. He did not know whether the Tory Scotch Members had much claim upon the forbearance of the Government; but after the eloquent testimony which had been borne by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy (Mr. Trevelyan) to the fidelity of the Liberal Scotch Members, he should have thought that the Government would have been prepared to treat them with greater consideration. What was it they had seen? After repeated conferences between the Lord Advocate and the Scotch Members, a scheme had been prepared, discussed, and practically settled. Public opinion had been collected, and it affirmed the main features of the scheme; and now the Lord Advocate came down to the House, and, without giving a moment's Notice or the slightest hint to the Scotch Members, announced that the whole policy of the scheme was to be thrown over. It was said that the Scotch Members had been treated with lack of consideration; but there was one body of Members who had been treated with even less consideration, and that was the Members for Ireland. He thought they had strong reason to complain of and protest against the action of the Government. What had happened? The Lord Advocate proposed to cancel a number of Amendments which now appeared on the Paper—10 in all, he believed. But the Irish Members had calculated that the discussion of those 10 Amendments would occupy the whole of the evening,

and they were now suddenly told by the Lord Advocate that the whole of the Scotch scheme had fallen through, and the Committee were suddenly thrust into the middle of Irish Business. That was certainly not a position which the Irish Members were prepared to accept. The Government ought to know their own mind, and if they found it necessary to change it, it was incumbent on them to give ample Notice to the Scotch Members and to the House. He was afraid that some of the Scotch Members were professing against the Government an indignation they did not in reality feel; but if their anger was real, there was a simple method they might pursue — namely, to follow the suggestion of the hon. Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Dick-Peddie), and move all the Amendments abandoned by the Lord Advocate, one after the other.

MR. BAXTER said, he had no intention whatever of taking part in the discussion. He merely rose to express a hope that the advice of the hon. Member for the Haddington Burghs (Mr. Craig-Sellar) would not be taken by his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. A. R. D. Elliot), who had been invited to divide on reporting Progress, and thus stopping the progress of the Bill. No doubt the Scotch Members had just cause of complaint, both against the Government and the Front Opposition Bench, for having let this matter go so far. He was one of those who had always been strongly in favour of merging the small burghs in the counties; but he had had doubts, from the beginning, whether it was wise on the part of the Government to attempt to take this course. It appeared to him that there had been no distinct understanding between the Front Benches and the Government. By adopting the course taken by the Lord Advocate they were pursuing a rather hazardous experiment, and blame was attachable to them for not giving fair warning of this at the beginning. Still, he could not blame the Government for the course they had taken that night, and he was not disposed to censure the Lord Advocate in the strong manner indulged in by some of his hon. Friends. The Lord Advocate had found that the simple fact was, that to go on with the proposals contained in the Amendments would necessitate very many days of long and, perhaps, angry discussion. This Bill was a Bill of "consent;" and although it might be amended in some small particulars, he had been afraid from the commencement that any such great amendment as this could not possibly be carried into effect without substantial agreement on both sides of the House. He was sorry to be placed in this position; but he thought the Government had had no alternative but to take the course they had now taken.

MR. ERNEST NOEL said, that, as one of those who agreed with what the Government had done, he would like to say a few words in answer to what had fallen from several hon. Members on that (the Ministerial) side of the House. The Government had been blamed very seriously for withdrawing these Amendments at a critical time, and they had been strongly blamed by his right hon. Friend on the other side (Mr. Raikes). One of them said that in a very few hours the Note would have been passed if the Government had been prepared to make certain concessions. What were those concessions? They were concessions which every single Scotch Liberal Member on that side of the House would have spent days, weeks, or any amount of time to prevent being passed. That was what the Government was blamed for—because they would not give in. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Raikes) also condemned the Government; yet he (Mr. Noel) ventured to say that if the right hon. Gentleman were in the House there was not one single Amendment brought forward by the Lord Advocate which the right hon. Gentleman would not have voted against. [MR. RAIKES dissented.] The right hon. Gentleman shook his head; but he (Mr. Noel) was perfectly certain that that would have been the course taken by the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Representative of the Wigtown Burghs (Sir John Hay) was also opposed to most of the Lord Advocate's Amendments. He wanted the small towns taken out of the counties and added to the groups of burghs. That was just what the Liberal Members for Scotland did not wish to see done. On the contrary, an hon. Friend who sat behind him was going to ask the Committee to put a town that was not already a burgh into the county.

[*Seventh Night.*]

He thought the Government did right, and were quite justified when they found a great difference of opinion among Scotch Members on this subject, to return to the original condition of the Bill. He would only make one observation more, and it was in answer to what had been said on that (the Ministerial) side of the House. There was a complaint that nothing had been done for Scotland. Why, more was done for Scotland by this Bill than for any other part of the United Kingdom. By this Bill the same principles were being carried out for Scotland as were being carried out in other parts of the country—that was to say, it disfranchised the burghs below 15,000.

THE CHAIRMAN reminded the hon. Member that he was now discussing the merits of the Bill.

Mr. ERNEST NOEL resumed his seat.

MR. A. GRANT said, he was astonished at the part taken by the Government that night, and he must take his share in protesting against the way in which they had behaved towards Scotland all through this business. He took this opportunity of saying that his hon. Friend the Member for the Haddington Burghs (Mr. Craig-Sellar), who by the Forms of the House could not say it himself, while disapproving of a great portion of the Lord Advocate's scheme, and having no great wish or desire that it should be carried out, wished him to say that his object when he rose that night was not to speak in regard to the Lord Advocate's scheme, but to join his protest with that of other Scotch Members against the way in which Scotland had been treated. It seemed to him that they had just ground for complaining that the Scotch Members and the Scotch people had been trifled with in this matter. What had been the course of events? Before they separated in the autumn they were told distinctly by the Government that the question of redistribution, as regarded the grouping of burghs in Scotland, was an open question, and that they might take counsel with their constituents and the people of Scotland generally, and endeavour to elaborate a scheme, which scheme would have the full consideration of the Government and of the House. That idea was strengthened by the fact that the Lord Advocate, as the Representative of the Government, afterwards submitted a scheme to the Scotch people and the Scotch Members in such a way as to justify them in the belief that the Government were in earnest. They, therefore, gave their support to the proposals of the Government contained in that scheme. The House was allowed to take up parts of the scheme, and take divisions — yet, now, the Government turned round and told them that all that had been make-believe, and that they were not going to have any part of the scheme. It seemed to him that this was only another illustration of the mischief and inconvenience arising from the practice of legislating by means of private compacts between the two Front Benches. He presumed that the statement of the Lord Advocate that night would prevent the Government from supporting the Amendment he (Mr. A. Grant) had to make in regard to his own (the Leith) District of Burghs; but he would nevertheless feel it his duty to his constituents to go on with the Amendment.

MR. PENDER said, he thought the Government should be commended for their courage in coming forward and abandoning what seemed a hopeless task. He entirely concurred in the course pursued by the Lord Advocate, and he trusted that the Scottish Members would continue to be loyal to the Government now as in the past, and that the good sense of the hon. and learned Member (Mr. A. R. D. Elliot) would be shown by the withdrawal of the Motion.

MR. RAIKES said, that the hon. Gentleman the Member for Dumfries (Mr. Ernest Noel) made a statement concerning him (Mr. Raikes) which he wished to refute. The hon. Gentleman said that he (Mr. Raikes) was prepared to vote against any of the Amendments which the Lord Advocate proposed. On the contrary, he had voted for those Amendments which had been proposed, and he was prepared to vote for those still on the Paper in the name of the Lord Advocate.

SIR EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, he could not allow that conversation to close without expressing his opinion that, after what hon. Members had said, he was not surprised at the course the Government had taken. He was one of those who had taken a prominent part in pressing that this subject should be

taken up. A very moderate scheme was brought forward—the extinction of smaller burghs—one which he regretted they could not have carried much further; but the scheme, as it was, had a favourable reception from the Scottish Members. When it came down to the House, however, and it was announced that some of the best parts of it were abandoned, it met with some very severe criticism on the part of hon. Members on Wednesday. In the face of the very unexpected opposition to the rejection of the small burghs, he began to despair of the thing going on. He must say he did not feel surprised that the Government had given the scheme up. He said so with the greatest regret, because he felt that the state in which the Scottish burgh system was left was one which would invite severe criticism and encourage agitation for reform. If the Government had taken up this question earlier and in a larger spirit, he thought it would have been more easily carried; but with only the small burghs taken out, he did not think the matter was worth fighting for. He hoped the hon. and learned Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. A. R. D. Elliot) would not put the Committee to the trouble of a division.

MR. MARJORIBANKS said, he could not congratulate the hon. Member for the City of Edinburgh (Mr. Buchanan) and the hon. and learned Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. A. R. D. Elliot) on the course they had taken that night. After all, they had only succeeded in raising a storm in a teapot, and had buckled on their armour and worked themselves into a great state of indignation for nothing at all. The Amendments on the Paper amounted to nothing, and really did nothing to remove any anomalies in the burgh representation of Scotland. Most of all, was he surprised at the advice given by his hon. Friend the Member for the Haddington Burghs (Mr. Craig-Sellar) in urging the hon. and learned Member for Roxburghshire to divide the Committee on this most obstructive Motion.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: I rise to a point of Order. I wish to ask, Mr. Chairman, whether the hon. Member is justified in characterizing any Motion which you have allowed to proceed as obstructive, and whether he has not, therefore, come under the censure of the Chair?

THE CHAIRMAN: It has already been decided that the term obstructive is not out of Order.

MR. MARJORIBANKS said, he was about to say, when he was interrupted, that when obstructive Motions were made by hon. Gentlemen opposite, no Members on the Ministerial side of the House were more eager to denounce such Motions than the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. Buchanan) and the hon. and learned Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. A. R. D. Elliot). He hoped those hon. Gentlemen would see the error of their ways before it was too late. He did not think their course that night would appear in a very favourable light to their constituents, and he would strongly advise them, for their own sakes, to withdraw this Motion.

MR. MACARTNEY said, it was quite refreshing to him, and he was sure to many other hon. Gentlemen, to see a little independence displayed on the other side of the House. For the last four years, they had seen nothing but slavish submission; but he was glad now to see a little exhibition of the *perfervidum ingenium Scoturum*. The performance of the Government on this occasion was very like a balloon party, who, finding their balloon was not soaring so rapidly as they expected, threw over some ballast; the ballast on this occasion was composed of the Amendments of the Lord Advocate. He trusted that the Scottish Members, who were only expressing the dissatisfaction they all felt at the way the Government were attempting to thrust the Bill down their throats with alteration, would persevere in their opposition.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY said, he was not at all surprised at the course the Government had adopted on this occasion, because the Amendments which had been put on the Paper were of such a trivial character that they were not worth the time of the Committee to discuss them. The pity was that the Government did not discover this sooner, because they must know that small and trifling Amendments provoked from hon. Members quite as much opposition as very much larger changes did. What the Scottish Members did object to was the manner in which these proposals had been dangled before them, and afterwards abandoned by the Government. The Scotch Representatives would like

to know who was responsible on this occasion for the manner in which Scotland had been dealt with. Was it the Lord Advocate or the Members of the Government who were responsible for this Bill? If the Lord Advocate had the authority of the Government to submit to the Scottish Members the proposals which he did submit, he thought the Lord Advocate was entitled to expect from the Government the support necessary to carry them through when they had received the support of a large majority of the Scottish Members. But the manner in which Scotland had been dealt with in this Bill was like what they were accustomed to with regard to all measures for Scotland. Measures were dangled before them, and then withdrawn without explanations. What Scotch Members had to complain of was that influence was used in dealing with Scottish Business which was not publicly disclosed in the House. What explanation, for instance, had been given of various Bills which had been spoken of——

THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

MR. J. W. BARCLAY said, he would not go into that subject, or beyond the limits of the debate. He thought the objection he had indicated would be quite understood by the Scottish Members, and it was more on that account than on the account of the wretched Amendments to which the Lord Advocate's proposals had been reduced, that his hon. Friends desired to take the opinion of the Committee. The Scottish Members wished to indicate that they were not at all satisfied with this mode of conducting Scottish Business; and that if there was to be some one specially in charge of Scottish Business, he should have certain powers and responsibilities, such as the Lord Advocate did not appear to have under the present system.

MR. GORST suggested that this conversation might now be brought to a conclusion, and the Committee allowed to proceed with the real Business of the evening. It was not often that the Members who represented Scotch constituencies broke out in clamorous rebellion against the Government; and, therefore, he thought that on this occasion the Committee would be ready to receive their complaints with indulgence. But the conversation had now been going on for an hour, and the Committee were perfectly possessed of the feeling of Scotch Members; they knew how bitterly the Representatives of Scotland resented the manner in which they had been treated by the Lord Advocate—["The Government!"]—and how worthless they considered the relics of the scheme the Government were now about to withdraw. Under the circumstances, would it not be as well to withdraw the present Motion, and allow the Committee to proceed with the real Business before it?

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, it was not his business to defend the Government, and on that occasion he could not if he would; but he must say it seemed to him that they had here the principle of better late than never, and that the Government had been wisely advised in dropping a bad scheme. He thought the Government could not have done otherwise. The real truth was that almost every Scottish Member wanted something done, and no two were agreed as to what should be done, and they had got into such a mess that the Government would never have been able to make a satisfactory scheme unless they had devoted weeks to the subject. It seemed to him that the Government had in this matter two courses open to them; they should either have produced a complete scheme, making things fair all round, or have confined themselves to one or two small changes, in regard to which there would be general agreement. They had taken neither course. They had taken a middle course, and proposed a partial scheme—a scheme of no principle whatever—and he was not surprised that there had been rebellion against it on all sides. He must, however, join in the expression of surprise at some of the statements made by hon. Members. He was not surprised that his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. A. R. D. Elliot) should have expressed his indignation, for he rather thought the whole scheme was hatched in the brain of his hon. and learned Friend; and it was natural that he should be indignant at the prospect of its being addled. The hon. Member for the City of Edinburgh (Mr. Buchanan) had throughout condemned the scheme as one without a principle, and one which created greater inequalities than existed before. Now, however, the

hon. Gentleman expressed his indignation at the withdrawal of the scheme. Under all the circumstances, he (Sir George Campbell) thought the Government were quite right in taking the step they now proposed.

MR. BOLTON said, the conduct of the Government and of the Lord Advocate had been animadverted upon by many of his hon. Friends. He did not join in that animadversion. The Lord Advocate and the Government had endeavoured to make arrangements which they thought would be satisfactory to the Scottish Members; but he was afraid that, taking each of these Amendments by itself, the reverse of satisfaction had been the result. Every Amendment had had a supporter; but, unfortunately, every Amendment had also had a great many opponents. He was, therefore, satisfied that the Government had done the right thing in withdrawing these Amendments, and he should give them his support.

MR. FRASER-MACKINTOSH drew the Lord Advocate's attention to the peculiar position of the Inverness Burghs, which he had the honour to represent, for, by an Amendment passed last Wednesday, those burghs had been dissolved. He was not present when the Lord Advocate began his statement that night; but he hoped to hear that his right hon. and learned Friend would take the very earliest opportunity of reconstituting the Inverness Burghs.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR) remarked, that if the hon. Member (Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh) had been in the House when he (the Lord Advocate) made his statement, he would have heard that as regarded the Amendments which had been already passed, the Government intended to propose on Report to delete them.

MR. CRAIG-SELLAR said, that before going to a division he desired to say a word of explanation in regard to a question which had been addressed to him by the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke). He had never disguised his opinion in private that he considered the Lord Advocate's scheme, in its present curtailed form, of little value, and that it was a waste of time to go on with it, and he might have stated that in the Lobbies and Tea Room in the hearing of the right hon. Gentleman. But the value, or worthlessness, of the scheme was not the point at issue. The point at issue was the manner in which Scotch Members had been treated in regard to this Bill from the beginning. His reason for taking part in the discussion was to protest, and to beg his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. A. R. D. Elliot) to go to a division in order that they might protest, against the general manner in which the Scottish Business had been conducted in this matter. He was glad the scheme had been withdrawn.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he was glad the hon. Member had made the explanation, because he had made the statement to himself (Sir Charles W. Dilke), and the hon. Member was one of those whose names he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had mentioned to the Lord Advocate as being opposed to the scheme.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR apologized to the hon. Gentleman the Member for Berwickshire (Mr. Marjoribanks) for calling the Chairman's attention to the use by the hon. Member of the word "obstructive." He ought to have known that the epithet was legitimate, because it was used so frequently and with much gusto by Scotch Members in respect to Motions introduced by Irish Members. Now, Scotch Members seemed to think that the abandonment by the Government of the Scotch scheme concerned them alone. That was not the case. Anybody who would take the trouble to look at the Paper would find that the removal by the Lord Advocate of all his Amendments had the effect of launching the Committee upon a discussion of the Irish portion of the Bill, which no one expected would come on for some considerable time. The general expectation of the Committee, certainly the expectation of the Irish Members, was that the earliest opportunity of arriving at the Irish portion of the Bill would be next Monday or Tuesday; but now, at 7 o'clock on Friday evening, they were compelled to begin a discussion on the Irish part of the Bill, one of the most important and debatable portions of the whole measure. He and his hon. Friends had every reason to expect that the Scotch debate would have gone on for a much longer time than it had. In the first place, they had every reason to believe that the scheme was one which had been carefully con-

sidered by the Government and the Scotch Members. They had been informed over and over again by many Scotch Members that they had gone down to their constituents to consult them as to the merits of the scheme. They had heard that the scheme was the result of an understanding between the Representatives of Scotland and the Government, and in the face of all that the scheme was suddenly dropped and the Committee were plunged into another part of the Bill. While he and his hon. Friends would support the hon. and learned Member (Mr. A. R. D. Elliot) if he went to a division, they protested against being called upon so suddenly to discuss matters which affected so seriously their own country.

MR. J. A. CAMPBELL said, that so much had been said on the other side of the House expressing dissatisfaction with what the Government had done, that it might be thought they on the Opposition side were gainers by this new move on the part of the Government. So far as he was able to form an opinion, they were not gainers at all. There had been a mistake, and for that mistake the Government must bear the blame. But he must say he and his hon. Friends would have supported some of the Amendments of the Lord Advocate so far as they went, and he thought it was to be regretted if nothing should be done to improve the grouping of some of the Scotch burghs. Although the Government withdrew their Amendments, he believed it was still open to private Members to bring forward Amendments in the same direction, and he hoped advantage would be taken of that opportunity. He and others wished Amendments of a different kind, in addition to many that the Lord Advocate had proposed; but he wished particularly to say that they did not consider themselves in any way gainers by the course the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate now proposed to pursue.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 45; Noes 242: Majority 197.—(Div. List, No. 70.)

MR. DICK-PEDDIE proposed, in Schedule 1, page 13, column 2, line 49, to insert, at the end of the foregoing Amendment—

"Kilmarnock (District of Burghs)	Ayr, Lanark, Renfrew, and Dumbarton."

The hon. Gentleman said, he had not expected that it would devolve on him to move this Amendment; but as the Lord Advocate, in whose name it stood on the Paper, had been obliged to give it up in consequence of the decision of the Government to leave the Scottish group of burghs unaltered, he was obliged to take it up. He might explain that his object in moving this Amendment was to bring about a re-arrangement of the burghs, which would reduce to some extent the population embraced in the Kilmarnock group. That group was the largest group of burghs in Scotland, with the exception of that of Leith. The 13 groups of burghs in Scotland had an average population of 40,000; Kilmarnock had a population of 69,500. If, however, they took Kilmarnock out of the list, they would find that the average population of the remaining 12 groups of burghs was 37,883. The population in the Kilmarnock group was, therefore, out of all proportion to the average population of the other groups of burghs. If Kilmarnock be altered, as proposed in the scheme of the Government, it would be reduced to a population of about 58,000, and the remaining 12 groups of burghs would have an average population of about 38,800, still leaving to Kilmarnock a very large number in excess of any other group of burghs. What Kilmarnock wanted—and in asking this all the Members connected with Ayrshire agreed—was that two groups of burghs should be formed in Ayrshire—one in the North, having Kilmarnock as the returning burgh, and the other in the South, having Ayr as the returning burgh. Ayrshire would then have four Members — two county Members and two burgh Members — and considering that the population of the county was 217,000, that would be by no means an excessive representation. At present, the Kilmarnock group consisted of five burghs, and these burghs were scattered over four counties, and they had hardly the slightest connection or interest one with another. What the Government scheme proposed, and what his Amendment proposed to do, was to take out of the group which consisted of Kilmarnock, Renfrew, Port-Glasgow, Dumbarton, and Rutherglen, the last-

named burgh, and add it to another group, composed of Hamilton and Airdrie, in Lanarkshire. If that were done, the population of Kilmarnock Burghs would be reduced from 69,000 to 58,000; and, in his opinion, the groups would be very materially improved. Now, the scheme of the Government had, for months past, been before the burghs. Large public meetings had been held in every one of the burghs to consider the scheme, and, without exception, the burghs were unanimously in favour of it. Rutherglen was quite agreeable to be taken out of the Kilmarnock group and added to Hamilton and Airdrie; and Hamilton and Airdrie were quite pleased to be joined by Rutherglen. Now, this, therefore, was a case in which no burgh concerned had the slightest objection to the proposed change; indeed, every one of them approved of the change. The proposal did not touch the principle at all of merging burghs in counties, or affect in the slightest degree the representation of counties; and yet, for the sake of the idea which had been started that night, that very necessary reform, which would have been hailed with great satisfaction, was to be thrown overboard. He did not intend to detain the Committee longer. He trusted that the Government would be able to find the acceptance of his Amendment quite consistent with any arrangement they had made with the Front Opposition Bench.

Amendment proposed,

In Schedule 1, page 13, column 2, line 49, to insert at the end of the foregoing Amendment—"Kilmarnock (District of Burghs) | Ayr, Lanark, Renfrew, and Dumbarton."—(*Mr. Dick-Peddie.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR) scarcely thought that his hon. Friend could have been in the House when he (the Lord Advocate) made his statement a short time ago; because, if he had been, he would hardly have spoken of an arrangement being arrived at with the Front Opposition Bench. He (the Lord Advocate) need hardly say that if the Amendment were not associated with anything else he should not offer any opposition to it. In fact, it was a very similar Amendment to one he (the Lord Advocate) had proposed himself. The Amendment which he (the Lord Advocate) proposed would, in his own opinion, have been an improvement; but he must point out to his hon. Friends that the way in which the Government proposed to get a Lanarkshire group was by creating a new group, and that new group was to be created by, amongst other things, dissolving the present Stirling group of burghs, a group which comprehended no fewer than three small burghs—namely, Culross, Inverkeithing, and Queensferry, which it was proposed to merge. If the merging of the smaller burghs had been carried out, a re-arrangement would have been possible; but as the merging had not been agreed to, the matter would have to be dropped.

MR. COCHRAN-PATRICK said, he agreed with everything that had fallen from the hon. Gentleman the Member for Kilmarnock Burghs (Mr. Dick-Peddie). Scotch Members were originally informed by the Government that it was proposed to merge Kilmarnock, Irvine, and Ayr together. That was a proposal which was not assented to. The proposal, however, which the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate had that day withdrawn from the Committee was one which was agreed to by both sides in the House—which was agreeable to the wishes of the constituencies, and had been supported by public meetings, and by everybody in the districts; and he (Mr. Cochran-Patrick) could not help expressing his extreme surprise that the agreement come to on this matter should have been so summarily dropped. It was only the other day that an important deputation came up to London, and, after interviewing their Members, expressed themselves perfectly satisfied that the re-arrangement should be carried out. The deputation went home fully impressed that the re-arrangement would be effected. He could not say what their feelings to-morrow would be when they learnt that the scheme had been so suddenly withdrawn. He hoped his hon. Friend would persevere with his Amendment.

MR. BRYCE wished to say a word to the Committee with regard to the case of one of the burghs to which the Amendment had reference—namely, Rutherglen. Rutherglen had now practically become a suburb of Glasgow, and

there was no reason for keeping it as a separate burgh. The obvious course was to merge it in Glasgow, or in one of the divisions of Lanarkshire, which might be called by its name. If English and Irish Members realized how preposterous the present condition of the Scotch districts of burghs system was, they would feel some sympathy with Scotch Members when they expressed regret that the scheme of the Lord Advocate for its improvement had been dropped.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he thought that Rutherglen ought to be consulted before anything was done in this matter.

MR. R. PRESTON BRUCE said, he hoped that his hon. Friend the Member for the Kilmarnock Burgh (Mr. Dick-Peddie) would not press his Amendment to a division. He agreed with his hon. Friend that Scotch Members had been very badly treated in this matter; but it seemed to him quite impossible, on the spur of the moment, to construct a re-arrangement of the burghs upon a new basis. He thought it would be better, under the circumstances, to be content with the protest they had made, and to leave the groups as they stood.

MR. DICK-PEDDIE said, that no re-arrangement could be more unsatisfactory to Rutherglen than the one suggested by his hon. and learned Friend the Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Bryce). Rutherglen was one of the oldest Royal Burghs in Scotland; it was a very much older burgh than Glasgow; and while it was anxious to be joined to Hamilton and Airdrie, it had no desire to be swallowed up by Glasgow. He could not agree with the suggestion of his hon. Friend the Member for Fifeshire (Mr. Preston Bruce) to withdraw his Amendment. His constituents attached great importance to the matter; they had been under the impression that a satisfactory scheme had been arranged, and now that this change had been suddenly sprung upon them they had great reason to complain.

Question put, and *negatived.*

MR. A. GRANT said, the Amendment which he had now to move, with the intention of altering the mode of representation in the burgh of Leith, must be taken in connection with another Amendment which appeared in his name upon Schedule 4. His object in the two Amendments was to remove a very great hardship and injustice of which his constituents complained. That hardship and injustice consisted in the burgh of Leith being compelled to remain in its present unsatisfactory and unfair position of forming one of a group of burghs, and only sharing with the other burghs of the group the privilege of returning one Member to Parliament, and the services of the Member when returned. The people of Leith contended, and very justly so, that whether trade, population, electors, wealth, or commercial importance be taken as the test, they were fully entitled to a Member of their own. For the information of English Members, who perhaps had a very vague idea of localities in Scotland, he might say that Leith was a large flourishing seaport with 60,000 inhabitants, and with an electorate of 9,000. The rateable value of the property in the town amounted to £384,000, and there was in Leith a large and extensive system of docks, with a revenue of £83,000 per annum. He might say further that the Customs collected during the course of 12 months amounted to close upon £500,000 sterling—in short, Leith was fairly entitled to rank amongst the most important seaports of this Kingdom; and yet for all that, with all her claims to that position, she was relegated to the inferior and subordinate position of being only one of a group of burghs; while with the burghs to which she was allied she had very little, if any, interest at all in common. Now, with these strong claims to separate representation which she had, the people of Leith felt perfect confidence that justice would be done them in this Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill, and this confidence was strengthened by representations which they received from time to time from Members of the Government in answer to Memorials from them, presented previous to the introduction of this measure. He need hardly say that when the Bill itself appeared, and when it was found that all the new Members had been otherwise appropriated, and that the redistribution scheme for Scotland had been so arranged that the claims of Leith were entirely ignored, it gave rise to a large amount, he would not say of

astonishment and dissatisfaction, but of just indignation and of bitter disappointment on the part of the people. He thought that when the people of Leith read of what had taken place that night, when they learned that the Government had confessed that all along it had been under agreement with hon. Gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House that nothing should be done to redress injustice with regard to the grouping of burghs in Scotland, the indignation of the people would be vastly increased. The people of Leith trusted even yet that the innate spirit of fairness which characterized the House of Commons would redress the injustice which had been done them, and give them what they were entitled to. The Prime Minister himself had told the House that one of the fundamental principles of this Bill was equality of treatment in all the constituencies in the United Kingdom. He (Mr. A. Grant) asked if there was any proof that Leith had been treated on an equal footing even with other places in Scotland? Leith was the sixth town in Scotland as regarded population, and all the burghs before her had one or more Members of their own. Paisley, with a smaller population than Leith, had a Member of its own. The City of Perth, with one-half the population, and with a much smaller rateable value, had the privilege of returning a Member to Parliament; and, looking at the question from another point of view, he might say that there was not one other grouped town in Scotland which had anything like one-half the population of Leith. Now, if they compared the treatment which was accorded to Leith with that accorded to similar places in England, it would be found very difficult indeed to reconcile the treatment of Leith with the principle of the Bill. He found that in England the following seaports, analogous to Leith, had each a separate Member of their own — Whitehaven, with 20,000 people; Hartlepool, with 17,000; Tynemouth, with 44,000; Scarborough, with 30,000. He might be told that those were all places which had long had representation; that they were what the Prime Minister described as historical communities. Well, that might be so; but they found that the Government had thought fit in this very Bill to give separate representation to various places in England on account of the importance and population of those places. Amongst the new boroughs created, still taking places analogous to Leith, he found Barrow-in-Furness and Great Yarmouth, the one having 47,000 of a population, and the other 46,000. Now, what became of the principle of equality of treatment when such places as those were given separate representation, and Leith, with its 60,000 and with its varied and great interests and rapidly increasing size and importance, was denied such representation? He might be told that this Bill had avoided, as much as possible, interfering with the present electoral arrangement of Scotch burghs. Now, was that so? The Bill, in the first place, took away representation from two of the Scotch burghs, applying the English rule with regard to the limit of 15,000; and, in the second place, it had satisfied the claims of various large towns in Scotland to increased representation, solely on the grounds of their population and importance. Why, he asked, was not Leith treated in the same spirit? It would not open up any great question, for the case of Leith was perfectly unique, and there was no other burgh which could present anything like so good a claim to separate representation. Now, with regard to the other burghs in the Leith group, they, perhaps, had even more reason to complain of the present arrangement than Leith, and very naturally so, because they at present were so overshadowed by their larger neighbour, that they could not exercise their just influence in connection with electoral or Parliamentary matters. He was speaking for those burghs when he said that they would infinitely prefer to be merged in the county of Mid Lothian rather than remain under their present condition; and that was the solution of the difficulty which he suggested as the most feasible under the present circumstances. If the Government, however, did not see their way to that solution of the difficulty, he was perfectly willing to accept any better scheme which they could propose, and which would carry out the object he had in view. He was bound to say that there was a certain section of people in the smaller burghs of Portobello and Musselburgh who would prefer to be joined with some other smaller places more like themselves, and form a group

of burghs; but that would involve the difficulty, which apparently was insurmountable, of finding another Member. He must admit that there was a feeling in Mid Lothian that if Portobello and Musselburgh were merged in the county, the county would form such a large constituency that it would be entitled to an additional Member. Mid Lothian would, undoubtedly, under such circumstances, have a fair title to another Member, if another could be obtained. At the same time he must point out that even at present Mid Lothian was a very large constituency to have only one Member; and that the addition he proposed to make would not amount to any large increase, though, of course, it would make the county larger than at present. Assuming that it was impossible to get another seat, he would put this question to the Committee—"Are you not doing a greater injury to Leith by keeping it in its present position, than you would do if you provided that these two small burghs should be thrown into the county?" Now, if he were to take into account the number of inhabitants subtracted from the county by the alteration of the boundaries of Edinburgh, he might show that the addition of these two burghs to the county would not make any appreciable difference in the balance of Parties in the country; and he might also show that, although the constituency would be enlarged, it would not come up to the limit which had received an additional Member by the Bill. It was not necessary, however, for him to take up the time of the Committee by going into those details. Let him say, in conclusion, that public opinion in Scotland generally was all in favour of the claims of Leith. Those claims had been discussed in the Press, at public meetings, and by associations of both sides of politics; and at a large and enthusiastic meeting lately held in the burgh of Leith itself, attended by people of every shade of politics, the treatment dealt out to Leith was animadverted upon in very severe terms, and the hope was expressed that even yet Parliament would see reason to give effect to the fair and just claims Leith put forward. He appealed to the Government, and to the feeling of justice which existed in the Committee, to do what was fair and right in this matter, especially when that could be done with so little interference with the Bill, and with so little, if any, real hardship to anyone concerned.

Amendment proposed,

In Schedule I, page 13, column 2, line 49, at the end of the foregoing Amendment, to insert the words—

"Leith (District of Burghs) | Mid Lothian."

—(*Mr. Andrew Grant.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, his hon. Friend had very fairly stated the case of Leith, and he was quite justified in saying he had had a certain amount of encouragement at various times for bringing the matter before the Committee. What his hon. Friend asked was just one of the things which he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had always very much wished to see his way to do. He had told his hon. Friend so; but he had, at the same time, put frankly before him the difficulties which stood in the way. The hon. Gentleman admitted that if an additional Member had to be got to make the scheme workable, there would be no difficulty in finding that Member. Therefore it was that his hon. Friend, on the whole, thought it most expedient to propose to throw the burghs which were grouped with Leith into the county of Mid Lothian, and to leave matters otherwise as they were. But, on the other hand, it must be remembered that this was the case of a group of burghs with 72,000 population, and that the county of Mid Lothian, when reduced by 8,000 by the extension of the boundaries of Edinburgh, would still be a county of 78,000 population, and, he might add, a rapidly increasing county too. Now, the proposal to take 14,000 away from a group of burghs of 72,000, and throw them into the county of Mid Lothian with a population of 78,000, would make 92,000, which would be an enormous constituency for one Member, especially having regard to the fact that the population was rapidly increasing. The Bill gave the county of Perth, which had about that number, a second Member, and the Government would have been glad to carry out the same idea in regard to Mid Lothian if they had seen their way to find a Member. But although they had not been able to do so, he could not ignore the fact that the

single-Member counties in Scotland were at the top of the single-Member counties. The Isle of Wight, which was a very large and populous county in England, was, nevertheless, smaller than Mid Lothian. The reason of that was that there were in Scotland, in proportion to the total number of Scotch Members, a considerable number of small county constituencies, and unless they were to carry the principle of grouping counties further than the Government proposed to carry it, in cases such as the grouping of Caithness with Sutherland, they could not find additional Members for the larger counties. If that were done, no doubt a strong demand would be made for a Member to be given to the Western Islands, so that he fancied that the hon. Member would not succeed in getting a second seat for Mid Lothian; and he certainly did not think that the Committee would be willing to take away the second seat which it was proposed to give to Perthshire in order to give it to Mid Lothian, because, although Mid Lothian was undoubtedly increasing faster than Perthshire, its population was at present less than that of the county of Perth. Under these circumstances, it would be objectionable to take away a population of 14,000 from the Leith Burghs, in order to add them to a county which already possessed a population of 78,000; and he regretted that, on the whole, he must ask the Committee to reject the proposal of the hon. Member, although it was one the Government would be glad to see their way to accept.

MR. BUCHANAN supported the Amendment moved by his hon. Friend behind him, believing that it would remedy one of the chief practical defects in the Bill. He felt, however, that the position of affairs was very much changed by what had happened that evening, and that the prospect of his hon. Friend being able to carry the Amendment, or to get support for it, had been considerably diminished by the action of the Government and the Leaders of the Opposition. Before the Bill came out, it was recognized that one of the first defects to be remedied was the fact that Leith had no separate representation. Since that time every speaker had had but one voice in the matter, and every public body the same. Both political Parties were agreed, and it would be found that the National Union of Conservative Associations for Scotland put the claim of the burgh of Leith to have independent representation as the leading feature of their programme for redistribution. Very recently a deputation from Leith waited upon the Lord Advocate, and this was what the right hon. and learned Gentleman said to the Provost—

> "It is unnecessary that you should come to convert me to your views. I think as strongly as you that Leith should have a Member to itself. I have always thought so."

Even more recently the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy (Mr. Trevelyan), when the question was raised in the House, speaking from the Treasury Bench, said—

> "Notably they (the Government) earnestly hoped to meet the case of the burgh of Leith, which was, perhaps, the strongest case of the many which had been put forward by the Lord Advocate, and viewed favourably by the Scotch Members."

The separate representation of the burgh of Leith also stood first among the suggestions of the Lord Advocate, which were submitted to the Scotch Members upstairs. He (Mr. Buchanan) asked the Committee to imagine the surprise and disappointment of the Scotch Members after the prominence which had been given to Leith by the right hon. and learned Gentleman, the statement he had himself made in regard to it, the further declarations of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy on Wednesday, the 4th March, and on the following Tuesday, March the 10th, to find, when the Lord Advocate's Amendments appeared, that Leith was dropped out of the scheme altogether. It was not necessary to add to what the Government had themselves said of this burgh. Its population, its commercial importance, and its shipping fairly entitled it to separate representation; and if Portobello and Musselburgh were taken away, Leith would still remain one of the largest constituencies in the United Kingdom with a single Member only. He certainly thought that, having regard to the circumstances of the case, and to the wishes of the constituency, that it was advisable to merge Portobello and Musselburgh in the county, although, undoubtedly, in that case, the county would require an

additional Member. It was a great blot upon the Bill that this strange anomaly should be allowed to exist, and it was only right that it should have been removed by the action of the Government themselves. For his own part, he was prepared to merge Portobello and Musselburgh in the county, even although Mid Lothian did not obtain additional representation. But he acknowledged the strong grounds there were for giving that county additional representation. With that object, and in order to obtain a Member for a new Highland constituency, he had put down Amendments to merge in the counties the Wick and the St. Andrew's Burghs, the two smallest district groups. That seemed to him a reasonable and practical way of meeting the difficulty; but after what had taken place that evening he would not proceed with these Amendments. In conclusion, he wished earnestly to impress upon the Committee the great disappointment and regret which would be felt in Scotland in regard to this question of the separate representation of Leith. He was unable to say what occult influences had been at work; but, whatever the cause might be, it was very disheartening that, after the statements made by the Government before the Bill was introduced, and the approval which had been unanimously given to the promised proposals of the Lord Advocate, all the good intentions of Her Majesty's Government were now to be frustrated.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE wished to say a word on the subject, because, a short time ago, he had the honour of receiving a deputation from Leith with respect to this arrangement. He could only say—and he thought it was the feeling of the Committee on both sides—that it would have been a very great satisfaction to him and his hon. Friends if it had been possible to do what was desired—namely, to separate from Leith the other boroughs which were now associated with it. He was bound, however, at the same time, to say that Leith so completely dominated the group of burghs, and they had been so much in the habit of talking of "the Member for Leith," that until recently he was hardly aware that there were any other burghs associated with it. He had always looked upon Leith as possessing predominating influence over the group, and he was quite sure that it would aways be so considered. Still, it would have been a matter of great satisfaction if that which was so much desired in Scotland could have been done. The question had been urged ably and temperately by the gentlemen who did him the honour to wait upon him, and at one time it appeared as if some arrangement might be made by which what hon. Members desired could be accomplished. But the difficulty which the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. Buchanan) had acknowledged, and which the President of the Local Government Board had pointed out, did arise, and would not be easy to deal with—if they were to throw Musselburgh and Portobello into the county of Mid Lothian, and thus greatly increase the population of that county, it would follow as a matter of course that they must provide a second Member for Mid Lothian. How were they to do that? Various plans and suggestions had been made; but, on the whole, it seemed to him that the Government had arrived at a right conclusion in the matter—namely, that the only possible way of dealing with Leith, and giving it a separate representation, was to give the county into which Musselburgh and Portobello would be thrown an additional Member.

Mr. DICK-PEDDIE said, he was glad to find, from the statement which had just been made by the right hon. Gentleman opposite, that the claims of Leith to separate representation were equally acknowledged on both sides of the House. It was a very curious matter, then, that when an injustice was acknowledged by everybody, and admitted to be of a glaring character, the combined ingenuity of the Government and the Front Opposition Bench was not sufficient to find a remedy. He thought it was possible, however, to make some arrangement by which the principal seaport in Scotland, next to Glasgow, should obtain a Member for itself instead of being in the position of having only partial representation. If the Bill were allowed to stand in its present shape, it would not be long before some Government, perhaps a Government composed of Gentlemen now sitting on the Opposition

Benches, would be compelled to bring in a plan to remedy the gross injustice which would exist in regard to the Scotch burgh groups. He would certainly support his hon. Friend the Member for Leith (Mr. A. Grant) if he went to a division, if it were only by way of entering a protest.

MR. DALRYMPLE said, he regarded it as very unfortunate that Scotland was not dealt with by itself, instead of being included in a Bill of this kind embracing the whole of the United Kingdom. If Scotland had been dealt with by itself, such a case would not have occurred as a place like Leith not having a Representative for itself, and a county like Mid Lothian not having a second Member. It ought to be a matter of some consolation to the hon. Member for Leith (Mr. A. Grant) to recollect that at a meeting of the Scotch Members, little as was now thought of it, although it lasted for two days, a unanimous expression was put on record that Leith ought to have a second Member; but it was coupled with the condition that Mid Lothian was to have a second Member. The hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. Buchanan), who addressed the Committee a few minutes ago, told them that that was also the recommendation of the National Union of Conservative Associations in Scotland; but that it was coupled with the same condition. He desired to express his sympathy with Leith, on account of its not having obtained separate representation for itself; but he thought there would be less injustice in Leith remaining as it was than there would be if a considerable additional population were thrown into the county of Mid Lothian without giving it a second Member. It must be admitted that it would be less hard for Leith to remain as it was, especially after the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Devon (Sir Stafford Northcote)—that in that House Leith was always spoken of as the returning burgh, but never as the Leith Burghs—than to create a hardship which would undoubtedly be much greater by making a large addition to the constituency of the county of Mid Lothian. Reference had been made by the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill to the case of Perthshire. It was true that Perthshire, according to the last Census Returns, contained a somewhat larger population than Mid Lothian would have, even by including within the latter the burghs of Portobello and Musselburgh. No one could for a moment doubt that in the next Census the population of Mid Lothian would be considerably greater than that of Perthshire. In one place, on a farm in the West part of the county, the population, in the course of a few weeks, was increased by 600, owing to works which were being erected in the neighbourhood. While he sympathized very much with the case of Leith, and would gladly have seen an arrangement made by which that burgh could have obtained separate representation, he did not see that any advantage would be derived from dividing the Committee on the subject.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR) said, that this was a very important matter, and reference had been made to the opinion he had already expressed upon it. He had not gone back in the slightest degree from that opinion; and so strong did he consider the claim of Leith to be that, in the scheme submitted for the consideration of the Scotch Members, a separate Member for Leith was proposed, even although Mid Lothian was only to get one Member. Leith was of great importance as a seaport, and the special character of the burgh certainly marked it out for separate representation. But when the scheme came to be considered by the Scotch Members, while considerable sympathy was expressed for Leith, it was thought, for reasons which were perfectly intelligible, that to put 94,000 persons into the county of Mid Lothian, and leave only 58,000 in the burgh, would scarcely be fair. Consequently, a rider was attached to the resolution in favour of Leith, which made that point perfectly clear. The Scotch Members were unanimous in assenting to that rider, and the effect of it was to provide that a separate Member should only be given to Leith on condition that the county of Mid Lothian got a second Member. That being so, the question was carefully considered by the Government, and the reconsideration lasted until yesterday, various schemes being suggested by which a second Member might be obtained. Reference had been made to

the county of Perthshire. The claims of that county were fully considered when those of Mid Lothian for a second Member were put forward. Although Mid Lothian was numerically somewhat under Perthshire in its present population, it was felt that it would very soon be equally as large, seeing that the population of Mid Lothian was increasing at a much greater rate than that of Perthshire; but as a second Member had already been appropriated for Perthshire, and the necessity being laid upon the Government of taking the existing population as their basis, it was found impossible to appropriate a second Member to Mid Lothian. Therefore, as there were no means by which a second Member could be obtained for Mid Lothian in any other way, the Government were left in the position, which he admitted to be a most unfortunate one, of not being able to do that which in itself was most desirable.

MR. A. R. D. ELLIOT remarked that, if all they could do was to separate Portobello and Musselburgh from Leith and throw them into the county, without giving a second Member to Mid Lothian, the arrangement would be a very unsatisfactory one for the county of Mid Lothian. He therefore hoped that the hon. Member for Leith (Mr. A. Grant) would not put the Committee to the trouble of a division, but would rest content with the protest he had made.

MR. A. GRANT said, he was obliged to his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. A. R. D. Elliot) for the advice he had given to him; but, at the same time, he regretted that he was unable to take advantage of it. He should certainly feel it his duty to take a division upon the question. In regard to the difficulty which his hon. and learned Friend had named, he might say that his proposal would be the taking of the initial step for securing a second Member to Mid Lothian. If the Committee adopted his proposal, he thought the Government would be compelled to find some way of giving a second Member.

MR. C. S. PARKER desired to say, in the absence of his hon. Friend the Member for Perthshire (Sir Donald Currie), that that county would feel much aggrieved if, in consequence of the acceptance of the proposal of his hon. Friend the Member for Leith (Mr. A. Grant), it were arranged to give a second Member to Mid Lothian, with a smaller population than Perthshire, and to deprive Perthshire of the second Member already promised to it. He had no doubt that much dissatisfaction would have been expressed in Perthshire if the proposal of the Lord Advocate had been accepted, and an exception to the rule of taking the present population as a basis of representation had been made to the prejudice of Perthshire.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR): I only stated that the suggestion was made and considered.

MR. C. S. PARKER said, he hoped that it would not, as sometimes happened, be reconsidered. He regretted that it had not been found possible to give a separate representation to Leith, and to allot a second Member to Mid Lothian as well as to Perthshire.

MR. M'LAGAN said, he could not understand what those who framed the Redistribution Bill were thinking about when they made so egregious an omission as to leave Leith in the unjust position it occupied now—of not having a Member to itself. As a division was intended to be taken, he felt bound to express the regret he felt at being obliged to vote against the Amendment of his hon. Friend. At the meeting, upstairs, of Scotch Members, a Resolution was distinctly passed that it was not desirable to give separate representation to Leith unless a second Member could be got for Mid Lothian. As the claims of Mid Lothian to a second Member were even greater than those of Leith to separate representation, he should feel compelled to vote against the Amendment if it were pressed. At the same time, he thought the time had arrived when the claims of Leith to separate representation should be fully considered. He hoped the hon. Member for Leith (Mr. A. Grant) would content himself on the present occasion with the discussion which had taken place; and seeing the position in which many hon. Members would find themselves, who deeply sympathized with his hon. Friend, but who could not vote with him, because a second Member was not to be assigned for Mid Lothian, he hoped his hon. Friend would withdraw the Amendment.

MR. CALLAN said, he was surprised to find that the unanimity which generally prevailed among the Scotch Members had been broken up. They often heard of dissensions among the Irish Members; but they rarely found the Scotch Representatives adopting the attitude of the Kilkenny cats. He felt bound to complain that the Government had not shown as much deference to the opinions of the Irish Members as the Lord Advocate had shown to those of the Scotch Members in these matters. He failed to see why similar attention should not have been paid to the Irish Members by the Chief Secretary for Ireland as that which had been paid to the Scotch Members by the Lord Advocate. Both the Irish National Representatives and the Conservative Members had a right to complain, because if the same deference had been shown to their opinions they might have arrived at some amicable understanding. The present fight was upon some unintelligible system of the grouping of Scotch burghs. In point of fact, they had been in a Scotch mist, all the evening, about this question of the grouping of burghs; and he wished to know why the vital limit of 15,000 for the purposes of enfranchisement, which had been extended to England and Ireland, had not been applied also to Scotland? It was quite evident that the system of grouping burghs in Scotland had saved numerous burghs in that country from being extinguished. That was not the case in Ireland; but, on the contrary, nearly the whole of the borough representation in that country had been extinguished; whereas, if the system of grouping had been adopted, the Irish boroughs would have been saved. He maintained that it was neither a fair nor an honest proceeding on the part of the Government to have refrained from consulting, either formally or informally, the Irish Members in the same way as the Scotch Members had been consulted. He intended to vote with the hon. Member for Leith (Mr. A. Grant), in order to show that the different system upon which the Irish borough constituencies had been treated by the Government was fully appreciated, and further to express the discontent and dissatisfaction of the Irish Members at not having been consulted as to the arrangements in regard to Ireland in the same way as that in which the Scotch Members had been consulted by the Lord Advocate.

MR. BIGGAR said, that he differed from the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, and was disposed to think that the principle of private consultation with regard to the provisions of a Bill, when the interests of the different parties were not identical, was not a good one, nor one calculated to be attended with any great success. He thought that, taking it for all in all, the Scotch Members would have had every reason to be perfectly satisfied if they had not had this opportunity for private consultation. He doubted whether the Front Opposition Bench would not themselves have been satisfied if they had refused to enter into a private conference, and to enter into the loving embrace of the Government. His own impression was that the arrangement which had been entered into was far from being a satisfactory way of doing business, having always been of opinion that explanations of all matters on the floor of the House was fairer to the House generally than the practice of entering into private consultation. It was perfectly impossible in a private consultation to consult all Members, and it was always possible for someone to be left out who took great interest in the question. It was possible for many Members to be left out who took much more interest in the question at issue than many of those who were taken into consultation; and altogether he thought that consultations between individuals and the Government were far from satisfactory, and things to be avoided. If he had any influence with hon. Friends near him, he would press them to vote against the proposal.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 15; Noes 89: Majority 74.—(Div. List, No. 71.)

MR. J. A. CAMPBELL said, he wished to move the Amendment standing on the Paper in his name, in order that he might have an opportunity of adding Kirriemuir to the Montrose Burghs under Schedule 4. It certainly required some courage to make a proposal of that kind after what they had heard the other day from the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy

of Lancaster (Mr. Trevelyan). The right hon. Gentleman had declared the opposition of the Government to adding any new town to an existing group of burghs. Indeed, he had said that he could not find words to express how strong the opinion of the Government was upon that subject. At the same time, this question of adding to the existing groups of burghs was perfectly open to the Committee. It was not included in the agreement of which they had heard so much. The discouraging fact which he could not get over was that the Government appeared to be opposed to any proposal of the kind. He (Mr. Campbell) might be excused for stating on what grounds such a proposal as this was advanced. They heard the other day that the main principle of this Bill was that representation should be given as much as possible in proportion to numbers. That no doubt was one principle, but it was not the only principle of the Bill. There was another, of which he thought they had not heard quite enough—namely, the principle of keeping different interests separate. That principle was not a doctrine of that (the Opposition) side of the House only, but was one which had been recognized as a general principle of legislation by both sides. Allusion had already been made to the Instructions to the Boundary Commission for Scotland, in which attention was called to the proper way of dealing with populous localities of an urban character in counties. But they had something more definite than even a general instruction given to the Boundary Commissioners; and with the permission of the Committee he would venture to remind them of a few words which they heard about that time last year—namely, on the 28th of February, from the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister. The right hon. Gentleman, when introducing the Franchise Bill, said that in a sound measure of redistribution the distinction between town and country, known to electoral law as borough and shire, ought to be maintained; that although the franchise was identical, that was not the question; that the question was whether there was not in pursuits and associations and in social circumstances a difference between town and country, between borough and shire, which it was expedient, becoming, and useful to maintain. The object of his (Mr. Campbell's) Amendment was simply to carry out this principle in the case of the county of Forfar. At present they had a group of five burghs, four of them in Forfarshire, and one small burgh in Kincardineshire. The population of these was 59,654; and his proposal was to add to that group the manufacturing town of Kirriemuir, which had a population of 4,390. In that way they would have all the manufacturing towns in Forfarshire outside of Dundee grouped together for representation. Their aggregate population, including the town of Inverbervie in Kincardineshire, would then be 64,064; and this addition of Kirriemuir to the Montrose Burghs would still leave for the constituency of the county of Forfar a population of 63,083. It was on these grounds that he proposed the Amendment, which he submitted to the Committee as a reasonable and proper one, which would place the electoral arrangements in the county of Forfar on a fair basis. He had the honour to move his Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

In Schedule 1, page 13, column 2, after line 49, insert—

"Montrose (District of Burghs.)	Forfar and Kincardine."

—(*Mr. J. A. Campbell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR) said, that the arguments against proposals of this kind had already been urged with such emphasis and clearness that he would not repeat them. He would merely say one or two words with regard to the particular case before them. His hon. Friend had referred to a speech delivered by the Prime Minister in which the right hon. Gentleman had spoken of maintaining the distinction between borough and shire. Well, he (the Lord Advocate) must point out that certainly, in reference to a case like the present, they were maintaining the distinction between borough and shire. That statement of the right hon. Gentleman did not refer to a case like this. It merely had reference to what was occurring in England, and not to the creation of groups or the making of additions to groups. The place in question was not a burgh at all. It was a prosperous village in the county of Forfar. It had none of the qualities of a

burgh ; and unless, therefore, it was to be laid down that wherever a population was in excess of a particular number, say of 2,000 or 3,000, it was to be added to the nearest group, in which case it would be maintained that there could be no reason for dealing with one town in a different manner to another, there was no ground for favourably considering the present proposal.

MR. DALRYMPLE said, it might be convenient to the Committee that he should say a few words upon his hon. Friend's Amendment, because, if he did so, he might in the result feel it unnecessary subsequently to move an Amendment which stood on the Paper in his own name. He should not be content to deal with this Amendment and other Amendments of a similar kind, even if they were defeated or negatived by the Committee, without making some remarks. He spoke more freely of the present Amendment because he had no connection whatever with that part of the country to which his hon. Friend had alluded, and he only took this case as an illustration of the cases that the Scotch Members had had very much in their minds. He did not understand from the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate on what authority he gave them his interpretation of the words of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government. The Scotch Members were entitled to their own view of those words, and he had never until that moment heard any doubt thrown upon the interpretation given to the words of the Prime Minister by his hon. Friend (Mr. J. A. Campbell). Those words had been referred to before that day. They were referred to very frequently, both in the House and outside it, and yet he had never heard of any interpretation differing from that of his hon. Friend. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate maintained that the Prime Minister had not meant what he said ; whereas he (Mr. Dalrymple) had a very strong authority for the interpretation which his hon. Friend (Mr. J. A. Campbell) had given of the words used. He held that the declaration made by the Prime Minister gave encouragement to the various Amendments which the Scotch Conservative Members proposed to the Committee, and it had never yet been disputed that the words entitled them to the attention of the Committee in respect of every Amendment of this character. He must refer to what had happened on a former occasion in reference to this Amendment. The hon. Member for Stirlingshire (Mr. Bolton), in reference to an Amendment on this question, had said that he wondered what would be said when this became known in Scotland. Why, there was nothing in the whole world to be more desired than that the subject should be made known all over the country. There was nothing in these Amendments, and there was nothing in the opinions that Scotch Members entertained upon any political question, for which he did not desire the utmost publicity. Their opinions, political and otherwise, were not of an exotic character, and would stand the full scrutiny of the people of Scotland. He was prepared to defend the principle upon which they had put this Amendment on the Paper on every occasion, and desired for such defence the utmost possible publicity. Reference had been made to the general expression used when any attempt was made to amend the county representation by adding towns that were not at present Parliamentary boroughs to the existing groups. He need not refer to the expression always used in that connection ; but he was perfectly content, however they were described, so long as the proposals made were thoroughly understood, and so long as hon. Members had an opportunity of vindicating them in that House. He supposed no one would dispute that it was open to them to propose these Amendments. Certainly the statements of Her Majesty's Government had conflicted most sharply the one with the other upon this subject. In a debate which took place on Wednesday week the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill had used these words—"If it was possible to extend, break up, and reconstitute the groups, he would be glad to hear the opinion of the Scotch Members upon it." Then the next thing they heard on the following Wednesday was from the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancester (Mr. Trevelyan). That right hon. Gentleman said that this was a vital question—and it was almost ludicrous, in view of the statement of the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board in the previous week, that the right

hon. Gentleman should have used these words. He said—

"I do not want to emphasize this by adding words at this moment; but it is quite impossible that any form of words which I can use should exaggerate the strength of the opinion which the Government entertain on this subject."—(3 *Hansard*, [295] 1611.)

That statement reached almost the highest point of force that any words could convey; and yet, in the previous week, they were given to understand that this was an open question. He wished to recall, for one instant, the attention of the Committee to the fact that when the extension of the franchise to the counties was resolved upon, the class to whom it was proposed to give the franchise, who had been, as it was stated, kept a long time out of their rights, was the agricultural class—the class of country voters. And he (Mr. Dalrymple) said that it was a strange comment on the statements that were so frequently made at that time that by the measure that was now before the House the very class to whom they gave their votes by the Franchise Act would have no say whatever in time to come in the counties in which they resided. They would have their votes, no doubt; but the votes of the counties would be swamped out of sight by the existence all around them of these towns which, by their numerical superiority, would outweigh them to the utmost possible extent. Who would have thought that the Party opposite would have so arranged matters that the suffrage which had just been given to those country districts would have no practical value for those receiving it? He knew that in some minds there existed the notion that there was some spell or charm about the possession of a vote; but his contention was that it was not in the least important to bestow it unless it in some way influenced political feeling and the result of elections. He desired to offer one word of explanation on the character of the proposals now made. The case just brought before the Committee was a good illustration. They might be quite open to the charge that they had not gone on any principle in the selection of towns, because it was sometimes without explanation difficult to state the principle on which they had acted. But it was simply this. They had not in all cases proposed to take the largest towns out of the counties. They had not proposed to take what he might call the capital towns out of the county. Far from it. They had held that in some cases a mixture of urban and rural voters was thoroughly good. There was often a county town which was essentially a country town, where people went to church and to market, so to speak, and where the inhabitants were related in every possible way to the country districts. But the principle on which they had gone in the selection of the burghs which they proposed to add to the existing groups was that of taking out places that were essentially foreign to the districts in which they were. He was scarcely out of Order in referring, by way of illustration, to the case of Stirlingshire, especially as he did not intend moving the Amendment which he had put on the Paper. In Stirlingshire two of the towns which they proposed to group were busy manufacturing places of 4,000 or 5,000 inhabitants, and they were a distinctly foreign element in the districts in which they were. They would never have proposed to take out what were in any sense considered as country towns, and they would have avoided doing so even although the population of such towns had been larger than those of the manufacturing places they proposed to take out. It was said two or three days ago, in answer by anticipation to this Amendment, that all the grouping system in Scotland was unpopular, and that they were proposing to aggravate it. Well, if it had been proposed to abolish the grouping system altogether he could have understood the principle upon which it was proposed to act. He could have understood the complete abolition of the grouping system in Scotland. Then there might have been a redistribution indeed, and the counties, in his judgment, would have had a fairer share of representation than they would have under the present partial system of grouping. But here they had been met, as they had been met elsewhere, by the conviction, forced upon them from every quarter, that the case of Scotland in regard to redistribution had never received adequate attention, and that what they had been favoured with had all along been an extremely inchoate and imperfect scheme, altogether inadequate to the circumstances

of the case. As matters stood, the condition in which this measure would pass would leave the grouping of burghs in neither one state nor the other, but in a most anomalous condition, only greatly aggravated by the large measure of franchise extension which had been passed. He would not detain the Committee longer, having said these few words in defence of the position which they had taken up. He, for one, had never been in favour of the creation of purely urban and purely rural constituencies. He was in favour of what the hon. Member for North Lanarkshire (Sir Edward Colebrooke) had called a mixture of the constituencies; and it was only where boroughs were of a foreign character, had grown up in a short space of time, and had been increased by manufactures, or works, or mining operations, and so forth, that he called them foreign elements in counties; and he maintained that those were places which ought, from their character, to have been added to the existing groups of boroughs. He cordially supported the proposal of his hon. Friend so far as it went, and was glad that he had had an opportunity of supporting it, and of expressing his opinion on the whole question, though he did not propose to trouble the Committee with his own Amendment.

Amendment *negatived.*

VISCOUNT CRICHTON said, he did not intend to trouble the Committee with the two Amendments which stood in his name. They were consequential on the Amendment he moved on the 2nd clause of the Bill, reducing the limit from 15,000 to 10,000. The same remark applied to the next group; but when they reached the Amendment referring to Lisburn, that stood on a different footing, and he proposed to proceed with it.

MR. CALLAN said, that, on rising to move to leave out Drogheda from the Schedule disfranchising certain one-Member constituencies, he had, in the first place, to call the attention of the Committee to the declaration made by the Prime Minister in introducing the Bill, which was to the effect that the limit of 15,000 as affecting Ireland was not to be taken as a hard-and-fast line. His (Mr. Callan's) attention was, during the very first week of his knowledge of the Bill, directed to the case of Drogheda, mainly in consequence of the substitution of one Bill for another, through an amended Bill having been circulated shortly after the original Bill was introduced. In the amended Bill he found that in the case of Warwick this hard-and-fast line had not been adhered to. In the case of this old historic English town of some 8,000 population, the Commissioners had gone beyond the municipal boundary for a distance of five or six miles in one direction for the purpose of bringing in a population sufficient to bring the constituency within the requirements of the Bill. He found at the same time that, with regard to Drogheda, a hard-and-fast line had been laid down. The 15,000 limit having been insisted upon, and no measure having been taken to extend the boundary, although only 338 people, according to the Census of 1881, were required to bring the population up to 15,000. He could not but think that the Government, when considering the representation of Ireland, had acted—and he said it with all due deference, but, at the same time, he did not think he should be contradicted in the statement, upon imperfect information in including Drogheda amongst the disfranchised boroughs. Although he happened to be a Member for the county in which Drogheda was mainly situated, he did not know, until two years ago, that he had constituents in that town. Two years ago, when he went to Drogheda, it was pointed out to him that he had passed his own constituents in the main street of the town. This street ran from east to west, and was the main street, and he was entirely at a loss to make out why one-half of it had been cut off and thrown into county Louth. It had been done evidently for some inscrutable reason. There could be no doubt that if the whole of the borough were included within the boundary Drogheda would have a population of 17,000, or 2,000 above the limit of 15,000. An inquiry into the circumstance of Drogheda had been held a short time ago; he referred to the inquiry of the Boundary Commission. Captain Purchas, R.E., one of the Boundary Commissioners, had sat in the assembly room of the Tholsel on the 17th of January for the purpose of considering the Parliamentary boundaries

of Louth. Captain Purchas had taken some important evidence; but, looking at the Report of the Commissioners, he found that this evidence was not set forth. The evidence, however, given on that occasion was to the effect that some years ago a Royal Commission sat and took evidence in reference to the borough of Drogheda. That was called Mr. Exham's Commission. He believed a Borough Commission was also appointed in England at the same period; but of that he was not quite sure. At any rate, a Commission had sat in Ireland. The Government had adopted the Report of the Exham Commission for Belfast for the purpose of a jerrymandering arrangement between the two Front Benches. The Boundary Commissioners had accepted the Report of the Exham Commission for the borough of Belfast in order to give it four Members; but they had disregarded it in the case of Drogheda. The Exham Commission had made a Report recommending the extension of the borough boundary; but unfortunately for Drogheda no Bill had ever been introduced into Parliament to carry out the recommendations of the Commissioners. It appeared from the Report of the proceedings of the Boundary Commission on the 17th of January that the population of Drogheda now stood at a figure short only by 338 of the 15,000 required by the Bill, although, if the recommendation of Mr. Exham's Commission were carried out to-morrow, Drogheda would have a population which would exceed by 3,000 the number required to entitle it to a Member. Belfast, as he had said, was to be dealt with in the way in which he now asked the Committee to deal with Drogheda —that was to say, Mr. Exham's recommendation had been accepted in the one case, and he hoped the Committee would accept it in the other. All he asked was that the Report of the Exham Commission should be adopted; that the main street of the town, both east and west, should be included in the borough of Drogheda; and that no portion of it should be included in the county. He (Mr. Callan) had been present at the investigation in the Drogheda Tholsel, and had heard the evidence given. Amongst those who had given evidence were a number of the leading residents in Drogheda. Mr. Alderman Whitworth, a brother of the present Member, had expressed the opinion that it would be manifestly unjust to disfranchise the borough. Then he had been asked—

> "Is it not a fact that portions of the town connected with streets within the borough are excluded from the Parliamentary boundary of the borough?—Yes; and most unaccountably—no one knows why."

Mr. Whitworth had said that if the Commissioner walked from the Court, a distance which he would reach in a few minutes, he would come to that portion of the town the exclusion of which was complained of. This gentleman went on to state that he was born and bred in Drogheda, and never could get the slightest information as to who cut off that part of the borough, or why it was done. He had added that the part of the town excluded was as much part and parcel of the town as any street within the borough. Mr. Pelham J. Mayne, Clerk of the Peace for Drogheda, had stated that he considered the exclusion of a portion of the main street of the town a most unmeaning act, and for which no rational justification could be offered. It had, he said, the effect of unjustly limiting the population of Drogheda so as to reduce it below the number which under the Bill would entitle Drogheda to representation in Parliament. He (Mr. Callan) believed he was not incorrect in saying that if the Government had been at the time the Bill was drafted in possession of the information they now had they would not have proposed to disfranchise Drogheda. But the question arose, if Drogheda were allowed to retain a Member, where would he be taken from? That, he confessed, was the difficulty; but the Government had created the difficulty, and it was for them to extricate the Committee from it. It was not for him (Mr. Callan) to say where the Member was to come from. All he wanted was that Drogheda, which was one of the oldest and most historic towns in Ireland, being a town in which an Irish Parliament had once assembled, and a town whose historic associations were more identified with the past of Ireland than those of any other town in the country, should not be disfranchised. The town was endeared to Irishmen by the recollection of the massacres of English oppressors. The town was one which recommended itself to all Catholics, and, at the same time, recommended itself to

Irish Conservatives as having been the one through which ran the river which gave its name to the great battle between the Loyalists and the Catholics—a battle which the Loyalists never won although they claimed it—namely, the Battle of the Boyne. The only cotton factory in Ireland was in this town, and Drogheda was a more industrial place than any other town outside Ulster. Moreover, it was an improving town. From the Income Tax Returns they would find that it was one of the wealthiest towns in Ireland. If he were allowed to go into those Returns, and into the Valuation Returns, he would be able to deduce ample reasons why Drogheda should not be disfranchised. He had no particular fancy for any method of retaining the franchise in Drogheda; they might group it with another town, or do what they pleased. All he asked for was that Drogheda should be saved. He had questioned the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board, the other day, as to his reasons for his leniency in the case of Warwick, and he had not been able to give any. He would again ask the right hon. Baronet on what substantial ground he could extend the boundary of Warwick, with its population of 8,000 —what reasonable justification there was for extending the boundary of that town some five miles, in order to save its representation, if not for a partizan of the Government, at any rate for a supporter of the Government, when he excluded Drogheda, with its population of 14,614, and its large number of other urban residents who, through some accident, had not been included within the borough boundary? Why should one be enfranchised and the other disfranchised? He asked that the same rule should be applied to both. If they enfranchised the one, let them enfranchise the other. If they disfranchised Drogheda, they must be consistent and also disfranchise Warwick. Of course, he knew that this was the result of an arrangement between the two Parties in the House. The Government were totally disfranchising 22 towns in Ireland, and partly disfranchising three others. They had cut down the borough representation of the country by 25 Members. They left only three boroughs enfranchised—namely, Newry, Londonderry, and Kilkenny — and clipped the wings of Galway, Limerick, and Waterford; and he must say, county Member as he was, that the counties of the country had got an unfair and preponderating representation as compared with the boroughs. Some of those boroughs were the life and soul of the districts in which they were situated. They were the very gems of Irish commercial life; and yet the Government had swept away with one stroke of the pen substantially the entire Irish borough representation. He thought the Government would give satisfaction to both sides of the Committee and to all parties if they gave Drogheda a Member, or added Lisburn to it and gave a Representative to the group. In his opinion, it would be very easy to find a Member for each of the two boroughs he had named. Tyrone would yield one for Drogheda.

Amendment proposed, in Schedule 1, page 14, column 1, line 13, leave out "Drogheda"—(*Mr. Callan.*)

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the hon. Member (Mr. Callan) had stated his case very fairly to the Committee, and he had no fault to find with the manner in which he had brought it forward. The hon. Member had made one observation with regard to the treatment of Irish boroughs, which was a matter the Committee had already discussed at considerable length on an earlier stage of the Bill; but it was just as well that he should remind the Committee that even now the Irish boroughs were very much over-represented at the expense of the counties. The Irish borough population was 756,000, and the county population 4,418,000. The counties had 85 Members by the Bill, and the boroughs 16. The result was that the Irish counties had one Member to every 52,000 population, which was much the same as in England and Scotland; and the Irish boroughs had one Member for every 47,300. So that when they spoke of the ill-treatment of the Irish boroughs it should be explained that though, no doubt, there were but a few Irish boroughs left, yet that Ireland was an agricultural country, that most of the population dwelt in the counties, and that the Irish boroughs were better

represented than the counties. They had decided not to reduce the Irish University representation, and therefore a seat for Drogheda could only be found by taking a county seat; and, looking at the fact that the counties were not so well off as the boroughs, it would be regarded as rather a hardship to counties in general, as well as to the particular county which might be selected for the loss of a seat, if a Member were found for Drogheda in this way. On the earlier stages of the Bill, when this matter was fully discussed, and when they were considering the desirability of grouping Irish boroughs, a suggestion was thrown out by an hon. Member on the opposite side of the House who was not at present in his place. The hon. Member proposed that some arrangement should be come to by general consent with regard to the Irish boroughs. He (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had said that, so far as he was concerned, he would throw no difficulty in the way of such an arrangement. Since then he had carefully examined the papers and the details of the question; and he was bound to say that he doubted very much if any other Irish borough could make out so strong a case as Drogheda, or whether the hon. Member who had brought that case forward could justify any argument for giving a couple of Members to Drogheda and Lisburn, as he had for the enfranchisement of Drogheda. It would be very difficult to extend the two places to the population which was recognized as the general limit. Even though it might be thought desirable to make an exception in the case of Ireland, on account of the small number of borough Members it possessed, it would be difficult to find boroughs over the 15,000 line to be represented at the expense of the agricultural districts. Enormous agricultural sections of the country would have to be added to the boroughs in order to bring them up to the required population. In the case of Lisburn, in order to bring its population up to the required 15,000, it would be necessary to bring in a very large acreage indeed. He had gone through the cases of Dundalk, Wexford, Armagh, and Carrickfergus. In Armagh, in order to add the necessary number of 5,000 to bring up the population to the 15,000 limit, it would be necessary to increase the borough, which now consisted of 1,000 acres, to 16,000 acres, or one acre to each person, and it would be impossible to call that an urban population. In Carrickfergus, in order to add 6,000 population to make up the 15,000, they would have to include 22,000 acres. In Dundalk, in order to get in 3,000 or 4,000 population, they would have to add 9,000 or 10,000 acres; and even in Lisburn, for which the hon. Member (Mr. Callan) had to some extent pleaded, both now and on a previous occasion, it would be necessary, in order to add 4,000 population, to take in 8,000 acres. In Wexford also, in order to add 3,000 electors, it would be necessary to include 10,000 acres. [Mr. CALLAN: How about Drogheda?] He was speaking of the others first, and was showing that it was difficult to pair off any other borough against Drogheda. He had promised to look into the matter, and do what he could to meet the wishes of the Irish Members at a later stage of the Bill. With regard to Drogheda, the hon. Member had made out a very strong case, except on one point. If it were desired to make an exception in Ireland, and to keep in one additional borough, in spite of the argument of over-representation of the boroughs at the present moment as compared with the counties, no doubt the hon. Member had made out a strong case; but a point which the hon. Member had not borne in mind was that in Drogheda the population had steadily decreased of late years. [Mr. CALLAN: How about Warwick?] Well, he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) should be prepared to defend what had been done in the case of Warwick at the proper time; but he might here state that the population of Warwick had been one which had been very steadily increasing—that was to say, the population of the borough which it was proposed by the Boundary Commissioners to include within the district.

MR. CALLAN: How much has Warwick increased during the last 10 years?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that Warwick was a small place, and the increase had not been so remarkable there; but the increase in the borough included within the boundary by the Commissioners had been going on with extraordinary rapidity. Warwick was a little over 12,000 by itself; but Leamington, which was included with it, was making

tremendous strides. Now, they found that the population of Drogheda had very largely decreased. The decrease was larger than the average decrease in Irish boroughs. If the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Callan), however, wished to make a special exception with regard to Drogheda, he had a fairly strong case, a far stronger case than could be made with respect to any other Irish borough. In the case of Drogheda it would only be necessary to add 410 people to bring the population up to 15,000; and, therefore, if the Committee wished to make an exception in the case of one Irish borough, undoubtedly Drogheda had the strongest claim; but he understood from the previous discussions in the House, when the proposal was made to pair off two boroughs one against the other, that there would be no probability of a general consent with regard to this matter. That being so, they had to consider the case of Drogheda as standing by itself. Standing by itself he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) thought there was very little to be said for it. It would be necessary to take Members from counties which were large and populous; they would have to take a Member from constituencies which, on the average, had something like a population of 50,000 each, and give it to a town where there were not 15,000. That seemed impossible; and he doubted whether the Irish Members generally would approve of such a step. The counties which would stand first for reduction would be the counties of Tyrone and Tipperary; those would be the counties which would stand first for reduction in the event of any general agreement as to giving separate representation to Drogheda. He doubted whether it was possible to arrive at a general agreement, therefore he asked the Committee to adhere to the general principles of the Bill.

MR. WHITWORTH said, the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) went a long way to prove that Drogheda was entitled to retain its separate representation, and he (Mr. Whitworth) did not think the county of Louth would object at all to have one Member and let Drogheda have another. The population of Louth was only about 70,000, and a portion of that was in the borough of Drogheda, so that if there could be no other means of retaining the representation of the town, he thought it would be well to adopt the suggestion he had now made. He was quite certain that Drogheda had now a sufficient number of inhabitants to entitle it to separate representation, for at the present moment the actual population was something like 16,000. It ought to be considered that Drogheda was becoming a large manufacturing town. It was the site of a very large active manufacture, and he did not think Parliament would be doing justice to Ireland if it were to shut out altogether representation of the commercial element. Drogheda was one of the oldest boroughs in Ireland, and he hoped the Committee would allow it to retain its separate representation.

MR. SEXTON said, he thought that the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Whitworth) who at present occupied the position of Member for Drogheda had not added any wisdom to the debate on this subject. The proposal of the hon. Gentleman was not a very wise one certainly, because he proposed that one of the two Members should be taken away from the county of Louth and given to Drogheda. His proposal, therefore, amounted to this—that 14,600 or 15,000 people in the town of Drogheda should have one Member, and that the county of Louth, with a population of something like 63,000, should have another Member, or, in other words, that the citizens of Drogheda, who had proved their wisdom by returning the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Whitworth), should each of them be of the same value as five ordinary persons in the county of Louth. There was some inconvenience in discussing this question in the absence of the particulars which the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board had promised. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would say how soon the Committee might expect the Reports made by the Commissioners to be laid on the Table.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he hoped to lay the particulars to which the hon. Gentleman referred on the Table on Monday, and to circulate them on Tuesday. He spoke with some doubt, because Sir John Lambert was not very well, and was absent from London. It ought to be borne in mind, however, that what he had promised had special reference to the case of counties.

MR. SEXTON understood that they were to expect Reports as to what had been said in the case of Drogheda.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the promise he made was in answer to a specific question put to him by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy), and the particulars were to relate principally to counties.

MR. SEXTON said, it was unfortunate that the Committee were obliged to discuss the case of Drogheda with such meagre information as they were possessed of. The Commissioners reported that applications were made to them on behalf of Lisburn and other towns, but that they had not thought it necessary to take any action upon those applications, as they were confessedly made in the hope of retaining for those towns their present separate representation. The Boundary Commissioners might have felt themselves absolved from making inquiries into the circumstances; but it was certainlyr elevant—indeed it was indispensable—that when the Committee were called upon to consider the case of towns like this that Captain Purchas and the right hon. Gentleman should lay before the Committee the evidence which had been given.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE remarked that it was no part of the business of the Commissioners to take evidence.

MR. SEXTON said, he had read the Instructions given to the Commissioners in England and Ireland carefully, and he quite admitted that that was so. He (Mr. Sexton) had understood that the Instructions to the Commissioners were that if in any case it might be shown to be desirable that the boundaries of a borough should be extended they must take evidence.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE remarked that it was quite within the power of the Commissioners to take evidence where they thought it was desirable for the purpose of taking urban populations out of counties to bring up a borough to a particular line.

MR. SEXTON accepted the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, but thought that it was clearly elliptical; it must have been by private conversation, and not from absolute instructions, that the Commissioners arrived at that conclusion. No doubt it was by a stretch of condescension that Captain Purchas was led to consider the case of Belfast. Now, while agreeing with the right hon. Gentleman on the general question that Ireland was in the main an agricultural country and that its interests laid in rural representation, he must admit that there was a very special and exceptional case to be made for Drogheda. He could discover no parallel between Drogheda and the towns which had been aimed at by a previous Amendment, moved by the noble Viscount the Member for Fermanagh (Viscount Crichton), for those were towns of only about 10,000 inhabitants. Lisburn, for instance, had only a population of 10,000; it was an inland town, it had no particular ancient municipal position, and its manufactures were not very considerable; and, therefore, on the whole, the interests of Lisburn might be fairly and adequately represented by a Member who would sit for the division of the county in which the town was situated. Drogheda, on the contrary, was a corporate town; it was a county town; and, besides having manufacturing and industrial interests, it had a shipping trade. He (Mr. Sexton) noticed that, in this connection, the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board evaded the case of Warwick. On each occasion, however, when he did approach it he tried to impress the Committee that, in contradistinction to the decay of Drogheda, Warwick had increased considerably in the course of the last few years. Now, at the last Census, the population of Warwick was only 11,800, and the increase since 1871 had only been 800. Surely there was nothing in an increase of 800 to entitle the place to any special consideration. Now, he (Mr. Sexton) had said that Drogheda had very special claims, and he should be glad indeed if any means could be found whereby the separate representation of Drogheda could be continued; because he agreed with those people who said that though it was true the proportion of representation for counties in Ireland was lower than in the boroughs, still, no doubt, the representation of boroughs in Ireland had been minimized. He was bound to say that if he could see his way to give a Representative to Drogheda he should be very glad to do so, because he considered that the 2,000 men who would have to vote in that town would take at least as intelligent and as common sense a view of the interests of Ireland as the 2,000 learned

gentlemen who returned a Member for Trinity College.

VISCOUNT CRICHTON said, he did not think the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had stated the case fairly with regard to the urban population of Ireland. If they were to take the urban populations preserved by the Bill, the people in towns numbered upwards of 700,000; but if they were to take the people residing in towns having 3,000 inhabitants and upwards, they would find there was in Ireland an urban population of 1,200,000. That population would be very much under-represented by the proposed arrangements; and, therefore, if the hon. Gentleman the Member for Louth (Mr. Callan) went to a division, he (Viscount Crichton) would certainly vote with him.

MR. WHITWORTH ventured to suggest to the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke) a proper solution of the difficulty —namely, that Drogheda and Dundalk should be constituted one constituency, and the county of Louth another. The county would then have 52,000 inhabitants, and the two boroughs between 25,000 and 26,000. He thought the adoption of some such solution as that would meet the difficulty.

MR. BIGGAR said, the hon. Gentleman the Member for Drogheda (Mr. Whitworth) was no doubt very anxious that the separate representation of the borough of Drogheda should continue. He (Mr. Biggar), however, was opposed to the formation of small boroughs, because he thought the tendency of them was towards corruption. It was his opinion that the argument that the boroughs in Ireland were over-represented was, after all, almost unanswerable. It was idle to talk of boroughs of 3,000 inhabitants, because, in point of fact, such populations were purely rural. The interests of such populations were entirely mixed up with the interests of the rural population; indeed, there was no practical difference between the interests of the two populations. It was very properly said that Drogheda was a manufacturing and seaport town; but manufacturing places would be very fairly represented under the Bill. Belfast was to have four Members, Dublin four, Cork two, Derry one, and Newry one. These were all more or less manufacturing and seaport towns; and, seeing that Ireland was a much more agricultural country than a manufacturing or mercantile country, he thought the different trades were very fairly represented by the Bill as it now stood. He was somewhat timid about making such changes as the one now proposed. If they were to give Drogheda a seat, a difficulty as to where they were to get the seat from would arise. He thought that, under all the circumstances, it would be well to take the Bill for better or worse, and let Drogheda be thrown, as proposed, into the county.

MR. MACARTNEY said, he was glad he had had the advantage of hearing the speech just delivered by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar), because it appeared that the great fear of the hon. Members for whom the hon. Member spoke was that the retention by the smaller boroughs of Ireland of separate representation would open the road to corruption. The hon. Gentleman could not be afraid of corruption from the landlords, because they had been deprived of the means of corrupting anybody. The right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had said that Ireland was an agricultural country, and really had a very small commercial and manufacturing population; it was an agricultural country, he said, and would remain so. He (Mr. Macartney) had always thought that the English who wrote on the subject of Ireland lamented the fact that Ireland was so completely an agricultural country. Whatever strictly urban population there was in Ireland they were to be deprived of proper representation in Parliament by being handed over to the mercy of the counties. It had been said that if Drogheda were to retain its own Member a seat would have to be taken from Tyrone or Tipperary. He would like to know which? ["Tyrone."] On behalf of Tyrone and Ulster generally he should object to such a proceeding, and he supposed that if it were proposed to vote a seat from Tipperary hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway would object equally strongly. It would be perfectly unfair to deprive Tyrone of a Member. At present Ulster was not properly represented as compared with the Province in which Drogheda was situated. Under the Bill Leinster would return one Mem-

ber for every 43,000 people, while Ulster would return one Member for every 55,000 inhabitants. If hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway would agree to the Members to which Leinster was not entitled being distributed over the other Provinces it would be a great boon. Hon. Gentleman, however, were not likely to agree to that, because their *bête noire*, or enemy, Ulster, would receive fair treatment. If the present proposal were to be carried out by taking a Member either from the county of Antrim, in which the borough of Lisburn was situate, or any other Ulster county, he should certainly oppose it.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND said, he could easily understand the very natural desire there was upon the part of certain Members of the House, and certain persons outside the House, to keep for Drogheda the privilege of separate representation. The right hon. Gentleman who was in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke) said very truly that perhaps there was no borough, certainly in Ireland—he (Mr. W. Redmond) was sure there was no borough in England —that came so near to the required limit of 15,000, and that, consequently, would have a better right to have an exception made in its favour, than Drogheda. While he (Mr. W. Redmond) fully recognized and sympathized with the hon. Member (Mr. Callan), who moved for the retention of the separate representation of Drogheda, he (Mr. W. Redmond) could understand why the Government would not consent to the Amendment. He could not see, if Drogheda were to be allowed to retain its Member, how the Government could very well refuse to allow other boroughs, with almost equal populations, to have separate representation. He did not know whether the noble Viscount the Member for Fermanagh (Viscount Crichton) intended to move an Amendment which stood in his name farther down on the Paper, with reference to the borough of Wexford. ["No!"] Of course, he supposed it would depend upon the reception which the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Louth (Mr. Callan) obtained whether or not the noble Viscount would propose his Amendment; but he (Mr. W. Redmond) did not see very well how the Government could make an exception in the case of Drogheda, and refuse to make it in the case of Wexford. Wexford was also a town upon the sea-board, and it had many claims which Drogheda also possessed. It was true that Wexford was not as near the required population as Drogheda; but still he felt that if Drogheda were to be made an exception of, a great many people in the South of Ireland would consider that there was an almost equal claim for an exception to be made in the case of Wexford. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Drogheda (Mr. Whitworth) proposed to solve the difficulty by grouping Drogheda and Dundalk together, and giving them one Member, and the county of Louth one Member, instead of two. Perhaps he (Mr. W. Redmond) might be allowed to offer a suggestion. That suggestion would be to take the two Members from the University of Dublin, and give one of them to Drogheda and the other to Wexford. Certainly, if that were done, nine-tenths of the people of Ireland would be highly delighted.

Mr. CALLAN said, that the hon. Gentleman the Member for Drogheda (Mr. Whitworth) had suggested, as a means of giving a Member to Drogheda, that a Member should be taken from the county of Louth. Although he (Mr. Callan) was very sorry that Drogheda and Dundalk were not to continue to retain their Members, in order to show that with the extended franchise they could be as true to the cause of Irish nationality as any other part of Ireland, he could not consent to Louth being deprived of its fair share of representation. Hitherto Drogheda and Dundalk had returned Whig supporters of the Government; but with an increased electorate of 700 in the one case, and 600 in the other, he was fully persuaded that if they were allowed to retain separate representation, they would return Members whose hearts beat as true to the cause of Ireland as any other constituency in Ireland. In view of the arrangement arrived at between the two Front Benches, he would not now take a division upon this question. He would, however, certainly do so on Report, and hoped that, in the meantime, they would be able to arrive at a fair solution of the difficulty. The right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had compared Drogheda and Warwick; but he regretted that he had not given any rea-

son why the former should be included in the Schedule, and the latter excluded from it. The right hon. Baronet had applied a hard-and-fast rule in one case, but not in the other; and although he would not divide the Committee on his Amendment, he (Mr. Callan) should take the opinion of the House upon it on the Report, unless some explanation was given.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

VISCOUNT CRICHTON said, he felt bound to oppose the retention of the name of Lisburn in the list of boroughs to cease as such. Lisburn was a somewhat smaller borough than Drogheda, and it would require a larger extension of area in order to bring it up to the requisite limit. But while they were told that Drogheda was decreasing in population, Lisburn was increasing steadily. In 1871 the population was 9,356; and in 1881 it was 11,083, the increase being about 1,700 in 10 years. And he was informed that it was calculated that there had been a further increase, amounting to nearly 1,000, since 1881. Now, he thought, although Lisburn was not historically of such importance as the borough of Drogheda, for which the hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Callan) had asked exemption from the Schedule, yet, taking it as a fair representative of the manufacturing interest of Ireland, he might claim for it representation. It was one of the boroughs inquired into and reported upon by the Exham Commission which sat in 1881, and which recommended that its municipal boundaries should be considerably extended. That recommendation, if it had been carried out, as he believed it was at one time intended it should be, would have prevented the borough occupying its present position with regard to the Bill. He was told that the population within the boundaries recommended by the Commission would have been 16,800. Under those circumstances, he thought he might be excused for urging the claims of this borough upon the Committee, and he hoped the right hon. Baronet would see his way to the adoption of the Amendment which he now begged to move.

Amendment proposed, in Schedule 1, page 14, line 8, to leave out "Lisburn." —(*Viscount Crichton.*)

Question proposed, "That 'Lisburn' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had already referred to the case of Lisburn on the previous Amendment, because it had been suggested that the position of the two boroughs—Lisburn and Drogheda—was the same. With regard to the population of Lisburn, while admitting that it was increasing, Lisburn was still but a very small place, and in respect of population considerably below 15,000. The noble Viscount had spoken of the extension of area recommended by the Commission which sat in 1880; but he would point out that even that extended area would not bring up the population to the required number of 15,000—that was to say, according to the Census of 1881. But even if it were so, he must remind the Committee that the principle of the action of the Commission was not that of a Boundary Commission; the idea was that of extending the boundaries, not for the purpose of bringing in an urban population, but for the purpose of bringing in the scattered suburban population lying around the town itself. Again, in order to add 4,000 to the population, which would bring it over the 15,000, it would be necessary to add an area of 8,000 acres to the area of the borough, and it was upon that fact that his main answer to the noble Viscount rested. There were other reasons which occurred to him; but for those he had stated he did not see his way to make an exception in the case of Lisburn.

MR. MACARTNEY said, that one of the places proposed a short time ago to be added to Lisburn was named Pillburn, where there were extensive works belonging to Messrs. Barbour and Co. There were besides a great number of manufactories, employing many persons who were paid wages, and had nothing whatever to do with agriculture. [*Dissent.*] Hon. Members below the Gangway made assertions about the trade and manufactures of the North of Ireland which were palpably erroneous. If they took the manufacturing interest of Lisburn alone, it would probably be found that the exports exceeded those of Drogheda. Lisburn was the seat of the damask manufacture in Ireland, which industry was founded there by a colony of Huguenots, who took refuge in Ire-

land from the persecution of Louis XIV. If the case of Drogheda was to be considered at all by the Government, he thought it would be a very extraordinary thing if that of Lisburn was not considered also.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. RAIKES said, he proposed to move that Boston should be included in Part III. of this Schedule, which dealt with boroughs disfranchised for corruption. He did not suppose there was any borough in the Kingdom which could show so bad a history as Boston with regard to electioneering malpractices.[1] The borough of Boston had a population of 19,000, and it had been the subject of inquiry at the hands of two Election Commissions. The House had decided to retain a special part of this Schedule in which to include the names of two boroughs which the Government proposed absolutely to disfranchise on account of malpractices in connection with Parliamentary Elections. The names of those boroughs were Macclesfield and Sandwich. The borough of Boston, like the borough of Sandwich, was very ancient; it had rather dwindled in importance, and had been passed in the race by other more thriving and enterprizing neighbours. It lay at a distance from the sea, a circumstance which had diminished its prosperity; and being a place of departed importance, yet retaining a considerable population, it was just one of those places in which it was found that electioneering malpractices most extensively prevailed. He wished to put before the Committee the disparity which existed between Macclesfield and Boston, which he believed was not altogether in favour of the latter. Macclesfield was a town of 40,000 inhabitants, and which had never been visited by a Royal Commission until after the last election. The malpractices which had taken place at Macclesfield were, after all, of a description which, although corrupt, was not corrupt in the strongest sense. They consisted chiefly of small sums paid freely and openly to the poorer voters on both sides, who regarded them only in the light of remuneration for services on election day rather than as the price of their voting for a particular candidate. He did not want to apologize for those malpractices at Macclesfield; but there were, no doubt, many parts of the country in which those practices had become almost a recognized part of the system of electioneering; and although it was the wish of Parliament to put a stop to them, they did not argue the same amount of accessibility to corrupt influences as was to be found in Boston, Sandwich, and other places where the election was determined by the weight of the candidate's purse. At Boston the Commissioners' Report stated that they had ascertained and reported the names of about 300 persons, many of whom were not of the impoverished class, and who directly received money in respect of their votes. It was stated that the persons who came before the Commission had an imperfect recollection of the persons to whom they paid money; but they remembered enough to give the names of 300 persons. But not only was that the case. The Commissioners admitted that if they had felt themselves warranted in pushing the inquiry to its full extent, they would probably have had to give an account of a great mass of bribery; and they went on to say, with regard to previous elections, that although no bribery had been proved to have been practised, several witnesses had informed them that all elections at Boston, both Parliamentary and municipal, had for a long time been corrupt. The vicar stated that the municipal elections had materially contributed to produce corrupt practices in the borough, and the Commissioners reported that they had formed emphatically the same opinion. They added that there was a large number of persons in the borough living by precarious employments; that of that class about 600 were voters, and their votes were sufficient to determine an election in favour of any candidate. He did not know what the Committee might think; but it appeared to him that never had there come from any Commission appointed to examine into the position of a borough a stronger statement as to the hopeless condition of corruption in which it was found to be. The number of voters proved to have received money in respect of their votes was 300; and that of the persons who the Commissioners were satisfied gave their votes corruptly was 600, a number which they said was, in their opinion, sufficient to determine every Parliamentary and Municipal Election which

had taken place for a long time past. The whole tenour of the Report was to suggest a condition of habitual and absolute corruption. The population of Boston, again, was little more than the limit determined upon in the case of pure boroughs; and the Committee were still to allow Boston to retain its electoral franchise. They were to leave other places, like Birkenhead and Cardiff, without second Members, in order to preserve this beggarly and corrupt borough from disfranchisement. He trusted the Committee would not hesitate to do justice in this matter. The Government had shown a disposition to do rather more than justice in the severity with which they dealt with Macclesfield, although he did not feel himself free to vote against the action of the Government in that case. As Boston had been, so it was proposed it should continue to be—one of the sinks of iniquity, which was to disgrace the Parliamentary system whenever an election took place by the continued application of parties in that constituency to reverse the result of the polling. He thought there would be no harm if the House were to save itself from these recurring scandals. He would not argue or make any precise suggestion as to whether the seat which his Amendment proposed to take away should be given to restore in some degree the electoral privileges of the City of London, or to some other deserving borough. He had only to say that if it were a question of distributing the seat of any constituency, they could hardly do worse than give it to Boston.

Amendment proposed, in Part III, page 14, line 26, before the word "Macclesfield," to insert the word "Boston."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Boston' be there inserted."

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said, as he had the melancholy satisfaction of exposing, by his Petition, the corruption which took place at Boston in 1880, he was sure the Committee would assent to this proposition—that he, for one, was as anxious as any Member of the House of Commons in no way to palliate malpractices which might have taken place in Boston or elsewhere. In fact, he would even go so far as to say that if the Government had thought fit to include in this Schedule all those boroughs against which the Election Commissioners had adversely reported he should have supported their proposal. But that was not the object of the right hon. Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Raikes). The right hon. Gentleman proposed, unjustly as he thought, to single out Boston, as against Chester, Gloucester, and other corrupt but unscheduled boroughs, and place it in the same category as Macclesfield and Sandwich. The right hon. Gentleman practically challenged comparison between Macclesfield and Boston; and it was there that he (Mr. Sydney Buxton) would directly meet his argument. He said that, as regarded disfranchisement, Boston was not in the same category with the boroughs which the Government in their discretion had thought fit to disfranchise, and for these reasons. There were several points of difference between them. In the first place, there was no case of gross corruption proved against Boston before 1880, and the bribery in the election of 1880 was confined to one side. Although no one denied that there was a corrupt element in the borough, that did not represent the corruption of the constituency as a whole; whereas anyone who studied the case of Macclesfield would see, by the Report of the Commissioners, that there had never been a pure election there. As regarded the elections of 1865, 1868, 1874, and 1880, the Commissioners reported definitely that—

"Corrupt practices do extensively prevail in Macclesfield."—(Report, page 16 [C.—2853.] 1881).

Then there was no question, as far as Macclesfield was concerned—and the right hon. Gentleman himself had acknowledged the fact—that both sides had been equally lavish in their bribery, and equally responsible for what had taken place; while it appeared also that corruption was not the exception, but the rule, in Macclesfield, seeing that the Commissioners reported that out of a total of 5,500 electors who voted in 1880 some 4,000 were bribed. He thought he had shown that Macclesfield compared very unfavourably with the constituency which the right hon. Gentleman desired to place in the same category with it. Now, with regard to the corruption in Boston, the right hon. Gentleman had quoted a passage from the Report, which showed the individual opinion of a

clergyman at Boston, and the individual opinions of one or two other persons, that some of the elections there had been corrupt; but the right hon. Gentleman had omitted to quote the Report of the Commissioners themselves, where they said they accepted the Report of the Commission of 1874 to the effect that—

"Gifts of coal had been made corruptly, but that direct bribery of a grosser form had not taken place at the elections of 1874 and 1868."

That, he thought, showed clearly that, although, undoubtedly, there had been some corruption at Boston, it had not been so extensive, or in anything like the same degree, as the corruption which took place at Macclesfield. Then, with regard to the second point, that the direct bribery was entirely confined to one side; no single case of direct bribery had been produced against the Liberals even after 30 days of exhaustive examination. There was the allegation that the Liberal Party employed too many persons, and that he did not deny; on the contrary, he was clearly himself of that opinion, although he was sure the Committee would acquit him of any personal knowledge in the matter, and he was equally ready to acknowledge that the Election Judges were entirely justified and right in unseating Mr. Ingram. There was, however, absolutely no allegation of any sort or kind of direct bribery proved against the Liberal Party. But in every way—and this was his point—the two sides were entirely different. On the one hand, the Liberals spent £1,860 in all; on the other hand, the Conservatives returned their expenses as £4,000, of which £1,100 was put under the head of "employment," and, in addition, they spent some £3,300 in acknowledged direct bribery—money spent with the knowledge and at the instigation of one of the Conservative candidates, and by the son and son-in-law of the other. That he mentioned to show that the bribery, such as it was was, all on one side. Then, as regarded the last point, that there was an element of corruption in the borough. That no one could deny; but this element did not extend to the constituency as a whole; it did not, as in the case of Macclesfield, include the majority of the electors. The Commissioners scheduled 300 out of 3,000 electors. But granted that many escaped; granted that the whole of the 600 "needy persons" mentioned in the Report were all corrupt, that, after all, was nothing like the proportion of corrupt voters which was acknowledged to exist in Macclesfield. Even then nothing approaching to the half of the number of voters were corrupt, and there remained the large balance of the constituency unaffected. Then as to the point which the right hon. Gentleman endeavoured to make, that it was not so much the number of persons who were corrupt, but the amount of money spent, which constituted the real corruption of a constituency, he (Mr. Sydney Buxton) entirely dissented from that proposition. He took an opposite view; for it seemed to him that it showed a greater virtue in the constituency that it should require a greater amount of money to overcome its scruples. No doubt the bribers were the worse in the latter case; but the bribees were less bad, and it was for the sins of the bribees, more than of the bribers, that disfranchisement was inflicted. It appeared to him that a constituency was more corrupt if the vast majority of the electors were ready to receive bribes than it would be, as in the case of Boston, in which a large sum of money was spent upon a small number of electors. Moreover, in that case, it was clear from the Report of the Commissioners that it was not, as at Macclesfield, the voters who importuned the bribers, but the bribers who had arranged a carefully prepared plot to corrupt the place. The Commissioners reported (page 5, Report [C.—2784] 1881) that—

"It appears to us that Mr. F. Rowley and his agent Mr. George Wise intended at an early period to procure votes corruptly,"

and so on, showing how the matter was arranged. That, he thought, proved that it was the bribers who prepared a carefully laid scheme in order to corrupt the constituency of Boston. The blame was on the bribers in this case more than on the bribees, and that was a matter which he thought ought to be taken into account in the question before the Committee. He had no desire in any way to whitewash Boston, or to blacken Macclesfield; and if it were a question of all corrupt boroughs being disfranchised, he would vote with the right hon. Gentleman with that object. All that he urged was that the case of Boston was not so bad as that of Mac-

clesfield; that, comparing Boston with Macclesfield, the former came out well in comparison with the latter in the points which he had endeavoured to lay before the Committee—namely, that it had a better record in the past; that, in 1880, the corruption was mostly confined to one side; and, that while there was a corrupt element, the constituency as a whole was not corrupt. On these grounds, he trusted the Committee, if they were not going to disfranchise all the peccant boroughs, would not accept the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. EDWARD CLARKE said, he thought it unfortunate that in a discussion of this kind such a speech should have been made as that which had been delivered by the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. He regretted that the hon. Member should have taken the opportunity of making the question a political one, and attacking one political Party.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I did not desire to make any political attack. It was necessary for my argument to show that one side was worse than the other. I referred to the Report of the Commissioners; but I assure the hon. and learned Gentleman that there was no intention of making any Party attack.

MR. EDWARD CLARKE said, as he wished to be perfectly fair, he also would refer to the Report of the Commission. The hon. Member had repeatedly stated that the bribery at Boston had been all on one side, and that it had been the deliberate intention of the candidates of the Conservative Party to corrupt an unwilling constituency. He (Mr. Edward Clarke) thought it a pity that charges of this sort should be introduced into the debate; but in order to make things fair he would read one passage in the Report—

"In addition to the acts of bribery above set forth it appears that Mr. R. W. Staniland, Mr. J. Lockwood, Secretary to the Boston Liberal Association, Mr. G. Wise, and others, endeavoured to procure votes corruptly by paying voters and the children or friends of voters for unnecessary work, and on a scale of remuneration at least double the ordinary rate of wages in the town. The total number of persons employed was certainly not less than 1,200 (variously estimated at 1,200 or 1,500), of whom the large majority were voters, the whole number of voters in the borough being about 3,000, including 66 freemen, almost all of whom are otherwise qualified. Of those employed 150 Boston men and 20 persons imported from Lincoln were appointed by Mr. Staniland as watchers to detect and prevent the bribery which he states that he had reason to believe would be resorted to. We are satisfied, however, that there existed no excuse for the number of watchers, or for the number otherwise employed by that gentleman and his sub-agents. As it is proved that Mr. W. T. Ingram and Mr. S. C. Buxton were in consultation with Mr. Staniland on the subject of this employment, we have had very grave doubts whether we ought not to report to your Majesty that they were guilty of bribery; but, it not being certain that the scheme of employment was corrupt in intention and in extent at the time when they approved it, we have omitted their names from the Schedule appended to this Report. Both these gentlemen have stated to us that the watchers were employed by them in order to prevent and detect bribery, which they believed would exist, and that their intention was thoroughly honest in employing them. We find, however, that in fact the watchers, with few exceptions, used their position simply as an excuse for taking bribes, which they did not, except in a few cases, report, and which they were allowed to keep even when they did report them."

He hoped that, so far as the charge or counter-charge of the hon. Gentleman was concerned, this passage would be considered by the Committee as a sufficient answer to the speech they had just listened to. He did not say that Boston should be added to this Schedule; he thought there was a good deal to be said on both sides, and it was true that there were some considerations with regard to Boston which might have justified the decision of the Government with regard to it. But, knowing something of the electoral corruption which had taken place in this country, he did not think there was a worse case than that of Macclesfield. That borough was created by the Reform Act of 1832; it was a borough of the ideal size, and out of about 5,000 voters there 3,500 had received payments in money; it showed on both sides the most outrageous system of corruption that anyone could conceive, and it would be a disgrace to the House of Commons if the name of Macclesfield were retained as an enfranchised borough.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I am sure the hon. and learned Gentleman had no wish to misrepresent the case. As the hon. and learned Gentleman, however, represented it, the employment was entirely on the side of the Liberal candidates. But that was not so, because anyone who has read the Report will know that Mr. G. Wise was the agent on the other

side. I only wish to make a personal explanation.

MR. EDWARD CLARKE: I read the Report as it stands.

MR. GREGORY said, he thought that the hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Sydney Buxton) had adopted an unfortunate line in his defence of the borough in question; nor had he improved his position by what had just fallen from him, as he had adopted a paragraph in the Report of the Commissioners which not only showed that his agent had been guilty of bribery, but nearly brought it home to the hon. Member himself. As regarded the proposition of his right hon. Friend behind him (Mr. Raikes) he was not prepared to accede to it. The Schedule referred to was of a highly penal character, as entirely disfranchising the boroughs at present in it, and ought not to be extended beyond the necessity of the case. The two boroughs scheduled were *in flagrante delicto*. The bribery there was notorious and universal; but if they were to insert Boston on the Report of the Commissioners, he pointed out that they must deal with seven or eight other boroughs at least in the same way as they had dealt with the state of things which existed at Macclesfield and Sandwich. He would point out that some of the statements in the Commissioners' Report—such, for instance, as to there being 600 men in the town open to bribery—were somewhat of a hearsay character, and rested on very little or no evidence. For these reasons he could not support the Motion of his right hon. Friend.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES) said, he was very anxious to keep the discussion apart from Party politics. He would point out that the hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Sydney Buxton), although he contended that the bribery was all on one side, had admitted that Mr. Ingram was rightly unseated. With regard to the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, he would acknowledge that the right hon. Gentleman had made out a strong case against Boston, and that his heart was not with that constituency. But he could also make out a very strong case against the eight towns which had been the subject of inquiry, with the exception of Knaresborough and Canterbury. The amount of corruption in those cases was a matter of degree, and the Government had endeavoured with regard to them to draw a somewhat rough-and-ready line. In respect of Macclesfield and Sandwich, they found a number of persons reported for bribery which exceeded half of the constituencies. In Macclesfield the number amounted to 53 per cent, and in Sandwich it was 60 per cent of the constituency; and, inasmuch as more than one-half of the electors who voted had been detected in voting corruptly, the Government thought that on the side of clemency at least the 50 per cent limit was a safe line to draw. If they were to schedule Boston they must also schedule Gloucester. In the case of Gloucester, 40 per cent of the constituency was reported to have been bribed. In order to draw the line referred to, the Government had, however, to strike Gloucester out. The number of persons bribed at Boston amounted to 12 per cent. He would not enter into the details of the Report in any way. He repeated that the Government had drawn a rough line at 50 per cent, and that if they were to schedule Boston they would have to schedule all the other boroughs reported upon also.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 37; Noes 136: Majority 99.—(Div. List, No. 72.)

Schedule *agreed to*.

SECOND SCHEDULE.

BOROUGHS TO LOSE ONE MEMBER.

MR. JERNINGHAM, in the absence of his hon. and gallant Colleague (Colonel Milne-Home), wished to move the Amendment which stood in his name, which was in effect to insert Berwick-on-Tweed in the Schedule, in order that it might retain one Member.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE rose to Order. He wished to point out that Berwick-on-Tweed had been retained in Schedule 1, which had now been passed.

THE CHAIRMAN said that, Berwick-on-Tweed having been retained in Schedule 1, it was not competent for the hon. Member to reopen the question on Schedule 2.

MR. JERNINGHAM remarked that, that being the case, it would be his duty to bring the matter forward on Report.

MR. H. S. NORTHCOTE rose to move that "Exeter" should be left out

of the Schedule of boroughs which were only to return one Member. The hon. Gentleman said he would not have troubled the Committee with matters of a sentimental character if it had not been that the Government had laid stress on the fact that in bringing forward this Bill they desired to have regard to the historical character of the constituencies, and they also wished to have regard for electoral continuity. Now, with regard to the sentimental side of the question, he would point out that Exeter had for several centuries returned two Members to that House; it was the county town, it was an Assize town, a considerable seaport town, and was commonly known as the Metropolis of the West. If it had been a decaying town, however, he would not have mentioned even those matters; but, as a matter of fact, it was a steadily growing town, and although it might not be increasing as rapidly as some of the great Northern manufacturing towns, it was gradually increasing. There were considerable railway works in Exeter; further railway extension to it was contemplated, and at the present moment it had a population of some 48,000 inhabitants; so, as he had said before, it was growing steadily. On this occasion he fully agreed with the remarks of the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton), with whom it was seldom his good fortune to agree on matters in that House, in regard to the Boundary Commissioners. He found that the Instructions to the Boundary Commissioners contained the following:—

"The Commissioners will, therefore, previous to making any recommendation, take the necessary steps for satisfying themselves whether there are any considerable number of houses beyond the boundaries, but contiguous thereto, the occupiers of which, either from community of interests with the borough or from other circumstances, form part of the town population proper."

Now, he ventured to assert that if the Boundary Commissioners had carried out those instructions in the spirit and the letter, he would not have been then standing there to advocate the claims of his constituency, because Exeter would at the present moment have been entitled to two Members. There was no question of having to add thousands of acres to the borough in order to bring it up to the dimensions of a borough returning two Members. When the representative of the Boundary Commissioners went down to Exeter, Petitions were presented to him signed by more than 90 per cent of the population of those portions of the city which were just outside the present boundaries, praying for inclusion within the City limits; and they were utterly unable to ascertain why the Boundary Commissioners had reported against the inclusion of those parts of Exeter within the Parliamentary borough. Very great weight must, of course, be given to the question of numbers; but he contended that the mere question of numbers should not alone determine the amount of the representation to be given. Rateable value ought also to be taken into account. Now, the rateable value of Exeter was £230,000, whereas the rateable value of Plymouth was only £205,000, and that of Devonport £97,000; and yet both the latter places were to return two Members, as against one Member for Exeter. Then, again, Exeter had an unusually large number of electors in proportion to its population. In a population of 48,000 there were 7,523 electors, while in Devonport there were only 5,421 electors in a population of 63,000; and again in Bath, which had just over 50,000 of population, there were only 6,231 electors. It appeared to him that these were reasons which ought to have some weight with the Government to induce them to look favourably on the proposal he now submitted. Moreover, Exeter had many varied interests. It had a very large clerical population owing to the existence of the Cathedral there; and, at the same time, in the town and its neighbourhood they had a large number of retired officers of the Army and Navy, well-to-do tradesmen, as well as a great quantity of the working classes. For a borough of its size also it represented an unusually large amount of agricultural interests. He did not wish to speak disparagingly of the boroughs of Plymouth and Devonport; but he was obliged to point out, in contradistinction to the varied interests involved in Exeter, that the interests of those two places were very much of an uniform Dockyard character. The Government had not taken into account, moreover, the probable position of Exeter within the next few years. If he could induce the President of the

Local Government Board to consider this matter, he thought he could prove to him that there need be only five instances in which boroughs at present returning two Members might claim to keep them, and that Exeter might easily be enlarged so that its population would be raised over the necessary 50,000. Then, again, he would remind the right hon. Gentleman that the constituency of Exeter was evenly balanced in political feeling, and he believed that for nearly the last half-century it had returned one Member of each particular shade of political feeling; and if it was now to be deprived of one of its Members, there would be a number of citizens in Exeter who, according to the 15,000 population test, would be entitled to a Member, who would be absolutely unrepresented in that House. He admitted that in the South-West of England there were a large number of small constituencies which, under anything like a drastic Reform Bill, would have to be disfranchished; but that was a stronger reason for retaining any borough constituency the population of which nearly approached the limit laid down by the Bill for double-Membered constituencies. Under this Bill he believed there would be only two borough Representatives left in Cornwall, three in Somerset, and five in Devon. Now, he had the greatest respect for the Gentlemen who would represent the counties in the South-West of England; but he was not inclined to give up the proper representation of the South-Western boroughs. If the President of the Local Government Board would listen to his appeal, he was quite certain he could show him where the population of Exeter could be increased to upwards of 50,000 without making any serious inroad upon the county constituency. As he commenced by saying, if this Bill was to recognize the existence of historic associations, and if such associations were to have any weight at all, he thought the City of Exeter was a place which deserved to be treated with some leniency.

Amendment proposed, in page 15, line 15, to leave out "Exeter."—(*Mr. H. S. Northcote.*)

Question proposed, "That 'Exeter' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the City of Exeter had been the subject of careful inquiry by the Boundary Commission of 1868, and if hon. Members would refer to the Report of that Commission they would find it contained a large map of the borough of Exeter, and they would also find that the city had not yet reached the limits of the boundary which was shown thereon. In the extension of boundaries in 1868 the Commissioners had provided for the possible increase of the population; but, as a matter of fact, the increase of the city had never come beyond the Parliamentary limits. Although not touching the boundary of the city, there was a collection of railway *employés* houses, about 93 of them, and the only reason for bringing them into the Parliamentary boundary would be to raise the number of the constituency to upwards of 50,000 persons. But, looking at the matter from the hon. Member's point of view, they would have to consider where they were to get the extra seat from? By the arrangement which had been arrived at it would be impossible for them to take seats from constituencies of 50,000 to give them up to constituencies which had less than that number. Suppose they decided to give extra seats in cases such as this, where would they have to be taken from? They would have to be taken from great English borough constituencies like Wolverhampton and Sheffield, whose representation was to be increased by the Bill; but he did not believe the Committee would consent to take seats away from constituencies like that, where each seat represented, in some cases, something like 65,000 or 70,000 people, in order to give them to towns like Exeter, where, although they represented great historical associations, each Member would only represent about 24,000. The hon. Member had said that the South-West of England suffered by the Bill. That might be true; but under that Bill it would still be more represented than was Wales, although Wales was over-represented as compared to all the other parts of the Kingdom.

MR. THOROLD ROGERS remarked that there was an observation made by the hon. Member opposite, in support of his claim, derived from the historical associations of Exeter, and the fact that it divided its representation. That argument seemed to him to go

against the hon. Member himself, because, in his opinion, any constituency which could not make up its mind in politics ought to have but one Representative. If the Government had determined to reduce all Cathedral towns to the position of one-Member constituencies they would have found in him a warm supporter. He considered that the explanation of the division in the representation was due to the corrupting influences of the presence of a Dean and Chapter. If there was one part of the Bill which was settled it was this—that boroughs with 15,000 inhabitants and over should have one Member, and boroughs with 50,000 and over should have two Members. What, then, was the good of discussing a thing which was already decided? The whole of that debate reminded him of two lines of Pope, which summed up the whole case—

"Thus, well-bred spaniels civilly delight
In mumbling at the game they dare not bite."

The hon. Gentleman had dwelt on the opulence of the Exeter citizens. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer told him yesterday that Exeter was too poor to buy silver spoons, and therefore it had lost its Assay Office. If that was so, it appeared to him that the City of Exeter was a decaying and not a progressive city. His (Mr. Thorold Rogers') own city had lost its representation; but that must be because it had a Dean and Chapter. The City of Oxford was a great manufacturing town however, for they were just as much a manufacturing town for the manufacture of graduates as the City of London was for the manufacture of fagot voters. He considered that it was idle to discuss this question further, because they had already arrived at a decision upon it.

MR. INCE said, he had listened to the very able and interesting speech of the hon. Member opposite (Mr. H. S. Northcote) with much interest, and as he went on he (Mr. Ince) felt less and less inclined to take the course which he was about to take. He thought those large towns like Exeter and the large town which he had the honour to represent, which at the time of the last Census had less than the number of electors which would entitle them to two Members, but which would be now entitled to two Members, having regard to their present population, had some cause to complain. But he felt that after the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who had charge of the Bill, it would be absurd to persist in this Amendment; and as he could not prophesy what would be the result, in any of these cases, of a division, he would not persevere with the Amendment which stood in his name.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS remarked that his hon. Friend (Mr. H. S. Northcote) had put the claim of Exeter in the strongest possible way, and therefore he would not attempt to add to its force; but he rose to say a few words in consequence of the general answer given by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board. The general answer which he gave really came to this—that however strong the case it could not be entertained, because if it were the House would have to take away seats from places like Wolverhampton and Sheffield, or other large towns. Now, he entirely objected to that proposition. His observations alluded more particularly to an Amendment which would be moved presently; but as the right hon. Gentleman had made that general statement he felt bound to protest against it at once. He saw no magic in the number 658 as the number of Members in that House. There had been no magic used in order to add 12 to the number of Members, and it was nothing to the purpose to give a general answer to a strong case, for there was no reason why the 12 should not be made 13. He objected altogether to the proposition that if a Member could not make out a good case for taking away a seat from one constituency that that was to preclude him from getting an additional seat for another constituency. That was no answer to the argument. If a case of hardship was made out they ought to deal with it upon its merits.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the view of the right hon. Gentleman was not in accord with his on this matter. He (Sir Charles W. Dilke) did not consider that an increase of the number of Members of the House would be in accordance with the agreement which had been entered into between the two Parties.

MR. H. S. NORTHCOTE said, he proposed to do what he believed to be his duty to his constituents in this mat-

ter, regardless of what might be the opinion of the hon. Member for Southwark. In regard to the observations that had fallen from the hon. Member, he might remind him that if there had not been a very able and very Radical Bishop at Exeter they would very probably have returned two Conservatives. He had hoped that he might have conveyed the suggestion that there was an alternative besides taking a Member from Sheffield or Wolverhampton; Plymouth and Devonport would group exceedingly well, and spare a Member. He could not accept the recommendation of the hon. and learned Member for Hastings (Mr. Ince) to withdraw his Amendment; but he did not think there would be any advantage in troubling the Committee with a division, and therefore he should simply move it and allow it to be negatived.

Question put, and *negatived.*

SIR EARDLEY WILMOT said, that notwithstanding what had fallen from the hon. and learned Member for Hastings (Mr. Ince), he felt it his duty to move his Amendment, which was to leave Hastings out of the Schedule of towns which were to have only one Member. Now, he protested in the strongest manner against the doctrine that they were to leave all those matters in the hands of the Treasury Bench. When the compact was made between the Leaders of the two Parties in that House he understood that, although the general principles of the Bill were agreed to, they, as Members of the House, were still entitled to discuss the details of the Bill. He defied the Prime Minister to show a single case in which great fundamental principles had been settled by a compact between the Leaders of the two Parties in that House. He did not say that the compact might not have been desirable; but he did say that they, as Members of that House, had a perfect right to exercise the privileges conferred upon them by their constituents of moving Amendments. With regard to the claims of Hastings to two Members, he might mention, in the first place, that it was perhaps the most ancient borough in England, and he thought he was right in saying that there was never the suspicion of corruption having existed within it. He might also remind the right hon. Gentleman who was in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke) that Hastings had had many distinguished Representatives. It had been represented by the Earl of Liverpool, when Sir Charles Jenkinson, by Mr. Canning, by Lord Palmerston, and others; and, although this might be what his hon. Friend (Mr. H. S. Northcote) had called a sentimental consideration, still he thought it was a ground upon which it could be urged that they should be allowed to continue their present representation. Now, with regard to the manner in which the seats for these constituencies were to be supplied, he did not think that they, on that side of the House, were called upon to show the method in which seats were to be supplied under the scheme of the President of the Local Government Board. He believed it to be that right hon. Gentleman's measure, because he could not believe for a moment that the right hon. Gentleman who presided over the destinies of this country could be the father of such a measure as that before them. If the right hon. Gentleman would not give him his attention he would sit down.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I am very happy to listen to the hon. Baronet.

SIR EARDLEY WILMOT: The right hon. Gentleman was talking to the Prime Minister and laughing.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he was very sorry if the necessary conversation which he was obliged to hold with the Prime Minister had led the hon. Baronet to believe that he was offering him any disrespect.

SIR EARDLEY WILMOT: The right hon. Gentleman laughed.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE could only repeat that there was no discourtesy intended.

SIR EARDLEY WILMOT: I beg to withdraw my Amendment, Sir.

MR. RAIKES begged to move the insertion of Ipswich in the Schedule, and thought that in this particular case they might make an exception to the rule that had been laid down. He ventured to think that the limits had been rather inconsiderately laid down. The limit of 15,000 population was too low for boroughs to retain one Member, while 50,000 population was not sufficient for

two. He could not help thinking that if the Committee had been free to exercise its own judgment in the matter it would have declined to fix the number at 50,000, but would have raised it to something higher. He believed the proper figure would have been 75,000 or 80,000. He would not ask the Committee to raise the limit; but he would ask them not to extend any exceptional privilege to Ipswich. He was not biased in this matter. The hon. Members who represented Ipswich both represented very interesting views in that House; but he could not help believing, apart from personal considerations, that it would not be difficult to make out a case for depriving Ipswich of one Member. It was a place with a population of scarcely 50,000 inhabitants. It had seen its best days, and was rapidly declining. It had been a much more important place than it was ever likely to be again, and there was no reason to suppose that it would make a fresh start and become a centre of population. The neighbouring borough of Cambridge, which was a much more important place, had but one Member; the great City of Exeter, which they must admit was the capital of the West of England, and his old constituency (Chester), which, although a little smaller, was, at least, as important as Ipswich, and he believed more so, had only one Member each. He would like the Committee to remember that this Bill perpetuated the extreme inequalities of the system by which great towns like Birkenhead, Cardiff, Huddersfield, Dewsbury, Walsall, and others, with 60,000 to 100,000 population, were still to be contented with one Member, yet which conferred upon a broken down old town like Ipswich two Representatives. He thought the Government might fairly make this concession, even if they adhered to their first rule in other matters, because it was impossible in the case of Ipswich to justify the two Members for a borough which, as he had said, was below the electoral quota for one Member. Although the right hon. Baronet who was in charge of the Bill would probably be too discreet to say that he agreed with him in this matter, he believed he did so in his heart, and he begged to move the Amendment which stood in his name.

Amendment proposed, in page 15, column 1, after "Hereford" (line 19), insert "Ipswich."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Ipswich' be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the line must be drawn somewhere, and Ipswich came within the limit fixed for two Members. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman was hardly fair to Ipswich, for it left in the minds of the Committee the impression that Ipswich was a decaying borough. Now that was not so at all. It was, on the other hand, a rapidly increasing place. In 1871 the population was only 42,000 odd, in 1881 it was 50,000 odd, and it was calculated that at the end of the present year it would be 54,613. Ipswich had a very much larger population than either Cambridge or Chester, and was very steadily, he might say rapidly, increasing. It was not by any means a decreasing place, and under these circumstances the Government considered it was fairly entitled to retain its two Members.

MR. RAIKES said, he did not propose to put the Committee to the trouble of a division; but he wished to point out that he had at least obtained from the right hon. Baronet an important admission. The right hon. Baronet had laid stress on the fact that Ipswich had increased since 1881, and when they came to consider the case of other towns which were growing that would be an important argument. He could only attribute the argument which the right hon. Gentleman had used to the popularity of Ipswich on the Treasury Bench. He begged leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. LEWIS said, he thought it would not be convenient for him to raise the question he was about to raise—namely, the propriety of omitting Warwick from this Schedule; but he would raise it on the 5th Schedule, which he supposed they would approach before very long.

MR. ECKERSLEY, in moving an Amendment, said, he would ask the indulgence of the Committee while he briefly submitted for consideration the very exceptional case of the borough of Wigan. In the few observations he proposed to make he hoped to be able

to prove to the satisfaction of the Committee that the population properly belonging to Wigan at the Census of 1881 considerably exceeded the prescribed number of 50,000, and that Wigan ought to be left out of the Second Schedule of this Bill. According to the Census Returns of 1881, the population of Wigan was 48,196; but the Committee must remember that the town was at that time suffering from the effects of a very serious colliery strike, which had caused many persons to leave in search of employment in other places; some migrated to Oldham, and other towns in Lancashire, others went to South Yorkshire, Derbyshire, Staffordshire, Shropshire, and North and South Wales, the result being that the empty houses of Wigan, at the Census of 1881, amounted to the large number of 1,287, being 842 more than there would have been if they had formed the same proportion as was the case at the Census of 1871. Now, if the greater part of those 842 houses had been occupied at the time of the last Census, as they would have been under any ordinary circumstances, the population would have exceeded 51,000. Again, the population of Wigan, according to the Census of 1871, was upwards of 39,000, and between the Census of 1871 and the Census of 1881 there were 2,760 new houses erected, as against only 200 that were destroyed. If the greater portion of those new houses had been inhabited at the Census of 1881, as they would have been under ordinary circumstances, the population would have exceeded 51,000. These statements were fully corroborated by an estimate which was made by the Registrar of Births and Deaths, at the end of May, 1881, about two months after the Census was taken, which clearly demonstrated that at least 3,000 persons had returned to the town, many of them to the same houses which they had occupied previous to the strike, and a large number of them had resumed work under their former employers. The Committee should bear in mind that this estimate was made in May, 1881, for the information of the local authorities. The basis on which the estimate was founded was worthy of notice. In one street, consisting of 60 houses, only six were occupied during the strike; when the strike was over every one of them became tenanted; and many other instances of a similar character were fonnd in the districts where the colliers resided. The return of the 3,000 persons to the town brought the population to over 51,000 at the end of May, 1881. It might be stated that absentees were not enumerated in the Census of seaport towns. That must be admitted; but he contended that the two cases were not analogous. The absentees in seaport towns did not vary very materially at one Census from another; but the case of Wigan, where there was a temporary migration of large numbers at the time of the Census of 1881, the population was reduced below the prescribed limits only for a period of two or three months. In his opinion, the migration by these sturdy, independent Wigan colliers was a movement which deserved the highest commendation from Her Majesty's Government, for it showed the fixed determination of the colliers to support themselves and their families by their own exertions, rather than rely on the poor rates or on public charity in times of great difficulty and distress. Wigan was one of the three towns in Lancashire which was ordered to return two Members to the first Parliament, which was convened in the Kingdom upwards of 600 years ago; and during the whole of that period the duties and obligations attendant upon that privilege had, he believed, been faithfully performed. He himself felt very strongly upon this question, and so did all the inhabitants of Wigan, irrespective of politics. All the employers and employed were very desirous that this privilege of returning two Members should be preserved to them. They felt that they ought not to be deprived of one Member simply because the Census happened to be taken at a time when the town was suffering from a great public calamity. He appealed to the Committee to meet this exceptional case in that spirit of magnanimity and justice which was the great characteristic of our Parliamentary proceedings; and he asked them to act up to the spirit and intention of the Bill, which, as they had been assured over and over again by the Prime Minister, was one of enfranchisement. He hoped the Bill would preserve to Wigan that right of returning two Members to Parliament which it had always possessed, and to which he firmly believed it was justly entitled under this Bill.

Amendment proposed, in page 15, column 2, line 16, to leave out "Wigan." —(*Mr. Eckersley.*)

Question proposed, "That 'Wigan' stand part of the Schedule."

MR. A. F. EGERTON wished, before the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) rose, to say a few words in support of the Amendment proposed by his hon. Colleague. He did not think he need speak at any great length in support of it, for he hoped it would easily commend itself to the Committee, and it appeared to him that his hon. Colleage had satisfactorily made out that Wigan had a claim, as of right, still to continue to return two Members to Parliament. It might be said by the right hon. Baronet that the Government could not go behind the Census Returns; but surely this was an altogether exceptional case. It might be said that seaport towns were in precisely the same position; but he would put it to the Committee to say whether there was not a great difference between the case of Wigan and that of the seaport towns? The exodus from Wigan was one of a purely temporary character. It so happened that there was a great strike, which emptied a vast number of houses, and, as his hon. Colleague had pointed out, after a short time those houses became full again. But it so happened that during the precise period at which the Census was taken those houses were empty. He maintained that that formed a very strong ground for some relaxation of the determination of the Government with reference to the claims of Wigan to have two Members. He based those claims not only on the fact, which was well known to everybody, that Wigan had returned two Members for upwards of 600 years, but also on the conditions and nature of the industries and trades which were carried on there. All who knew Lancashire knew well that Wigan was a sort of capital of the coal trade for South-West and also, to a great extent, for South-East Lancashire. It had been in that position for a long time. It was also concerned directly with the iron trade—in fact, it was a manufacturing and a colliery town, and worthily performed the duties of a centre of those important trades, because he believed that the only mining school in Lancashire, which was of the greatest possible value, was conducted in that town. Under those circumstances, he hoped his hon. Friend would not be met by a *non possumus*, for that was the only argument that could be used against him. He might be asked, "Where are you to get the Member from?" But he would humbly suggest that there was more than one place from which a Member might properly be taken. There was one flagrant case—the case of Warwick—where a Member might be obtained, for he contended that the claims of Wigan most completely outweighed those of Warwick and Leamington. On all those grounds he asked the consideration of the Committee for the Amendment which had been placed on the Paper by his hon. Colleague.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: The hon. Member who has just spoken has argued the matter in such a way as to almost amount to a breach of the agreement, just as the right hon. Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross) was also going to argue a little while ago. As a matter of fact, there are two different proposals to keep the second seat for Wigan. The proposal which was made by the Corporation of Wigan, and which has been circulated generally among Members of this House, was one of a different kind from the one made now. The Corporation of Wigan proposed, by extending the boundaries of the borough, to bring it up above the 50,000 limit. I do not quite know which of the two proposals it is that I have to meet. If the proposal is to leave the borough as it is with a Census population under 50,000, and to give it a second Member, I should say that that was a great departure from the lines of the agreement; but if the proposal is that of the Corporation, to largely extend the boundaries, and give a second Member to the borough so extended by the addition of considerable surrounding districts, then no doubt we might do that and give the other Member. But that proposal, which the Corporation made and circulated among Members of the House, is open to objection upon other grounds. Committees of the House of Commons of late years have proceeded upon a very intelligible principle in regard to the extension of municipal boundaries, and they have acted in such a way as not to take in Local Board areas outside the municipality

except in cases where the Local Board district desired to be so absorbed. The borough of Wigan is surrounded by an urban population. That is the case, not only of Wigan, but of the Lancashire towns generally, and you get the same thing in other parts of the country, as, for instance, in Staffordshire. The towns stretch towards one another along the roads, and almost every town is connected by rows of houses along the roads with almost every other. We have thought the best way to deal with these urban populations is by the single-Member county division system, and even before that we thought of dealing with special cases in that way. If you propose to extend the borough of Wigan you are met by the fact that all round it this urban population is in Local Board districts. There is a complete ring of Local Board districts all round the borough of Wigan, and these Local Board districts are strongly opposed to being absorbed by Wigan. They wish to remain as county divisions, and they altogether object to being swallowed up by the borough. The Mayor of Wigan says he hopes to diminish the opposition of these districts by giving them a strong pledge that no attempt will be made to extend the municipal boundaries of Wigan, but only the Parliamentary boundaries; but still the places affected express a strong preference for being left as county divisions. I am, therefore, not quite certain what is the case which we have to meet—whether it is the extension of the borough boundaries so as to get above the 50,000 limit, or leaving the boundaries alone and thus going below that limit. If Wigan were extended, it would be extended like a star-fish, with long arms all round running into different parts of Lancashire. It would certainly be more like a star-fish than an ordinary borough. If it is to be left as it is, without the necessary population, then that would certainly be a distinct breach of the agreement arrived at with regard to the 50,000 limit. There is also another question. If Wigan is to retain its second Member, where is that Member to come from. The right hon. Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross) told us that if the House is to be increased by 12 new Members, he did not see why it should not be increased by 13. I am bound to say that that would be a breach of the agreement, because we agreed that the number of the Members of the House was only to be increased by 12, to meet the claims of Scotland. The hon. Member who has just spoken (Mr. A. F. Egerton) says we might do what is asked by taking a Member from Warwick, and other Members in the course of the previous discussions have mentioned other places from which Members might be taken. But there are 37,000 people in the new borough of Warwick and Leamington. The hon. Gentleman opposite laughs; but if he will look at the recommendations of the Commissioners of 1868, he will find that the Government were only carrying out those recommendations in regard to Warwick and Leamington. With so large a population it is clear that even if one seat were taken away from the borough, it would have to be given back again in the shape of a county district, for the boundaries would have to be re-arranged, and a county district would thus be created which would certainly require a Member to represent it. In that way Warwick and the neighbourhood could not lose a seat, so that the case is not much advanced. Under these circumstances I must ask the Committee to reject this proposal.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS: I am sorry to trouble the Committee again; but I would point out that no one knows the condition of this district better than the Prime Minister himself. I am not at all prepared to assent to the doctrine just laid down by the right hon. Baronet, that it would be any breach of the agreement to allow Wigan to retain its two Members. The right hon. Baronet says that the limit of 50,000 was settled by the two Parties. But it was never settled between the two Parties that this question of the 50,000 limit was to be regulated simply by the Census of 1881. The real question is whether, as a matter of equity, the borough of Wigan had not 50,000 inhabitants even in that very year? It was only by the particular accident of a particular strike that the inhabitants of Wigan were not far over the mark laid down at the time the Census was taken. The right hon. Baronet himself, when answering the hon. Member for Exeter (Mr. H. S. Northcote), alluded to the increase which had taken place in certain cases since

1881, and spoke of what was the population at the present time.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: That was only in answer to the hon. Member, who spoke of a particular borough as a declining place.

SIR. R. ASSHETON CROSS: Well, at all events, here we have the case of a very thriving borough and a very old one, which has sent Members to Parliament for hundreds of years. It is a very thriving borough, and if the right hon. Baronet will look at the Census for several decenninal periods, he will see how it has been growing. In the Census of 1871 there were 7,000 houses in the borough. In 1881 there were 9,700 houses, and at the present time there are 10,000. Therefore, it is very largely growing, and the inhabitants were only reduced below the number of 50,000 when the Census was taken by the accidental circumstance that a strike happened at that particular moment. It is not the fact that the population of the borough had permanently decreased at all, and, as the hon. Member for Wigan (Mr. Eckersley) has pointed out very sensibly and properly, it was to the credit of these poor colliers that, instead of staying in the borough to rely on the relief of charity or the rates, they all went out to other towns to seek other work, and so were enabled to retain their self-respect and independence. I think the case of the borough is a very hard one indeed, and it is no answer whatever to say that the limit of 50,000 is a bargain between the two Parties, because the question is, whether Wigan had not really and practically the full number of population to carry her above the limit? Simply for a few months, owing to a particular strike, there was a sort of exodus of between 2,000 and 3,000 people; but they all came back. You cannot say that the permanent population of Wigan has been below 50,000, and therefore the answer is good as to any compact between the Parties, because in equity and fairness the borough has had, and it has at the present moment, a population of more than 50,000. I think this is a very strong case indeed to press on the consideration of the Committee. I hope my hon. Friend will go to a division, and I shall certainly support him. The right hon. Baronet said he was not quite aware which case he had to meet—whether it was the case as presented by my hon. Friend, or the case as presented by the Mayor of Wigan for the incorporation into the borough of certain large populous districts just outside. But the case presented by the Mayor of Wigan is not the case which we are arguing now; and it is possible when we come to the latter part of the Bill, if we fail in this Motion, which I hope we shall not, there may be others submitted to the Committee as to what ought to be the boundaries of Wigan. But, taking the matter as it stands at present, the right hon. Baronet must see that the particular point which we are arguing, and none other, is that the borough of Wigan, for all practical purposes and in all equity, has not had a population of less than 50,000. Therefore, we are in equity entirely within the limit laid down in the compact between the two Parties, and it would be a very hard case indeed if the borough should be excluded from the benefit of having two Members, as it always has had, simply because of that temporary exodus of a portion of the people who went away with the intention of returning, and who did return.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: The right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has not, I think, added much to the strength of the case presented by the hon. Member for Wigan (Mr. Eckersley). The sole point he relies upon is that a certain portion of the population deserted the borough in consequence of a strike, and returned to it afterwards. Well, in what way does that differ from the case of towns which have been rapidly increasing since the Census was taken? Take the case of Hastings, for instance. Everybody knows that Hastings has greatly increased since the Census Returns of 1881, and the same principle, if adopted in the case of Wigan, would demand consideration in Hastings. My own constituency—that of Reading—affords another example. It had a population, according to the Census of 1881, of 47,000—that is to say, the Bill proposes to extend its boundaries, and when they are so extended the population of the district covered was 47,000 in that year. But everybody knows very well that the population of that district is now far beyond the limit of 50,000, so rapid has been its increase. What difference is

there, then, in principle between the case of Reading and that of Wigan? The right hon. Gentleman (Sir R. Assheton Cross) says he makes this claim as a matter of equity. But what possible equity can arise in the matter? Who is the equity between? Is it between Wigan and some other constituencies? I must say that I altogether fail to understand how the term can in any proper sense be applied to the question. The right hon. Gentleman has been totally silent on the point as to where the second Member for Wigan is to come from. Is the total number of Members of the House to be increased by one? If so, that is contrary to the agreement between the Leaders of the two Parties, and it would be very undesirable to re-open the question, because if we once break through the rule in order to meet the case of Wigan, we shall have other cases raised on behalf of other towns such as Exeter, Hastings, Reading, and others, and we might be called upon imperceptibly to increase the total number of Members of the House until that increase went to a very extraordinary extent. The case made out for Wigan is not substantially different from that of Exeter, Hastings, Reading, and many other towns that might be named, and if we once give way to the appeal now made to us, we should be led into further changes. The hon. Member opposite (Mr. A. F. Egerton) says we might take the Member asked for from Warwick; but the hon. Gentleman did not avail himself of the opportunity which occurred a few minutes ago of proposing that the reduction should be made in the case of Warwick. The House has therefore decided the matter so far as Warwick is concerned, and has resolved that Warwick and Leamington, with a population of 37,000, shall have a Member. Even if separate borough representation were not given to these towns, you would have, as my right hon. Friend the President of the Local Government Board has said, to make them into a county district. The towns in Lancashire, I think, have less claims than many of the Southern boroughs, such as Hastings. All round Wigan the population is practically an urban population, and Lancashire is divided into one-Member districts. The whole population there is practically urban, and therefore there is no reason for increasing the representation of Wigan itself. It appears to me that the case made out by the right hon. Gentleman opposite and by the hon. Members for Wigan is not different from that of many other places.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS: I must object to the speech just delivered by the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General, because he has entirely misstated the case. My case is not that Wigan has increased in population since 1881, but that it was over the limit of 50,000 before then, and it was only a temporary occurrence which happened when the Census was taken which reduced it for the moment below that limit. It is a town which for all practical purposes had been over 50,000 long before 1881. I only alluded to the increase since in order to show that it is increasing in spite of the exodus which took place then.

MR. GLADSTONE: With what the population was before the year 1881 we have no concern whatever. Wigan in 1881 was below the mark; Wigan since that time has come above the mark; but so, beyond all doubt, have many other towns which were also below the mark in 1881, but which have since got above the mark, and are continuing to increase. You cannot, therefore, establish a distinction in the case of Wigan as against other towns by showing that before 1881 it was above the limit. That is the contention, and it is perfectly plain that you cannot deal with the case of Wigan exceptionally. It would involve the necessity of discovering a very considerable number of seats—I believe not less than eight or nine.

MR. A. F. EGERTON said, his contention was that Wigan, within two or three months of the Census being taken, was over the mark. He would draw an analogy between the case of Wigan and the case of Grenada during the recent earthquake, when a vast number of citizens left the town and encamped outside, and if a Census had been taken at that particular time, those people could not have been included within it as actually inhabiting the town. There was a strong analogy between that case and the case of Wigan.

MR. LEA said, he had heard the arguments of the Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre); but they did not seem to him to meet the arguments of the right

hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir R. Assheton Cross), who rightly contended that the case of Wigan differed essentially from that of Reading and of the other towns mentioned, inasmuch as Wigan, only a few months—or, as he believed the actual fact to be, only a few weeks, not months—before the Census was taken, had a population exceeding 50,000, and within a few weeks afterwards the population again exceeded 50,000. No contention on the part of the Postmaster General for Reading, or any other town, could have any value when dealing with the facts before 1881; and therefore, in making an exception in favour of Wigan, the Committee would only be doing justice to that borough, and they would not be doing any injustice to Reading or to any other place.

MR. ECROYD said, he did not wish to stand for many minutes between the Committee and a division. He thought the right hon. Gentlemen who had spoken from the Ministerial side had entirely failed to establish their contention that the case of Wigan did not present any exceptional features. If the Census of Wigan had been taken two months earlier or later in 1881 than it was, the population would have been decidedly above 50,000. In point of fact, the real population of Wigan at the time the Census was taken was greater than that of Ipswich, and the population of Wigan to-day was greater than that of Ipswich. He rose particularly, however, to refer to the extraordinary statement made by the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) in charge of the Bill in defending the course taken with regard to Warwick. It had been understood that grouping was not one of the principles of the Bill, and yet the right hon. Gentleman said that if the grouping of Warwick and Leamington were abandoned——

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I never said grouping.

MR. ECROYD said, they would not dispute about words; it was understood by everybody that an exceptional course had been resorted to in the case of Warwick and Leamington. At all events, the essence of what the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) said was that if Warwick and Leamington were not to have a Member, a population of 37,000 would be thrown into the county, and therefore the representation of Warwickshire would require reconsideration. Now, if Warwick and Leamington were thrown into the county, Warwickshire, to which four Members had been assigned, would still contain 31,000 fewer people than North-East Lancashire, to which only four Members were given. There was, therefore, no possible reason why, if Warwick and Leamington were thrown into the county, the representation of Warwickshire should be reconsidered.

MR. TOMLINSON said, that it had been asked, admitting that the case of Wigan was exceptional, where the Member was to be taken from. If the rules were to be applied strictly, there would be no difficulty in finding a second Member for Wigan. 165,000 was fixed as the limit of population entitled to three Members. Now, if the figures which had been quoted several times were correct, Wolverhampton had only a population of 164,332, and therefore it was only entitled to two Members. His suggestion was that one of the Members to be given to Wolverhampton should be taken away and given to Wigan.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 91; Noes 65: Majority 26.—(Div. List, No. 73.)

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Monday* next.

SUPPLY.—REPORT.

ARMY (ANNUAL) BILL.

Resolutions [19th March] *reported.*

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—GENERAL GRAHAM'S ADVANCE—ACTION NEAR SUAKIN.

MR. W. H. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on the Motion for the Report of Supply I wish to ask the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War (the Marquess of Hartington) whether he has received any information which he can give to the House with reference to an action which is reported to have taken place to-day in the Soudan?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Mr. Speaker, I have received two telegrams from General Graham. It is possible that one may have been published in the evening papers; but per-

haps I had better read both of the telegrams to the House—

"Suakin, March 20, 5 P.M.

"From General Graham to War Secretary, London.

"Hasheen, March 20, 3.30 P.M.—Moved out from camp 6.15, leaving Shropshire and details as guards. Reached first hill 8.20. Enemy retired and occupied other hill one mile and a-quarter distant. After short halt ordered Berkshire and Marines to clear high isolated hill; Indian Contingent and Guards in support. This was done very effectually. Enemy, being driven off ridge, streamed away south towards Tamai, and were charged by two squadrons Indian Lancers in bush. Cavalry retired on Guards; many of enemy passed Guards at foot of hill and made for hill west of Hasheen Valley, and were shelled by Royal Horse Artillery. Other parties, moving round our right, were engaged in bush by 5th Lancers. Meanwhile zariba, with four intrenched posts on hill commanding it, is being formed. Advanced troops have all returned to this position, and will return to camp, leaving East Surrey and two Krupp guns, four Gardners, water tanks, and signal appliances at intrenched position. Killed:—Scots Guards, Captain Dalison, Private Ashley; 5th Lancers, Troop Sergent Major Nicholls, Private Edwards; 9th Bengal Lancers, one non-commissioned officer, four sowars. Wounded:—Surgeon Major Lane, A.M.S., severely; Scots Guards, six men; Coldstreams, eight men; Grenadiers, eight men; Berkshire, two men; 5th Lancers, Major Harvey, severely; two men slightly; 9th Bengal Cavalry, Major Robertson, severely; seven sowars; 15th Sikhs, one man; 70th Sikhs, two men. Infantry behaved with great steadiness. Strength of enemy estimated 4,000. Loss unknown, but considerable."

I have since received another telegram sent to Lord Wolseley to the following effect:—

"Suakin, March 20, 9.35 P.M.

"Following to Wolseley to-day:—The result of to-day's operations has been to establish a strong position commanding the Hasheen Valley, and protecting my right flank and line of communication in the ensuing operations against Tamai. The Cavalry showed great dash and individual gallantry in very difficult ground covered with high thorn bushes, occupied by an agile and determined enemy. The Infantry proved that when properly handled they could master the enemy in any position. The Berkshire, supported by Marines, stormed a steep hill strongly held, while the Guards showed an unshaken front when attacked in the thickest scrub, and protected the Cavalry by steady volleys. The Indian Brigade also worked admirably. The practice of the Artillery was excellent, and the positions chosen with judgment. The Royal Engineers, assisted by Madras Sappers and Miners and working parties of East Surrey, planned and executed the defensive works with great skill and coolness, although repeatedly threatened with attack by the enterprising enemy, who at one time swarmed round on all sides.—Graham, Suakin."

The Marquess of Hartington

First Resolution *agreed to.*

(2.) "That a sum, not exceeding £4,543,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge of the Pay, Allowances, and other Charges of Her Majesty's Land Forces at Home and Abroad (exclusive of India), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886."

Resolution read a second time.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, that, owing to some misapprehension as to when the Question was put, he was unable to move in Committee the Amendment he now proposed to move. He desired to move the reduction of the Vote by the sum of £500,000. He had gathered from a statement made by the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War (the Marquess of Hartington) that about £70,000 was now in his Estimate in excess of what would be the cost of the troops of England that were now forming the garrison in Egypt. He not only wished to move the reduction of the Vote by this £70,000, but by a further sum, and he had put the total down at £500,000. The garrison that they had in Egypt had been there for several years; it amounted, he believed, to about 6,000 men. The cost to them of those men would be considerably in excess of £500,000; but he did not wish to charge Egypt any more than was absolutely just, and therefore he only proposed to reduce the Vote by the amount he had already mentioned. As he had said, this garrison had been in Egypt for several years, and he thought it was very possible that it would be there some years longer. Now, although he had often raised this question in the House, he had never received a definite reason for their having to pay for those troops. It was very obvious they were there not to defend the country from its enemies, because when an enemy presented himself they sent over a separate Army. As a matter of fact, they were there to fulfil the duty which was fulfilled by a *gendarmerie*—in other words, to maintain order in Egypt. They had put up a Khedive, they considered that that Khedive ought to be defended by some armed force, and therefore they had permanently, so to speak, established that garrison of 6,000 men in the country. Under those cir-

cumstances, it seemed to him that the cost of maintaining that garrison formed part of the expenses of the administration of Egypt, and, that being so, he did not see why the taxpayers of this country should pay for the troops. Yesterday, during the debate on the Army Estimates, he heard many hon. Gentlemen speak as old soldiers. Now, he spoke as an old taxpayer. Hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench seemed to play with hundreds and thousands and millions of pounds in the most easy way, and, in order to make things comfortable, they said—"Let the British taxpayer pay this." He did not see why the British taxpayer should pay for those troops. He had no desire to raise an Egyptian debate—the matter was known in all its intricacies—but he had frequently asked hon. Gentlemen on the Liberal side if they knew why their troops were in Egypt, and they had said they did not. He was sure no one in the country did. He therefore thought the Egyptian Government ought to pay for the troops. Perhaps they might be told that the Egyptian Government could not pay. It was well known that the Egyptian Government could pay were it not that they were obliged to pay such large sums in interest to the bondholders. Obviously, the expenses of the administration of the country must come before the payment of its debts, just as the expenses of a railway must be defrayed before any dividend was paid to the debenture holders or the shareholders. The question was not one between us and the unfortunate fellaheen, but between us and the bondholders; and he was one of those who thought that it was not the taxpayers of this country, but the bondholders of Egypt, who ought to pay a portion of the expense of the necessary administration of that country. He therefore begged to move the Amendment which stood in his name.

Amendment proposed, to leave out "£4,543,000," and insert "£4,043,000," —(*Mr. Labouchere,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That '£4,543,000' stand part of the said Resolution."

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, he did not think the House would desire that he should enter into a discussion of this question at that hour of the night (12.45). As a matter of fact, he really had nothing to add to what he said in reply to a Question put by his hon. Friend the Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) on the Motion that the Speaker should leave the Chair. On that occasion his hon. Friend the Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) suggested that the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy should not press a Motion he had made, but should move a reduction of the Vote. The hon. Member for Northampton was anxious to take every opportunity of protesting against any payment by the taxpayers of this country for the occupation of Egypt, although he (the Marquess of Hartington) might point out that, a short time ago, his hon. Friend was one of those who urged that that occupation should be undertaken. He (the Marquess of Hartington) quite admitted that those who altogether objected to the occupation of Egypt by a British Army, and to any part of the expenditure involved by that occupation falling on the British taxpayers, were entitled to take every legitimate opportunity, and this was one of them, of protesting by their votes against such a policy; but it did not follow that the Government were obliged on every possible occasion to enter into a discussion of the matter. Especially at that moment they were not so obliged, because very shortly there was to be a discussion upon the arrangements which had lately been entered into by the Government and the European Powers with regard to Egyptian finances. That would be, in his opinion, the proper time to discuss whether the cost of the occupation should fall on the British taxpayers, the Egyptian taxpayers, or the bondholders. The Government had endeavoured to make the Egyptian bondholders contribute some of the expenses which were involved in the occupation. It was very fair to raise the question whether they contributed a sufficient amount; but a proper and convenient opportunity for the discussion of such a question would be when the general financial arrangements were submitted to the House. It would only be a waste of time at that late hour to go into the subject.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, that after the discussion which took place upon his Motion the other night, he should not have thought it necessary to

raise the question again, especially as another opportunity for discussion would be afforded. But there was another subject in respect to which he was very much inclined to propose a reduction of the Vote by £500,000—a subject on which he did not know whether they would have any opportunity of a discussion—namely, the Bechuanaland Expedition. He could not hope that a proper discussion on this question could be raised at that time; but he felt bound to protest against £500,000 being expended in Bechuanaland in addition to the £750,000 voted last year. They seemed to forget that little wars became considerable wars. In Bechuanaland they were undertaking very serious responsibility and incurring very great expense without saying what they were going to do. He believed that originally it was understood they would only undertake the Expedition for a short time, and that then the Cape Government would take the matter off their hands. They had sent a very strong-handed General (Sir Charles Warren), who seemed to be giving great satisfaction to one class of the people and great dissatisfaction to another class. According to the statements of the Special Correspondent of *The Standard*—a gentleman who seemed very impartial—an extremely bad feeling was being created by Sir Charles Warren's proceedings. They had already expended £1,250,000 upon the Bechuanaland Expedition; there did not appear any probability of its being brought to an end for some considerable time yet; and that the Cape Government would take the affair into their own hands was more improbable than ever. This £1,250,000, he maintained, was all going into the pockets of the people of Stellaland and Cape Colony. ["Divide!"] He did not wish to say much more, but he wished to register a protest in the matter. They were paying for a waggon to traverse a distance of 80 miles, £120, which was at the rate of 30*s.* per mile. That was an enormous amount to be taken out of the pockets of the taxpayers at home to be put into the pockets of the Colonists. They had entered upon a little war which, at any time, might become a considerable one, and which might enormously increase the burdens imposed upon the taxpayers of the country.

Sir George Campbell

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND said, he did not intend to detain the House very long; but he wished just to explain why he had very great pleasure in supporting the Motion of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere). He thought, on the part of a Government which professed to have in it a great deal of the Radical element, the expenditure of hundreds and thousands of pounds on the maintenance of a British Army in Egypt and in the furtherance of a useless war in South Africa, was simply scandalous. Unfortunately, it was not in the power of the people of this country to check that expenditure now. The Government could have its way for the present, and until a General Election arrived; but he was perfectly certain that when a General Election did come the people would show, in no unequivocal manner, their strong approval of the action of those Members who had endeavoured to check the reckless expenditure of the Government. He had no doubt that the people of the country would return a very proper verdict against the sham Radicalism of Her Majesty's Government. The maintenance of a British Army in Egypt at the present time was altogether unjustifiable. He believed that the Earl of Northbrook, in his Report upon the condition of affairs in Egypt, had said that however good an English Army might be for the ordinary purposes of war, for police work it certainly was not fit. So far as he could make out, the money that was being expended—derived from the reduction of interest on the Debt—was intended to pay the soldiers in Egypt who were doing the work of police. He believed the Egyptian people had a very proper appreciation of the advantages of a Police Force in the country, and that they would pay that money twice over if they believed the result would be to rid the country of the garrisons which the Government wished this country to pay for in Egypt. It was quite time that Members of the House, both English and Irish, in the interests of humanity and of the toiling masses of the people of the United Kingdom, raised their voices against this reckless expenditure of Imperial funds on the maintenance of an Army in a country totally opposed to its presence. With reference to the South African part of the question, he had

said before, from his place in the House, before Sir Charles Warren went out, that that officer's departure would very probably have the effect of involving Her Majesty's Government in another war with the Dutch portion of the inhabitants of the Cape of Good Hope. He had asked a Question that day with reference to Sir Charles Warren's mission, and he had received an answer from the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies which was not an answer likely to strengthen any impression which might exist in this country as to the possibility or probability of Sir Charles Warren bringing his mission to a successful issue in a peaceable way. On the contrary, as had been stated strongly and truly, the reports which had reached this country of the doings and actions of Sir Charles Warren all pointed to the conclusion that war was more likely than peace in consequence of the way in which he had aroused the ire of the Dutch inhabitants. The sending out of a filibustering Expedition such as that of Sir Charles Warren's was simply a provocation to the Dutch people in the Colony; and it must not be forgotten that they formed 80 per cent of the entire population. It was most galling to these people to have this country sending out their Generals and soldiers to "boss" them, so to speak. The people of Cape Colony were quite capable of settling their differences without the interference of English troops; and, therefore, as well as objecting to the garrison in Egypt, he should support the Motion of the hon. Member for Northampton. He thought it was simply disgraceful that when questions affecting the voting of such large sums of money as this came before the House the Benches should be empty. If there was a scene of excitement in the House, and it became the duty of Mr. Speaker, in the cause of Order, to suspend an hon. Member, the Benches on both sides of the House would be crowded—there would not be a seat vacant. Now, however, because the question was only one of voting away the taxes of the hard-working people of this country, there were only half-a-dozen independent Members present. He was glad to see a Member of the Government present who had a great character for Radicalism—although he was not proving his Radical principles by refusing to raise his voice on this occasion in support of the Motion of the hon. Member for Northampton. He (Mr. W. Redmond) was sorry there were not more hon. Members present to vote against the maintenance of a British garrison in Egypt and the carrying on of a costly and useless war in South Africa. Though he had no particular solicitude for the welfare of the British people, or the economizing of the expenditure of the British public, he should do everything in his power, whilst he had a seat in the House, to protest against British aggression.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 67; Noes 18: Majority 49.—(Div. List, No. 74.)

Resolution *agreed to.*

Ordered, That the Resolution, which, upon the 19th day of this instant March, was reported from the Committee of Supply, and then agreed to by the House, be now read; and the same was read, as followeth:—

"That 59,000 men and boys be employed for the Sea and Coast Guard Services for the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, including 12,900 Royal Marines."

Ordered, That leave be given to bring in a Bill to provide, during Twelve Months, for the Discipline and Regulation of the Army; and that the Marquis of HARTINGTON, The JUDGE ADVOCATE, and Sir THOMAS BRASSEY do prepare and bring it in.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 104.]

WAYS AND MEANS.—REPORT.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (No. 2) BILL.

Resolutions [March 19] *reported.*

MR. SEXTON said, that upon this Motion he was obliged, as a matter of duty, to express the deep dissatisfaction which was felt by the Irish Members at the course pursued by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) since these Sittings began in regard to Irish Bills, and the course pursued by the Government generally. He referred to the neglect on the part of the right hon. Gentleman to introduce a Bill on the subject of National Education in Ireland. The subject of that Bill was one which the Irish Members had since the beginning of last year strenuously and constantly endeavoured to bring under the notice of the House. They had urged it when the Estimates were under consideration, and had brought it forward in the form of a Motion, and, from beginning to end of last year, they had been deluded by the right

hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Trevelyan) by promises to the effect that he had a Bill ready in his pocket, but that the supreme pressure of the Franchise Question prevented him from bringing it forward. To convince the House of the urgency of the matter, it would be sufficient to say that the measure would concern the livelihood of 16,000 hard-worked and poorly-paid men and women in the service of the State in Ireland. In fact, the measure was of great importance to the community at large, as it concerned and had an important bearing upon the settlement of the question of Primary Education and the education of the children of the people of that country. From the beginning to the end of the last Session of Parliament the Irish Members had been obliged to remain satisfied with the promises of the right hon. Gentleman; but when the Autumn Session came, the hon. Member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) succeeded in obtaining a place for a Bill which, in despair of obtaining anything from the Government, the Irish Members had determined to bring in. His hon. Friend had succeeded in obtaining an opportunity for moving the second reading. The hon. Member moved it; but before any one of his Friends could second the Motion, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant had taken the unprecedented course of moving the adjournment of the debate. The result had been a prolonged and angry scene, an All-night Sitting, and a very earnest and excited debate on the last day of the Autumn Session. From those circumstances—that was to say, from the urgency of the question, and the number and importance of debates which had taken place upon it, the assurances which the Irish Members had received, and the strange and irritating action taken by the right hon. Gentleman himself—all those circumstances taken together had given him (Mr. Sexton) and his Friends reason to believe that the beginning of this Session would witness the introduction of a Bill. However, the Session proceeded some distance and nothing was done. On the 3rd of the present month, the hon. Member for Longford, who, from day to day, had endeavoured to keep the matter before the public by transferring his Bill from the Orders of the Day of one day to those of another, at last asked the right hon. Gentleman, who had promised to introduce a measure on the subject, when the measure might be expected, and the answer was that it would be presented in the following week—that was in the week ending on Saturday last. But during that week the right hon. Gentleman had not placed any Notice whatever on the subject on the Paper. He had not realized the hope which he had encouraged the hon. Member for Longford to entertain. However, on Monday last, a Motion appeared as No. 1 in the Notices of Motion. On that night, however, a prolonged debate had taken place with reference to the administration of affairs in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman had sat out that debate until the end; and seeing that the discussion had reference to an alleged breach of faith on the part of the Government in regard to another Bill, it might have been supposed and confidently predicted that the right hon. Gentleman would have been particularly attentive to the desirability of laying himself open to no other charge on that score. The right hon. Gentleman had remained in the House until after 5 o'clock. Though it might have been shown that it was then time to go to bed, it would have taken a very slight effort of self-denial, and would have been much more respectful to the House, if the right hon. Gentleman, having sat up so long, had remained another five minutes out of bed and had allowed Mr. Speaker to call on him to move his Motion. However, he had disappeared from the House immediately Mr. Speaker rose to call out the Notices of Motion, and he (Mr. Sexton) had been informed that the Motion was postponed. Since then the right hon. Gentleman had been questioned upon the subject, and had informed the House that he intended to bring forward his proposal on Tuesday next. He (Mr. Sexton) must confess the right hon. Gentleman's remarks had been altogether unintelligible to him. He had said that it appeared to be convenient in the interests of the Public Service that the Bill should be introduced on Tuesday. Well he (Mr. Sexton) was aware of no public convenience which could in any way be served by this postponement; but, on the other hand, the people whose beg-

garly incomes were to be affected by this measure were suffering, almost starving, for want of consideration, and every day which was allowed to pass without forwarding the settlement of the question was a day misused. The Bill had not been put down to-day, and the House was left in bewildered speculation as to what might be the cause of the obstinate delay on the part of the Government to proceed with a measure concerning which they professed to have made up their minds last year—a Bill of which the Predecessor of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant had stated, more than a year ago, that he had the draft in his pocket. Last night the right hon. Gentleman had had on the Paper three Notices of Motion relating to Irish Bills; but he (Mr. Sexton) had been so shaken in his confidence as to the right hon. Gentleman's intention to proceed with the Notices he placed upon the Paper, owing to his action the other night, that he had asked him yesterday at Question time whether he intended to move the Motions standing in his name. The right hon. Gentleman had replied that he did intend to do so, and he (Mr. Sexton) had expected, with as much confidence as he could muster in regard to a pledge of the right hon. Gentleman, that the Motion to which he was referring would have been moved. Another of those Bills dealt with the extra men of the Royal Irish Constabulary. That was a subject that the right hon. Gentleman must have seen the necessity of promptly proceeding with. The prolonged Sitting of Monday night, the painful scenes that occurred, the conflicts of veracity, should all have warned the right hon. Gentleman that this question of the police was one he was not entitled to toy with any longer. The third Bill affected the registration of voters in Ireland. He (Mr. Sexton) said unhesitatingly that without that Bill a measure on the subject of redistribution was of no use in Ireland, for the reason that the present law repelled the voter from the Registration Court in place of attracting him. What had happened last night? Why, the right hon. Gentleman had sat in his place until the conclusion of the debate, and the Irish Members had been compelled to rise one after the other to continue the discussion, no response being forthcoming to the questions and the statements addressed to the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman had not said a word during the last hour or, perhaps, hour and a-half of the debate, but had sat in sulky silence listening to what went on. To-day, however, by an extraordinary obliqueness of vision on the subject, the right hon. Gentleman had declared that the Irish Members had had the debate all to themselves. If the right hon. Gentleman had been in such a hurry to get to bed——

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said, that he had been unable to speak a second time—it was against the Rules of the House.

MR. SEXTON said, that was all the more reason why the right hon. Gentleman should have retired earlier, if he had been so anxious to get to bed. Seeing that the right hon. Gentleman had denied himself that repose which he no doubt had so well earned and had sat out the debate to the end, he (Mr. Sexton) ventured to assert that it would have given rise to less suspicion that the right hon. Gentleman had succumbed to an attack of temper, and was regardless of the feelings of the Irish Members, and would have shown him more attentive to the duties of his Office as Chief Secretary, if he had remained in the House five minutes longer and had responded to the appeals made to him to bring on his Notice of Motion. It was a very strange thing that the Minister for Ireland was the only man who dallied and delayed with Bills having reference to the administration of that country. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had a Bill dealing with the Court of Judicature, a Bill of an elaborate and complicated character; but instead of delaying with it, he proceeded until it was placed in the hands of Members that they might consider it and form their judgment upon it. The Financial Secretary to the Treasury, one of the hardest-worked officials on the Government Bench, had upon his hands five Bills of the greatest importance to Ireland, Bills of considerable importance and detail, but he had found time to introduce them. He having put down a Notice of Motion was ready in his place to move it when the Speaker called upon him. An extraordinary and unpleasing contrast was offered by the delay of the responsible Minister for Ireland in dealing with measures re-

lating to that country, when compared with the action of the Financial Secretary and of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. That was not a dignified or proper method of conducting Business. The people were waiting for the Bill, their livelihood and interests were concerned in it, and Irish Representatives were entitled to know what the Government were going to do. They objected to every day's delay. When the Government had made up their minds, when they had said the Bill was drafted, let the right hon. Gentleman move his Motion and introduce the Bill, not stay until the last moment of a Sitting and then, under a plea of going to bed, exhibit considerable disrespect to Irish Members by rushing out of the House. He would find that a frank business-like method of conducting Business would be more conducive to progress.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said, one of the advantages of occupying the post he had the honour to hold was that one found oneself guilty of a series of flagrant offences while quite unconscious of having given any occasion for attack. He had been sitting as usual in amazed admiration of the power the hon. Member for Sligo displayed in spinning out a tremendous story from the scantiest material. He would take the Education Bill first. The hon. Member went back to past Sessions; he (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) could only go back to the Autumn Sitting. In that Session —he was sorry to have to go over the old story—the hon. Member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) introduced a Bill which he put down night after night; it was not postponed for an interval, it was put down day by day, but it was never printed. At last it was printed, and the same day the hon. Member moved the second reading. The Government had only seen the Bill a few hours before, and it obviously had to be referred to Dublin, and it had to be carefully considered. It was a Bill —he would not discuss it—involving an enormous additional charge upon the taxation of the country, and the Government were expected without any consideration at all to say "Aye" or "No" to it! He had to consult the Irish Government, he had to consult the Treasury, and a great deal of consideration had to be given to it, and he thought it the most courteous, the most straightforward thing—not supposing that it was seriously expected they should then and there go on with the Bill—to move the adjournment of the debate, to avoid doing what he thought would have been extremely discourteous, to allow Members to get up one after another to discuss the Bill, and then for him to say—"You have wasted all your eloquence. I can really give no opinion upon the Bill." He thought it the most courteous, most straightforward method to move the adjournment of the debate. That was his crime on that occasion; but he was of opinion that the bulk of the House, instead of considering it an offence, thought it the most courteous and convenient course to take. Then it was announced the Government would have a Bill on the subject of Education, and that it was to be brought in in the course of that Session. But everyone knew the peculiar position of Business in the House; how every night, with the exception of those occupied with the Vote of Censure, was taken up with Committee of Supply or the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill; and, therefore, any statement he he could make in explanation of that very considerable scheme affecting the educational system of Ireland would have had to have been made at a very late hour. He thought it would be the desire of hon. Members, and a good deal more to their convenience, that he should not introduce a Bill on a day when it would have to be deferred to a very late hour; that was his sole object. He announced it for Monday; but in the course of the previous week there was a debate in the House upon educational topics, and he being asked about the Bill said he would put it down for Monday, but with no intention of going on with it, as the Navy Estimates were to be discussed on that day, and it was obvious the Bill could not be reached until very late at night, but that he would bring it on on Tuesday, or some other night advantageous for the purpose. On Monday the House sat until 5 o'clock the next morning, a much later hour than he anticipated when he said he would put down the Bill *pro formâ*, and he would leave the House to judge whether 5 o'clock in the morning, after an exhaustive and acrimonious debate, was the time to make a somewhat important statement

on the great question the Bill would deal with. That disposed of Monday, and he would go on with the history of the following night. He communicated with his noble Friend (Lord Richard Grosvenor) as to the most probable night when the House might expect an early deliverance from other subjects to allow of the Bill being brought on, and acting on his noble Friend's advice he put it down for Thursday, but only tentatively. Again, he was anxious to let hon. Members know what he was doing, and therefore on Wednesday he took the Notice off from Thursday, and announced it for the following Tuesday, as the most likely day for bringing it on. He hoped to bring it on on Tuesday, and he was ready to do so any night. He was not in the habit of speaking for the newspapers, and did not care whether he was reported or not; but he thought the dignity of the subject required that it should not be brought on at the fag-end of an evening spent in a somewhat wrangling discussion. So much for the Education Bill. Then there were other Bills—three that were put down for Thursday (last night). One of them, as he had already told hon. Members, he discovered was, as a measure affecting the payment of pensions to Civil servants, in the category of Money Bills that required Committee to be set up, and a Resolution to be passed, before the Bill could be brought in. So that Bill could not be brought in last night. Then there was the Distribution of Police Bill and the Registration Bill. Well, they all knew what happened last night. A debate was raised on the Report of the Vote on Account, and certain cases were brought forward, the Solicitor General for Ireland and himself making answers they thought were required. Then hon. Members went on—he made no complaint of it—bringing on fresh cases, introducing fresh subjects upon which his hon. and learned Friend and himself were, by the Rules of Debate, precluded from making reply. Hon. Members who made it a reproach that he sat silent for an hour and a-half or two hours, should remember that it would have been in contravention of rule if he had attempted to reply. Now, unfortunately, one of the Bills had not been put down for to-night; but that was simply through a clerical error, it would be down for Monday; the other he intended presently to bring in. That was the sum and substance of what had happened—the recital of the whole of his misconduct. If he had been guilty of any discourtesy, any want of consideration, he was extremely sorry for it. If there had been any error committed in the way in which he had put off the Education Bill, it was out of consideration for the convenience of Members, and to get an opportunity in proportion to the importance of the subject; with no other motive whatever.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY said, the right hon. Gentleman thought it was not paying due regard to the dignity of the cause of the National School teachers to bring forward his Bill at the end of a long Sitting; but he (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) was strongly of opinion that the National School teachers would rather have the justice of their claim satisfied than the dignity of the subject consulted — would rather have the Bill pressed forward even at the close of a long Sitting than have the dignity of the subject associated with delay. He would not refer to the question at length, but the speech of the right hon. Gentleman made a few words necessary. The right hon. Gentleman said when the Bill was brought on last Session the Government knew nothing of it, that he had no idea of its provisions, could not therefore discuss it, and was compelled to move the adjournment of the debate. The House might have been led to suppose that Irish Members had sprung a mine on the Government, and had brought in a Bill the Government had never heard of. But the Bill only embodied the demands Irish Members had made Session after Session. Every Member who cared in the least about the subject must have known perfectly, from discussions year after year, what were the grounds of complaint, and the precise remedies suggested. By Resolution after Resolution Irish Members made the facts known, and one Resolution they very nearly carried; and in the Bill they only embodied the remedies for a grievance that must have been familiar for many a year to every Member who cared a straw about the subject. Under such circumstances, it was strange that the right hon. Gentleman should have thought it necessary to take the unusual course of moving the adjournment. He said it was meant as

an act of courtesy, and he (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) did not doubt it when the right hon. Gentleman said so; but he could only say that at the time this new-fashioned courtesy looked very like old-fashioned discourtesy. The Bill was put off, and in a little time was down again for second reading on the renewed debate, and by a strange chance was not blocked. The discussion would have proceeded as a matter of course; the right hon. Gentleman, however, told him he was going to introduce a Government measure, and appealed to him not to press the Bill that night. On the assurance that the right hon. Gentleman intended to bring in the Government Bill in the first days of the present Session he accepted the suggestion, and did not make use of the rare chance of proceeding with his own Bill. Since then, from day to day, the Bill of the Government had been dangled before their eyes, but had never come within reach. The right hon. Gentleman asked the House to say whether, at the end of a long and weary Sitting, he could be expected to make a speech on an important Bill. But was it necessary he should make a speech on the introduction? What Irish Members wanted was to see the Bill. Let the right hon. Gentleman introduce the Bill with no speech at all, though, as he said he did not make speeches for newspapers, he might as well speak at one time as another. Let him, however, move the first reading in a formal way, without a speech to newspaper readers or anybody else; let that stage be carried, and there would be some prospect of the Bill going forward. The right hon. Gentleman accused the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) of having complained that he (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) sat silent through last night's debate, interposing with no words of his own. But his hon. Friend made no such complaint; what he did say was, that the Chief Secretary sat through two or three hours of the debate, and, the debate being over, he would not stay another minute to formally move the first reading of his Bill. In that there was fair reason for complaint. After the right hon. Gentleman's disclaimer, he was quite sure he did not mean to be unfair or discourteous. Still, his action did delay a measure of great importance, affecting the condition and interests of a large body of overworked and underpaid public servants, who had been promised for years that their grievances should be redressed.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he joined in the view of his hon. Friend the Member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy). The tone of the Chief Secretary's reply left nothing whatever to be desired, and he felt quite sure the right hon. Gentleman had no idea of being discourteous or unfair; but really, in the hard commerce of political life, results must be regarded rather than good intentions, and it must be confessed the right hon. Gentleman's action was most unfortunate in regard to the measure to which that action was applied. The right hon. Gentleman glanced with something like complaint at the proceedings of last night—that Irish Members continued debate among themselves. Now, he was really astonished that the right hon. Gentleman made that a cause of complaint against them.

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said, he did not do so.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he did not do so just now, but he did earlier in the Sitting; he laid stress on the fact that Irish Members followed each other on different questions. But was it their fault; was it not their serious complaint that they were continually compelled to follow each other, without the courtesy or decency of a reply from the Treasury Bench? True, the right hon. Gentleman had exhausted his right of speech, and so had the Solicitor General for Ireland. The Secretary to the Treasury had spoken on another subject, but the Chancellor of the Exchequer was present, and one or two Members of the Government, who could have been told by the Chief Secretary what answer should be made to the charges brought forward. But Irish Members proceeded without any reply being made, and it was one of their gravest complaints that they were thus treated in regard to questions they raised. The Irish Administration, as conducted in the House, was composed of water-tight compartments; the Chief Secretary and the Solicitor General seemed to retain in themselves all knowledge of Irish subjects; other Members of the Government debarred themselves, or were debarred, from all information. They knew nothing, and they cared less; and the result was that, though

10 Members might rise, each calling attention to a different subject, only two of them could get a reply, because the speaking power on the Treasury Bench was limited to the two Gentlemen directly associated with the Irish Administration. That was a most inconvenient and, he might say, a most unconstitutional state of affairs. However they might acquit the Chief Secretary of unfairness, the unfortunate effect was that this measure had been neglected. The right hon. Gentleman stuck obstinately to the idea that the first stage of the Bill required a speech. Nothing of the kind. It was a great deal more important to Irish Members and to the people concerned, and it would be a great deal better for the Chief Secretary, that they should have the text of the Bill before them. That was what they wanted, without a word of explanation. Dull though their intelligencies might be, they would endeavour to gather the meaning of the proposals of the Government. In order to get the Bill printed, nothing more was required from the Chief Secretary than less than five minutes of his time and the raising of his hat. Was it credible—was it credible that when the right hon. Gentleman found himself in the House, though at 5 o'clock in the morning, he should grudge the Irish Members—grudge the National teachers of Ireland — a few more minutes? That was the whole question. It was not a question of a speech at all. But when the time came for the Motion, the right hon. Gentleman had run away. [MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No.] No; he disappeared; he walked home; he glided home. Irish Members waited last night in full expectation of the Bill; and he might mention a matter that had been the subject of conversation—they might have counted out the House. There were not more than 33 Members in all parts of the House at the time when the final stage of the Vote of Credit was about to be taken. The discussion had gone on through a considerable part of the night, and the Government were extremely anxious to pass it. Under the statutory conditions, it was a matter of supreme importance that the last stage should be taken; yet they might have deranged the whole Business of the Government. The Government were at their mercy, but they did not count the House; and he could assure the right hon. Gentleman that the main reason that weighed against their doing so, apart from consideration of the serious inconvenience it would have caused the Government, was that it would have interfered with the expectation of getting the first stage of a Bill for the introduction of which Irish Members and all Ireland were eagerly looking. It was a most disagreeable surprise, a most venomous disappointment, when, having spared the Government, and allowed them to get their Vote, having remained up till half-past 3, to find, when the time came, that the Chief Secretary had gone and the Bill not introduced. Again he acknowledged that the Chief Secretary must be acquitted of any intended discourtesy; but it was to be hoped that now, having caused disappointment so often, he would not delay a single day, and that, above all, he would not make the absence of a speech the reason for delay.

MR. CAMPBELL - BANNERMAN said, if, with indulgence, he might be allowed to say a word, it might save further time being spent upon the matter. No one could dislike making a speech more than he did on any occasion; but in regard to this great subject of Education, he imagined, and from his experience he believed, it was the practice on a question of first-class importance always to make a statement upon its introduction. He had no desire to make such a statement for his own satisfaction; and he could say that if on Tuesday the Bill came on so late that it would be unreasonable to detain the House with a speech, he would be glad to introduce the Bill without a speech at all, and to leave the Bill to the acumen of hon. Members opposite when they saw it. With regard to the other Bills, there was really nothing to be said about them.

MR. JUSTIN HUNTLY M'CARTHY said, this little debate would be useful, if only as a proof to the country that they were represented in the House by a not very slumberous Party, who kept a sharp look out on the Irish Administration. But for that, this particular Bill might never be introduced. From all parts of the country, almost from every town, he received letters incessantly and earnestly imploring him to send the particulars of the Bill of the Chief Secretary, and he had been compelled to

reply that the Bill had not appeared; that, in spite of all efforts to extort the measure from the Government, they still remained in the same condition of obscurity in which they had been since the beginning of the Session. The Bill, he anticipated, would not be a very remarkable measure; but he and his Friends hoped that, before it passed, it would be knocked into something like a serviceable shape, so that it might stand as a temporary stop-gap until they had the opportunity of extorting from the present, or some other Government, a more complete and more useful measure. He hoped the result of the discussion would be to banish from the mind of official Members an unwonted passion for slumber. His Party were not, as a rule, anxious to close debates; but when they were so desirous, as in the case of Coercion Bills, the Government had always displayed a sleeplessness which he hoped they would extend to this Bill.

MR. O'BRIEN said, he thought the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) had some reason to congratulate himself upon the very marked change of tone he had produced in the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman as compared with those made that afternoon amidst the cheers of hon. Gentlemen opposite. When the Chief Secretary reminded them of the *désagrément* connected with his Office, he thought the Irish Members might very fairly remind him——

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I did not say anything about *désagrément*. I said it was rather an advantage.

MR. O'BRIEN said, the right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that he was making some patriotic sacrifice in filling his present post. He (Mr. O'Brien) would like to remind him that it was not, at all events, the Irish Members who had invited him to accept the Office he held; and, further, he would like to remind him that there was a not inconsiderable salary attached to it. That was the second night in one week on which the Irish Members had had the unpleasant duty imposed upon them of complaining of a breach of faith on the part of the Government towards themselves in regard to important Irish Business. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) had reminded them of what had passed last night, and he (Mr. O'Brien) confessed that he, for one, could not forget it. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt) would urge that the Irish Members could not produce the "traces," the *ipsissima verba*, of the agreement that these three Bills were to be introduced last night in consideration of their allowing the Vote under discussion to pass; but there was an unwritten understanding to that effect, and they forebore opposing the Vote. The moment, however, the Government had got what they wanted out of the Irish Members, by some accident the whole of their supporters had trooped out of the House in a most demonstrative manner—had made a regular demonstration and triumph of it. The right hon. Gentleman's argument was that although he had remained in the House until past 3 o'clock in the morning to get the Government this Vote, he could not remain the three minutes longer which would have been necessary in order to introduce the three Irish Bills, and to dispose of the only Business on the Paper connected with his Office of Chief Secretary. The only other thing he (Mr. O'Brien) would like to say was that when the right hon. Gentleman rebuked the Irish Members for doing their duty to their constituents at such unpleasant times and under such unpleasant circumstances as they were obliged to in the House, he would answer that if anyone had reason to complain of the unearthly hours to which the House was kept up, it was the Irish Members. That night, last night, and every other night, they had had to wait until English Business was over, and until most English Members were in their beds, to discuss matters which were of infinitely more importance to Ireland than all the preparations being made against the unfortunate people of the Soudan, to slaughter whom so much money asked for had been voted.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he wished to ask the Financial Secretary to the Treasury a question as to accounts in connection with this Vote. Certain Votes were taken in Supply, and now they had to be taken in Committee of Ways and Means to enable the Vote in Supply to be met. What he wished to know was how the Consolidated Fund to enable Her Majesty to meet the Services would affect the object in view? Was the money in the Consolidated Fund — had the Government got the

money? Because a mere Vote in that House would not give it to them. It was necessary to raise the money before they could use it. Could the Financial Secretary say that the Government were in a position, out of the Ways and Means of the present financial year, to meet the amount it was now proposed to vote?

MR. HIBBERT said, that, of course, the money would be forthcoming when required. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that day that it was not intended to impose fresh taxation during the present financial year, but that the money which was being voted would be forthcoming at the proper time.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: Is it to be borrowed?

[No reply.]

Resolutions *agreed to.*

Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Sir ARTHUR OTWAY, Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, and Mr. HIBBERT.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time.

POST OFFICE SITES BILL.—[BILL 72.]

(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Hibbert.*)

SECOND READING.

Bill read a second time, and *committed* to a Select Committee.

MR. WARTON: I object, on principle, to a Bill being read a second time one day and put down for Committee on the next day the House sits.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: It is proposed to refer the Bill to a Select Committee.

MR. WARTON: That is not the point.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: This is a Hybrid Bill, and is referred to a Select Committee.

MR. WARTON: Oh! that alters the case. I have no objection.

MOTIONS.

—o—

POSTAL SERVICE (GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTH AMERICA).

APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a Select Committee be appointed 'to inquire into the conditions of the Postal Service between Great Britain and North America, and to report what alterations should be made with a view to its improvement.'" — (*Mr. Shaw Lefevre.*)

MR. SEXTON said, he did not intend to oppose the appointment of the Committee; on the contrary, he thought it very desirable that it should be appointed, as there was good work for it to do. He was confident that the Postal Service between England and America was much less efficient and satisfactory than the corresponding post between America and England. In the case of the carriage of the mails from this country the contract was in the hands of one Company, the competition was consequently reduced to a minimum, and the mails were carried slowly. In America it was the custom for the Postmaster General to keep a record of the runs made by the several Companies, and upon that record the contracts were given — preference being given one month to the Company which had made the best run during the preceding month. In that way the quickest passages were secured for the mails coming to this country from the United States. He trusted that the representation of the Irish Members on the Committee would not be purely nominal, for in this matter Ireland was very much interested, for the reason that the mails were carried from Holyhead to Kingstown by an Irish line of steamers, and put on board the Atlantic liners at Queenstown. They could not forget the attempt which had been made some time ago to take the cross-Channel traffic out of the hands of an Irish Company for the purpose of giving it to the London and North-Western Railway Company. The attempt had so far advanced that a draft agreement had been prepared, and had it not been for the strenuous opposition of the Irish Members of all Parties the contract would have been entered into. When he saw the Motion on the Paper for this Committee he had come to the conclusion that it would be necessary, in consequence of the intrigues which had been carried on lately, for the Irish Members to keep a very careful look out. An attack upon the Irish mails might be followed by an attack on the Irish railways. He would ask the Postmaster General, who had proved himself a successful legislator that night by carrying through an unopposed stage of a Bill, what would be the composition of the Committee?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: As this is a question in which the Irish Members

are very much interested, I shall certainly propose to give them a fair representation on the Committee. I have not considered yet the number I shall propose, nor the composition of the Committee; but I will give the hon. Member full notice of my intentions in the matter.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR asked whether the Committee would inquire into the question whether the mails should or should not touch at Queenstown? He was informed that recently two or three mail steamers had actually run on to Liverpool without calling at Queenstown. He did not know what their authority was for doing that, or whether they had any right to do it. He must warn the right hon. Gentleman that the Irish Members would require to have a rather fuller representation on this Committee than on ordinary Committees, because they regarded this question as of supreme interest to Ireland. It would be little short of total destruction to Queenstown if the mails should cease to call there. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman would carry out, both in the spirit and the letter, the promise they understood him to have given—namely, that the Irish Members should have reasonable representation on the Committee.

Motion *agreed to.*

REGISTRATION (OCCUPATION VOTERS) BILL.

Select Committee on Registration (Occupation Voters) Bill *nominated* of,—Mr. STANHOPE, Mr. HENRY H. FOWLER, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LEWIS FRY, Mr. GORST, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GREGORY, Mr. MELLOR, and Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL, with power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY REDISTRIBUTION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Distribution of the Royal Irish Constabulary Force, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN and Mr. SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 105.]

BURIAL BOARDS (CONTESTED ELECTIONS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. STUART-WORTLEY, Bill to amend the Law with respect to Contested Elections of Burial Boards, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. STUART-WORTLEY and Mr. ARNOLD MORLEY.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 106.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 23rd March, 1885.

MINUTES.]—PRIVATE BILL—Trinity College, Dublin (Perpetuity Grants), *negatived.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Solicitors (Ireland) * (53).

Second Reading—Educational Endowments (Ireland) * (44); Elections (Hours of Poll) * (43).

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—MILITARY CO-OPERATION OF THE COLONIES.

HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS.

EARL SYDNEY (LORD STEWARD of the HOUSEHOLD) *brought up* and read at the Table Her Majesty's Answer to the Address in reference to the offers of military assistance from the Colonies and India, as follows:—

MY LORDS,

I have received your loyal and dutiful Address.

The generous offers of Military service made to Me by My Colonies, and by India have given Me the liveliest satisfaction.

I have gladly accepted the assistance thus loyally tendered, and I trust that it will be found practicable to despatch Contingents from several Colonies for service with My Army during the present year.

The patriotic sympathy and spirit which have been displayed on this occasion in distant parts of My United Empire have caused Me the highest gratification.

Address and Answer to be *printed* and *published.* (No. 52.)

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—ARTICLES IN THE "TIMES" NEWSPAPER.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH said, that he desired, in pursuance of private Notice he had given to the noble Earl the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, to put a Question to him re-

garding certain articles which had appeared in *The Times* newspaper, and which seemed to him to deserve some comment. Their Lordships generally and the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition (the Marquess of Salisbury) had hitherto refrained from pressing Her Majesty's Government with any Questions calculated to embarrass them in the present critical state of the delicate negotiations between this country and Russia in relation to Afghanistan. He would prefer to follow the example which had thus been set, and also to refrain from making any comments upon those negotiations, had it not been left for *The Times* to rush in where angels feared to tread. It was the custom in foreign countries to have organs in the Press which were regarded as official or semi-official. For instance, *The North German Gazette* was the authoritative organ of Prince Bismarck at Berlin, and *The Journal des Débats* was the organ of M. Ferry at Paris; and just as it was an ineradicable opinion abroad that the Lord Mayor was, next to the Prime Minister, the most important person in the Government, so also it had always been believed that *The Times* was the semi-official organ of the Government of the day. We could hardly complain that these misconceptions should be so prevalent; but he regarded it as an advantage in many ways, one of which was that his communication to the noble Earl of his intention to ask a Question on the subject gave the noble Earl the opportunity of, once for all, authoritatively denying that there was any inspiration in the articles in *The Times* newspaper. The tone of these articles was extremely remarkable, one which would suggest to a reader that they might be official despatches from the Secretary of State to Ministers abroad containing instructions as to the policy of the Government. Their Lordships were aware that this assumption of authority was nothing more than what Lord Beaconsfield would describe as the pretentiousness of irresponsible frivolity. He, therefore, thought their Lordships would admit that it was desirable it should be publicly known that whatever the foreign policy of Her Majesty's Government was—whether wise or unwise—it was initiated and inaugurated within the walls of the Foreign Office, and that in England the Government did not employ even the respectable columns of *The Times* newspaper for official or semi-official announcements of that policy.

EARL GRANVILLE: I believe that the noble Duke (the Duke of Marlborough) is quite right in saying that what appears in *The Times* is of great interest on the Continent, and there is no doubt that the feeling there is rather of a double character; and it is thought either that *The Times* represents the views of the existing Government, or that it represents the public opinion of the country. I cannot, however, imagine how, in any way, any English or foreign reader of the articles, either respecting the policy of the Foreign Office or the conduct of the individual who unworthily is at the head of it at this moment, would think I had any share in inspiring those articles, or that I could have contributed to them. To do so would be to suppose me guilty of a Machiavellian device; and even if I had had the talent I should not have done so, unless I was to act on the principle of Sheridan, who, in order to lay the ground open for a defence of himself, after having written a most brilliant attack upon himself, entirely forgot to answer it. Be that as it may, I think it would be inconvenient, and a novel precedent for me to establish, that I should be called upon to express either agreement with or dissent from either the whole or part of any articles that appear in the public Press. At the same time, I entirely sympathize with what I understand to be the spirit in which the noble Duke has put the Question—namely, that while Her Majesty's Government adhere firmly to the policy which they think the interests and the obligations of this country require, they agree that they should not omit any opportunity of coming to a friendly agreement satisfactory and honourable to all the parties concerned.

TRINITY COLLEGE (PERPETUITY GRANTS) BILL.

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF LEITRIM, in rising to move that the Bill be now read a second time, said, he regretted the absence of his noble Friend (the Mar-

quess of Salisbury), because, on the last occasion that the Bill was before the House, the noble Marquess expressed the opinion to him (the Earl of Leitrim) that he would carry his point upon the next occasion. When the matter was last year before their Lordships, it was adjourned in the hope that correspondence and communications between the College and the tenants might probably be the means of arriving at some agreement. He regretted that that had not been the result, and the College had not arrived at any agreement with their tenants. The case he wished to present was that of the grantees and subgrantees of leases by Trinity College, many of whom, residing in Donegal and Kerry, had no Representative in that House but himself. They had, however, sympathizers in the other House in Mr. Blennerhassett, Viscount Crichton, Mr. Charles Russell, Mr. Trevelyan, the Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Walker), and many others. The grantees desired an inquiry into their grievances; and that could be had by a Select Committee if the Bill was read a second time and sent upstairs. The College had stated that it challenged the fullest inquiry into all its proceedings with its tenants; and nevertheless the noble and learned Earl (Earl Cairns), who was Chancellor of the University, notwithstanding the assurances of Mr. Forster, when Chief Secretary for Ireland, had refused any inquiry into the tenants' case. The noble and learned Earl had alarmed their Lordships by saying the tenants were endeavouring to break their leases; but such a statement was absolutely incorrect. On the contrary, the tenants desired to retain the leases under the Act by which they held them; and they complained, not of the principle of the Act, but of its machinery, which compelled them to submit to a revision of the leases every 10 years. Such conditions were antiquated, cumbrous, and unjust, and needed to be reformed. All they desired was an inquiry. They were advised by high authority that the best means of obtaining it was by bringing in this Bill; and if their intentions were not clear, the promoters of the Bill would assent in Committee to anything being inserted that would make them clear. So far his opponents had never seriously attempted to argue this case on its merits; but they had maintained that those who broke a lease were trying to get out of their contract. The tenants gave a direct negative to the idea of the possibility of this ever having been accomplished. It was a maxim that no public Act of Parliament could contain a contract within its four corners. The Public Bill introduced in 1850 bore on it the names of Sir William Somerville, the Chief Secretary, and of the Solicitor General for Ireland. This was lost on technical grounds; but it was reintroduced in 1851 as a Private Bill, with the names of Sir William Somerville, and of the two Members for the University on the back of it, but not that of any tenant. In this form it was passed, and it was this Private Act of Parliament which was said to constitute the contract. He might observe, however, that although called a Private Act, it was really a Hybrid Act, and that it received the Royal Assent in the Public Act form—*La Reine le veut*. The Bill originated in this way—the original tenure of the leaseholders under Trinity College was for 21 years, with renewal fines of 5*s*. 6*d*. in the pound of rent, which, if paid every year, procured an extension of the lease for a year. Therefore, they were always in the position of having a 21 years' lease. By the College Statutes the renewal fines were bound to be paid to the Board of the College, whereas the rent was the property of the College itself for educational purposes. It was thus impossible for the Board to run out the leases without starving themselves for 21 years, and so the arrangement was practically that of a lease in perpetuity. Shortly before 1850, in 1849, in consequence of the hard times, some of the tenants were unable to pay the renewal fines, so the members of the Board, who were almost starving, went to the Government of the day, explained their anomalous position, and asked for a remedy. The Government investigated the case, and decided if the Board would grant its tenants perpetuity leases, to give the College Letters Patent, enabling them to pay themselves out of the general funds of the College, and that the renewal fines should thenceforward become part of the general fund of the College. That was the origin of the Bill of 1850 and the Act of 1851 to which he had referred. The tenants petitioned against that Bill on the

ground that any compulsory change in respect to their tenure should be based on a fair consideration of the advantages they had hitherto possessed, and on the faith of which large outlays had been made. They could not have made a stronger protest against the Bill which now they were represented as having contracted; and although he did not in the slightest degree wish to represent that the Government of 1851 had done anything unfair—on the contrary, they had done all they could to be fair—in the matter, yet they inserted in the Bill a provision which was very unfair. It was to the Government of that day that the tenants owed their present tenure; but the practical working of the Act had proved to be absolutely unfair. The provisions of the Act had been proved by the College itself to be unjust. The College authorities said that they were entitled, under the provisions of the Act, to a rise of 47 per cent on the perpetuity rents; but they had not sought to raise them by that amount, because they could not, they would not, and they dared not. For the first 10 years they had raised those rents only 25 per cent, and that increase was still being paid, and it had materially affected the interests of the tenants. As things were at the time the increase was made, he did not know that the tenants had anything to complain of, for they were in hopes that, if the then state of things could be maintained, they would still be able to pay this 25 per cent. But, unfortunately for them, there came on a depreciation in the price of land, and the under-tenants were unable to pay the middlemen rents sufficient to enable them to pay to the College treasury the advanced rents which he had specified, and certainly incapacitated them altogether to make reductions to improving tenants, and the College absolutely refused to reduce the rents. Then another grievance arose out of the machinery by which the increase of the rents was to be effected. The Act of Parliament prescribed that the proceedings under an arbitration should be at the cost of the party who asked for it. The College asked for such an inquiry in the case of the late Lord Leitrim, and obtained thereby an increased rent of 25 per cent, upon the strength of which it induced the tenants to agree to an increase of 20 per cent without the expense of an arbitration; and yet the cost of the one arbitration was levied upon Lord Leitrim's estate. This, however, was incidental, and did not bear on the question before the House. He had no hesitation in saying that the College authorities had been most distinctly guilty of fraud in connection with some of the arrangements. The leaseholders, as he had said, had petitioned Parliament against the Bill introduced by the Government, and then followed a lot of correspondence, in which they threatened to withdraw the Bill unless the opposition was withdrawn. If that had happened, the Government of the day would have said that the Bill had been lost through the factious opposition of the tenants; and if the tenants had really been factious, the Government might have granted the Letters Patent sought for by the College. The tenants accordingly accepted the arbitration of the Government of the day; and it was on this ground that they had always appealed to the Government to protect them when it was found that the Bill was practically unworkable. The letter from the tenants could not properly be regarded as a contract, but only as a courteous letter sent at the end of a long controversy. He (the Earl of Leitrim) had himself paid as much as £4,500 to the College, when he only received £700 from his own tenants, which was the best testimony he could give of the anomalous character of this tenure. But he did not object to that, for he found himself in the position in which he was placed, and so he paid the money like a man. All he asked was that, their rents having gone up in a good time, some recognition should be taken of the bad time. The present Bill was based on the evidence of the Provost of Trinity—not the present Provost—oh, no!—but Dr. Macdonald, who gave evidence in 1844—who gave evidence before the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the occupation of land in Ireland. The object of the Bill was to ascertain the real letting value of the land by substituting not theory, but actual facts, for the scheme which had proved so unworkable. Since the Bill had been last before their Lordships, the College authorities had, to some extent, abandoned the idea of a contract, and had suggested various Amendments to the Bill which the

tenants were unable to accept. Their desire was that the merits of the scheme should come before a Select Committee, and they were quite willing to abide by the result. Nothing, he thought, could be fairer than that; and he did not see how the noble and learned Earl could say that there was any intention on the part of the tenants to break their leases. That he distinctly denied, and, in conclusion, would move the second reading of the Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª." —(*The Earl of Leitrim.*)

THE EARL OF REDESDALE (CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES) said, he could not imagine anything more dangerous than the principle sought to be established in regard to lessors by this Bill. This was, in fact, a proposal to allow one of the parties to a contract, who might be dissatisfied, to come forward to Parliament for a Private Act, in order to break it through, so that he might get more favourable terms for himself. It was a practice which, if allowed, would be at all times unfair and unjust, and would lead to great confusion, unless the consent of the lessor was first obtained. The noble Earl (the Earl of Leitrim) had tried hard to persuade them that there was no contract or arrangement; but, in his (the Earl of Redesdale's) opinion, the arrangement of 1851 was one of very great importance. This Bill was utterly inadmissible, unless their Lordships were prepared to lay down the principle that any tenant was at liberty to bring in a Private Bill to have his rent fixed at his own valuation, and thereby render no property safe from one end of the United Kingdom to the other.

EARL CAIRNS said, he could not help expressing his surprise at hearing the noble Earl (the Earl of Leitrim) say that the College authorities had been guilty of fraud.

THE EARL OF LEITRIM said, he would explain it. The Act of Parliament provided that the costs of arbitration and inquiry, and all proceedings consequent thereon, should be borne and defrayed by the party requiring the same. Yet, in face of that, they had received the letter to which he had referred from the solicitor of the College.

EARL CAIRNS thought the noble Earl would himself regret, upon reflection, that he had made such a charge without having the slightest foundation for doing so. He objected not only to the details of the Bill, but also to its principles. The case made by the Bill was very simple. As he understood it, the position was this—Trinity College had a considerable amount of landed property, 70,000 acres, let to about 50 tenants. These tenants had become middlemen, and held, by lease, the perpetuity on certain terms. Owing to the depreciation of landed property through the action of the Legislature brought to bear upon the occupying tenants, the rent paid by the occupying tenants had been considerably reduced. Thus, the middlemen were unable to get the rents they formerly did. Then they came to the landlords, Trinity College, and said they objected to pay the rent they had agreed to pay. Now, they were promoting the Bill now before their Lordships' House—a Private Bill—in order to alter the terms under which their leases were held. If that were not an attempt to break a lease he had never heard of one, and he did not know what it was. The noble Earl said—"We do not want to break our leases; we want to keep them." He dared say they did. They wanted to keep them, but to alter their terms. They wanted to get rid of the old form of valuation, and introduce the entirely new principle of arbitration. That might be a right or a wrong principle; but it was contrary to the contract of which they were trying to get rid by means of a Private Bill. If the subject-matter of the Bill was proper for a Private Bill, it ought to go before a Select Committee; but if it was improper to bring forward such a Bill, it ought to be rejected altogether. They had heard a great deal of the Private Act of 1851, but the object of that Act was very simple. It was simply an Act to allow the Trinity College authorities to grant perpetuity leases in lieu of leases for 21 years, and it provided that every 10 years either party should be entitled to demand a revision of rent. The only consideration for making the change was this right of decennial valuation. It was said that there was no contract; but nothing was more clear than that the tenants agreed to the arrangement. Now they wished to get rid of the terms of their tenure, and he repeated that if this was not an attempt

to break leases he did not know what it was. What was the difference between the tenants of Trinity College and other tenants in respect to this matter, and why should they be able to bring forward such a Private Act? It would be fatal to all contracts if the tenants of a public Body were permitted to set aside a contract into which they had deliberately entered. In the case of the Irish Land Act of 1881, one of the great matters of discussion put forward by those who were strong advocates of a considerable change in all property in Ireland was, that there should be a power of opening up and of breaking all leases in Ireland. The Government of the day had not acceded to that proposal at the time, nor had they done so up to the present time. But, if this Bill were to be passed, he could not see how their Lordships could logically oppose that principle in a Public Bill; for the fact that this property was held by a public trust, he contended, was no reason whatever why different principles should be applied in this case from what were applied in ordinary cases of land tenure. If they agreed to alter these leases, as proposed by the Bill, it would give the power of altering the terms of leases all over Ireland, for what argument could they use against it? In conclusion, he hoped that their Lordships would reject the second reading of the Bill.

LORD FITZGERALD, in strongly supporting the second reading of the Bill, suggested that it should be referred to a Select Committee, where, if the Preamble were not found to be proved, the Bill might then be disposed of accordingly.

LORD CARLINGFORD (LORD PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL) said, that on a former occasion the proposal made on the part of the tenants of Trinity College was the appointment of a Royal Commission. The Government did not think it part of their duty to undertake the appointment of such a Commission, and he had, therefore, opposed that Motion; but on the present occasion, as this was a Private Bill, the Government as a Government did not propose to take any part in it. But he, personally, like his noble and learned Friend (Lord Fitzgerald), was disposed to vote for the second reading of the Bill, as he was not by any means convinced by the arguments of the other side, thinking as he did that the points which had been raised were essentially matters for Committee. It was a matter affecting the rights of the parties concerned, and was properly one for a Private Bill Committee, for it in no way touched public interests.

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD said, he was surprised that the noble Lord opposite (Lord Carlingford) should speak of the Bill as one which in no way interfered with public rights, and as only touching private interests. Leases were matters of public interest, and he was astonished to hear the noble and learned Lord (Lord Fitzgerald) hold out hopes that all leases might be broken at some future date. His noble Friend (the Earl of Leitrim) might well cry out —"Save me from my friends!" for if the noble and learned Lord's proposals were carried out, the noble Earl who moved the second reading of the Bill (the Earl of Leitrim) would be in a worse position than he was at present. These tenants of the College had, of their own accord, entered into a contract, and were bound to adhere to it. It would be impossible at the present moment to ascertain what was the letting value of land in Ireland, as the Land Act had thrown all the relations between landlord and tenant into a hopeless state of chaos, upon which it was impossible to base any calculations. The noble and learned Lord had pointed out that it was the Land Act which brought about this Bill, which no doubt was the case. But interests were involved in this Bill which had been thought too sacred to be dealt with in the Land Act, and a new Land Act was being introduced in the form of a Private Bill. No class had suffered so much from the Land Act as those who had mortgages and charges on their property. Yet they had not been relieved. Like the persons claiming relief under this Bill, he (the Marquess of Waterford) was himself a middleman; but he had never asked for an Act of Parliament on his own behalf. Trinity College, the tenants, and the Government had entered into a contract which was indorsed by an Act of Parliament. If that was to be set aside, what arrangement in the future would be binding between parties? His noble Friend (the Earl of Leitrim) had said that there was no contract. However, the noble and

learned Lord opposite (Lord Fitzgerald) admitted that there was a contract, but, because certain tenants objected, thought it right that the Bill should be read a second time, and the matter inquired into. But to read the Bill a second time would be to admit a most dangerous principle which ought to be repudiated. This proposal was most dangerous, and if accepted by their Lordships would probably lead to serious results.

LORD BRAMWELL said, it was clear that these tenants of Trinity College had entered into a bargain with that institution; they now felt it irksome, and wanted to be relieved from it; but that was a violation of agreement which Parliament could never sanction. The bargain had been made, and they were bound to stand by it. All the Act of Parliament did was to give legality to the bargain between the parties; and in resisting this attempt to evade it he should vote against the second reading.

LORD ORANMORE AND BROWNE said, he should also oppose the second reading.

LORD ZOUCHE supported the second reading of the Bill, in the belief that the subject was one well deserving the consideration of a Select Committee.

On Question? .Their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 16; Not-Contents 42: Majority 26.

Resolved in the *negative.*

EDUCATIONAL ENDOWMENTS (IRELAND) BILL.

(*The Lord President.*)

(NO. 44.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD CARLINGFORD (LORD PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL), in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, it was a Bill for the purpose of reforming and re-organizing the educational endowments of Ireland—a Bill which their Lordships had agreed to read a second time towards the end of last Session, but which, in consequence of the position of Government Business caused by the events of that period, they were prevented from passing into law. The present Bill was identical, or all but identical, with that of last year; and, as he had given a full explanation of its provisions on that occasion, he would not occupy the time of their Lordships by repeating it now. It would be enough if he said that the object of the Bill, which was a very important one, was to do at last for Ireland what ought to have been done many years ago—namely, to re-organize, revise, and reform her educational endowments in the same manner, by the same methods, and on the same principles, as those on which the educational endowments of England and Scotland had been and were now being revised and reformed. The case in favour of this revision and reform was of the strongest possible description. Inquiries of every kind had gone on year after year, or rather generation after generation. Committee after Committee, and Commission after Commission, had all come to the same conclusion—that the very considerable endowments of Ireland were, in their present condition, very far indeed from conferring the benefits which they ought to confer, and were, to a large extent, wasted. The Bill provided that these endowments should be dealt with by an Executive Commission. There was to be no more inquiry. That had been accomplished to excess. The Commission would have power to revise and reform the endowments in the same way as those of England and Scotland had been and were being revised and reformed. The Bill had been framed on the same lines as the English and Scotch Bills, conferred the same powers on the Commission, and contained the same safeguards. He begged to move the second reading of the Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª." —(*The Lord President.*)

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Friday* next.

MINISTER FOR SCOTLAND—SCOTCH NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF MINTO, who had the following Question on the Paper:—

"To ask Her Majesty's Government, Whether it is intended to introduce a Bill on the subject of establishing a new department for the administration of Scottish business; and, if so, whether the superintendence of the Scottish national schools will be included in its functions,"

in rising to ask it, said, their Lordships would be separating in a few days for the Easter Holidays; and, therefore, he thought it was not premature to make an inquiry of Her Majesty's Government as to the Business for the remainder of the Session. At all events, he thought it was perfectly legitimate on his part to ask for some information in answer to the Question he had placed on the Paper. Their Lordships would no doubt recollect what passed on this subject last year. A Bill was introduced last Session into this House; it passed through various stages, in the course of which it received several Amendments, and it stood for third reading on the 10th July. The House assembled on that day, expecting to go on with the Bill; and it seemed that after another half-hour's talk the Bill might have passed this House and been sent down to the House of Commons; but it so happened that, two days before, a division had been taken on the subject of Parliamentary Reform, and a decision had been come to which was evidently not acceptable to Her Majesty's Government. In consequence of that decision the Government decided to throw over all their other legislation, and this measure, among others, was sacrificed; and in that connection he must say there was more alacrity shown in giving it up than seemed to him to be necessary, because, as he had said, another half-an-hour would have sufficed to send it from this House down to the House of Commons; and if it were not considered desirable to pass the Bill in those circumstances, at all events they would have had the credit of passing it in this House. However, as it nearly passed this House, he thought it very desirable that a Bill of the same character should be introduced this Session; and in regard to the second part of his Question, whether, in the event of such Bill being introduced, the subject of education would be included in the functions of the new Department, he begged to intimate that, unless that was done, they had really better leave the subject alone. It seemed to him to be quite ridiculous to propose the formation of a great Department for Scotland at all, unless they introduced that very important subject; and, for his part, he did not care for a Bill at all unless that were done. He believed the desirability of including education had been generally and heartily approved of in Scotland; and in proof of that assertion he would remind their Lordships that at the great representative meeting of Liberals and Conservatives which was held in Edinburgh last year, on the subject of appointing a Scottish Minister, though it was not proposed that the matter of education should be there discussed, yet, if there was any one subject that came out more distinctly than another, it was the desire of the people of Scotland that the education of Scotland should be managed by a purely Scottish Board. He might say, further, that it seemed to him to be of great importance that the Privy Council should have nothing whatever to do with it. He thought it was contrary to the historical characteristics of education in Scotland that it should be managed from London; and he was perfectly certain that the whole subject would be much better managed if it could be entirely separated from all control of the Privy Council in London.

THE EARL OF FIFE said, that before the Question was answered, he wished to make a suggestion to those who, like himself, had taken a considerable interest in this matter. It had always been a subject of great regret to Scotsmen that in the last two Sessions of Parliament there should have been abortive attempts made to deal with this question; and he considered that the time had now arrived when they had a right to ask Her Majesty's Government whether they intended to create a Scottish Minister who should really, in all respects, have control over all Scottish affairs, and should be, in every sense of the word, a strong Representative of the country, and able to deal with all its interests. He, therefore, hoped that their two last failures to deal with the matter, together with the great difficulty there was at the present time of getting any legislation through the House of Commons, would really induce the Government seriously to take the matter into their consideration, because he hardly thought that the two Bills which they had produced on the subject had borne very great evidence of such treatment of the subject. His object in rising now, however, was simply to suggest that, unless the Government had made up their minds to place under the charge of this new Scottish Minister

all Scottish Administrative Departments, and especially all matters relating to education, which was a question of vital importance in Scotland, he should strongly advise them to abandon any attempt to deal with the question now in a dying Parliament. Of course, he might be told that there were differences of opinion in Scotland, as to whether education at all, or in part, or wholly, should be placed under this new Minister. He did not propose to offer at this time any argument on the point; but he should like to say that he had found very little differences of opinion on the subject amongst the general public, and all the arguments he had heard against placing education under this new Minister seemed to him to come entirely from professional sources, and to savour a great deal of red tape and Departmental jealousy. In his opinion, if the new Office was worth creating at all, it was worth while to place under it one of the most important matters affecting Scotland. Unless that was done, and unless a thoroughly representative Scottish Minister was appointed, it would be better to postpone any attempt to deal with the question until after a General Election, when the whole question could be submitted to the opinion of the people of Scotland.

THE EARL OF ABERDEEN said, that while he concurred generally with his noble Friends, he would venture to express the hope that if Her Majesty's Government were not at present in a position to announce that they intended to insert a provision in the Bill placing education under the new Minister they would be able to do so later on, when the measure was before the House. His noble Friend (the Earl of Minto) had given full expression, not only to the feeling of interest, but also, he might say, to the anxiety which existed in Scotland as to the intentions of the Government on this question. As to the general question of the introduction of some measure, the anxiety on that point had been set at rest by the general assurances of Her Majesty's Government.

THE EARL OF DALHOUSIE, in reply, said, he was happy, on behalf of the Government, to be able to answer the first part of the Question of the noble Earl (the Earl of Minto) in the affirmative, and to state that it was the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill providing for a Secretary for Scotland after the Easter Recess. It would be introduced into their Lordships' House. As to the question whether education should be given in charge to the new Minister, that was a matter which the Government thought had better be discussed when the Bill was before their Lordships. The Government did not think it would be convenient to enter into a discussion of the matter now, or even to state whether such a provision would, or would not, be inserted in the Bill. It was neither usual, nor was it convenient, to state before a Bill was produced what it would contain, and the Government did not think this was an occasion for departing from a salutary rule.

THE MARQUESS OF HUNTLY gave Notice that if the Bill did not contain the provision as to education, he would bring forward an Amendment, as he had done before, that education should be included in the jurisdiction of the new Department.

THE EARL OF MINTO asked, whether the Bill would be introduced in this House, or in the House of Commons?

THE EARL OF DALHOUSIE: I believe, as I have already said, it will be introduced in your Lordships' House.

SOLICITORS (IRELAND) BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to amend the laws for the regulation of the profession of solicitors in Ireland—Was *presented* by The Lord FITZGERALD; read 1ª. (No. 53.)

PRIVATE BILLS.

Ordered, That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after *Friday* the 19*th day of June* next:

That no Bill originating in this House authorising any inclosure of lands under special report of the Land Commissioners for England, or confirming any scheme of the Charity Commissioners for England and Wales, shall be read a first time after *Friday* the 24*th day of April* next:

That no Bill originating in this House confirming any provisional order or provisional certificate shall be read a first time after *Friday* the 24*th day of April* next:

That no Bill brought from the House of Commons authorising any inclosure of lands under special report of the Land Commissioners for England, or confirming any scheme of the Charity Commissioners for England and Wales, shall be read a second time after *Friday* the 26*th day of June* next:

That no Bill brought from the House of Commons confirming any provisional order or provisional certificate shall be read a second time after *Friday* the 26*th day of June* next:

That when a Bill shall have passed this House with Amendments these orders shall not apply to any new Bill sent up from the House of Commons which the Chairman of Committees shall report to the House is substantially the same as the Bill so amended:

Ordered, That the said orders be *printed* and *published*, and affixed on the doors of this House and Westminster Hall. (No. 54.)

House adjourned at Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 23rd March, 1885.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS — *Resolution in Committee*—County Officers and Courts (Ireland) [Pensions].

Resolution [March 19] *reported*—*Ordered*—*First Reading* — East India Loan (£10,000,000) [109].

Ordered — *First Reading* — Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 2) (Aller, &c.) * [107]; Local Government (Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 3) (Ashcot, &c.) * [108]; Registration of Voters (Ireland) * [110].

Second Reading—Cape of Good Hope (Advance) [101]; Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers) [99]; Army (Annual) [104]; Consolidated Fund (No. 2).*

Committee—Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) (*re-comm.*) [49]—R.P. [*Eighth Night*].

QUESTIONS.

—o—

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS (IRELAND)—ARKLOW BREAKWATER.

MR. W. J. CORBET asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, If he has received the special report called for on the subject of Arklow Breakwater, the foundations of which have given way, and whether he can state its purport; whether it is the fact that the grant of £15,000 and loan of £20,000 barely cover the contract and purchase-money paid to the Wicklow Copper Mining Company for their interests in the harbour; whether he can now give any estimate of the probable cost for extra work consequent on the failure; whether the ratepayers who guaranteed repayment of the loan, and who, through their representatives, condemned the plans of the Board of Works from the first, can now be held responsible or be called on to pay anything outside the amount guaranteed; and, whether the Government will fulfil their part by completing the harbour works in a satisfactory manner without further cost to the ratepayers?

MR. HIBBERT: The Chairman of the Board of Works visited Arklow on Saturday. His Report will reach me to-morrow, and I will communicate the result to the hon. Member. In the meanwhile, I may say that the greater part of the work done is quite uninjured, and that there is every reason to hope that no excess will arise on the total amount sanctioned, there being a margin of over £3,000 between that sum and the contract price. This being so, it is unnecessary to contemplate the contingency of an excess.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE—CHANCERY DIVISION.

MR. W. H. SMITH asked Mr. Attorney General, If Her Majesty's Government have taken into their consideration the serious delays in the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice to which attention was called last Session, and which still continues; and, whether they are now prepared to take any measure to secure to suitors a more rapid administration of justice?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES): It must be recollected that this block in the Court of Chancery is one that has existed certainly ever since the time of Lord Eldon's Chancellorship, and its removal is a work of great difficulty; but some progress has been made, and I am glad of this opportunity of stating how much has been done during the last 12 months, and is now being done, for relieving the pressure of business in the Chancery Division. It is impossible not to recognize the readiness with which the Lord Chief Justice and the Judges of the Queen's Bench Division have taken upon themselves the additional burden of rendering assistance to the Chancery Division. The Chancery Division has been relieved of Bankruptcy business. Until last year Bankruptcy was dealt with by a Chancery Judge; now it is transacted by a Judge of the Queen's Bench Division. The Queen's Bench Judges have taken upon themselves the whole burden of Circuits, and have relieved the Chancery Judges, so that all five Courts and

all Chambers of the Chancery Division are open throughout the sittings. Under the provisions of the Judicature Act of last year, a Queen's Bench Judge (Mr. Justice Field) is now sitting as an additional Judge of the Chancery Division, and will, as I am informed, by Easter have finished the list of causes transferred to him (50 in number). At the same time, an order has been made transferring 65 causes from the Chancery to the Queen's Bench Division, which will be heard next sittings along with the other non-jury causes in the Queen's Bench list. Any Chancery cause may now be set down for hearing in its place of origin at the Assizes instead of in London, if the parties, for any reason of expedition or expense, desire it; and if the number of causes so set down is large, special sittings will be arranged to take them. A very considerable part of the arrangements for more expedition in the Chancery Division rests with the Judges themselves of that Division; and an important Committee is now sitting (on which the Chancery Judges are powerfully represented), from which the Lord Chancellor expects material assistance in dealing with the causes of delay and expense. It is impossible to anticipate what their Report may be; but, no doubt, they will make important recommendations with reference to the most important causes of delay.

In reply to Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR and Mr. TOMLINSON,

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES) said, that both the taxing-office business and Chamber business were under the direction and control of the Judges themselves, and any question with regard to them would be for the consideration of the Committee to which he had referred.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACTS, 1876 AND 1877—DISPUTES BETWEEN HEAD SOCIETIES AND BRANCHES.

MR. TOMLINSON asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether his attention has been called to a decision of the Judge of the Wrexham County Court to the effect that he has no jurisdiction under the twenty-second section of "The Friendly Societies Act, 1875," 38 and 39 Vic. c. 60, to deal with disputes between a society and a registered branch of the same society as defined by "The Friendly Societies Amendment Act, 1876," 39 and 40 Vic. c. 32; whether it was the intention of the framers of the Acts that all such disputes should be within the scope of the twenty-second section of the Act of 1875; and, whether he will bring in a Bill to remedy this defect?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): In reply to the hon. Gentleman, I have to say that I know nothing of the decision of the Wrexham County Court Judge, except as it is referred to in the Question. I believe that it was the intention of the late Government, in framing the Friendly Societies Amendment Act, 1876, that all disputes within societies (except such as are subject to the special provisions of Section 30 of the Friendly Societies Act, 1875) should be within the scope of Section 22 of that Act. But the decision of a County Court Judge cannot, it appears to me, afford a sufficient ground for altering the law. If the higher Courts should confirm this decision I will then take the matter into consideration, with a view to see whether the law should be altered.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—AYR (LANDWARD) AND AYR (BURGH).

DR. CAMERON asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether Ayr (Landward) is a School Board district distinct from Ayr (Burgh), and how many children of school age are comprised in its population; whether it is true that beyond appointing a secretary and levying a small rate once in three years to pay his salary, the Ayr (Landward) School Board have done nothing to meet the educational wants of the district; and, whether it is the case that children belonging to Ayr (landward) district are educated at the schools and at the expense of the ratepayers of Ayr (Burgh) and Alloway; and, if so, whether he will take steps either to amalgamate the districts so as to make all the ratepayers contribute to the cost of the public education provided, or compel the board of the landward district to provide education for that district at its own cost?

MR. MUNDELLA: Ayr (Landward) is a school-board district, and distinct from Ayr (Burgh), and contains 161 children of school age. The hon. Member is quite correct in his statement of

the facts of the case, and the Department would before this have issued an order of amalgamation; but there is now before Parliament a Bill for the extension of the boundary of the borough which may affect the question. The issue of the order has, therefore, been postponed until the fate of the Bill is decided. Should the Bill be rejected the order will be issued.

RAILWAYS (INDIA)—BHOPAL, GWALIOR, AND CAWNPORE RAILWAY.

SIR JOHN HAY asked the Under Secretary of State for India, What was the date and nature of the agreement with a Company for the construction of the Bhopal, Gwalior, and Cawnpore Railway (605 miles); and, whether an offer was made for the construction of this line by the Great India Peninsula Railway Company in 1881?

MR. J. K. CROSS: An agreement was come to with the promoters of the Bhopal, Gwalior, and Cawnpore Railway in February last, as to the general terms on which a Company, to be called the Indian Midland Railway Company, was to be formed for undertaking the line in question, and a contract embodying in legal form the necessary provisions is now under consideration. The agreement is similar to that made with the Southern Mahratta Railway Company, with the modification suggested by the recent Select Committee on Indian Railways, and provides for the grant of interest at 3½ per cent on an estimated capital of £5,000,000, with one-fourth of the net earnings besides. For the first seven years, the Government also guarantee that the Company shall receive not less than 4 per cent interest per annum. An offer was made by the Great Indian Peninsula Railway in 1881 for the construction of a portion of the system which is to be undertaken by the new Company. But it was not favourably entertained by the Secretary of State in Council, as it involved an enlargement of the operations of the Great Indian Peninsula Company, combined with an extension of the Government guarantee.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—TRIM PETTY SESSIONS—MAJOR TRAILL, R.M., CO. MEATH.

MR. O'SULLIVAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is true that Major Traill, one of the resident magistrates for the county Meath, did, on the 2nd and 8th of August last, commence business at the Trim Petty Sessions Court two hours before the usual time for opening the Court and before any of the magistrates for the district arrived; whether the local magistrates complained to the Lord Lieutenant of Major Traill's conduct towards them; whether Major Traill's decisions on those occasions were reversed at Quarter Sessions by the County Judge and a full Bench of Magistrates; and, whether he will have steps taken to prevent the Petty Sessions Court being opened in future before the usual hour for so doing?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The circumstances referred to in this Question, which resulted in a temporary misunderstanding between Major Traill and some of the local Justices, have been before the Lord Lieutenant. The misunderstanding has been happily removed, and His Excellency has taken such measures as seem necessary to prevent the recurrence of such an incident.

EGYPT (THE MILITARY EXPEDITION)—SMALL POX.

MR. HOPWOOD asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he can state to what extent, and in what locality, small pox has occurred in the English Army in Egypt; and, whether the sufferers in these cases had been revaccinated according to custom before the attack?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON, in reply, said, from the first arrival of the Army in Egypt in 1882, down to the date of the latest Return, there had occurred among the troops, including the Forces on the Nile and at Suakin, 81 cases of small-pox, 7 of which had proved fatal. Of these, 38 had occurred at Cairo, and 20 at Dongola, the remaining 23 cases being at various stations. In 51 of these cases re-vaccination was known to have been performed; and it was believed that the regulations had been generally carried out with regard to the remainder.

LANDLORD AND TENANT (IRELAND)—SIR GILBERT KING'S TENANTS.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is a fact that twenty-four of

the county Sligo tenants of Sir Gilbert King, who went into the Land Commission Court in order to have fair rents fixed, and who paid in November last the rent due in the previous March, were serve in January with processes for the half-year's rent due in November last; and, whether there is any legal protection for tenants who avail themselves of the Land Act, against legal proceedings contravening the custom of the estate, and imposing costs upon them?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: This Question relates to legal proceedings taken by a private individual, as to which the Government has no information. If the gentleman referred to is acting within his legal powers the Government has no authority or right to interfere.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—DEATH OF DENIS MURPHY.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether District Inspector Davis, R.I.C. Castleisland, swore, at the inquest on the body of Denis Murphy, that from the first he did not believe the case was one of outrage, but that the shot had been fired from a constable's rifle; and, if so, why he reported the case to the county inspector as being one of outrage, why he made an affidavit to procure the arrest of innocent men, and why he caused the remand of those men in custody; whether both the constables concerned persisted for some time in denying that they had been in Murphy's house that night; whether the notes of evidence at the coroner's inquest will be laid upon the Table; whether his attention has been called to the remarks of the Lord Chief Baron, at Tralee, on the 13th inst., in his charge to the Grand Jury of Kerry, who declared that, apart from the question whether Murphy was wounded by accident, there could be no doubt that a very grave crime against the administration of justice had been committed; that there is nothing more calculated to shake confidence in the administration of justice than that members of the Constabulary force should lend themselves to what had been done in that melancholy case; and that he regretted, and deemed it unfortunate, that no bill had been presented to the Grand Jury in reference to the matter, so that the most searching investigation should be given to what appeared to him to be the very grievous misdemeanor of endeavouring to defeat, delay, or impede the administration of justice; why the Crown did not present to the Kerry Grand Jury a bill in respect of this offence; and, what will now be done in the case?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: District Inspector Davis did not swear at the inquest that, from the first, he did not believe the case was one of outrage. He stated that the surroundings did not strike him as being those of a genuine outrage. From the report of the constables, which was positive and unequivocal, he, in the discharge of his duty, reported to the County Inspector the case as communicated to him. He afterwards, from personal examination, satisfied himself that the case was not one of outrage. He did not make an affidavit to procure an arrest, nor did he cause any remand. The arrest was made by constables in his absence, and the remand was on their information. The constables did, for some time, persist in denying that they had been in Murphy's house, and this was one of the reasons for their dismissal. There is no objection to lay upon the Table the notes of the evidence at the inquest. The Lord Chief Baron did express himself to the effect stated. The charge of manslaughter was only dismissed on the 10th of March, and there was not then time to present a further charge to the Grand Jury at Tralee. A prosecution of another kind will now be instituted.

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—MODEL SCHOOL AT BAILIEBOROUGH, CO. CAVAN.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether Mr. Fream, the principal teacher of the model school at Bailieboro', county Cavan, is, and is known to be, a Freemason; whether, of the children attending the school, about two-thirds are Catholics; whether, owing to the refusal of the local landlord to grant a site, there is no other school available for the Catholic children of the place; whether he is aware that by an Encyclical Letter of the 20th of April 1884, the Sovereign Pontiff directed the Bishops of the Catholic Church to use all possible precaution to keep the young

apart from the influence of masters and schools connected with Freemasonry; whether the Catholic clergy of Bailieboro' refuse to visit the model school in question; and, whether, having regard to the recent declaration of the Right honourable gentleman that the Board of Education do prohibit such action on the part of any teacher as is calculated to interfere with the attendance at his school of children of any religious creed, what course of action the Commissioners will adopt in regard to the case of Mr. Fream?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am informed that there is, and has been for the last 17 years, a National School in Bailieborough under the management of the parish priest. It would therefore appear that the Catholic children who attend Mr. Fream's school do so by their own or their parents' choice.

NATIONAL SCHOOLS (IRELAND)—TEACHERS' EXAMINATIONS.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What are the "certain cases" referred to in paragraph (c) of the fifteenth regulation regarding the teaching of extra branches in Irish National Schools, and whether they include the cases of teachers who have passed the matriculation examination, and the first University examination, in the Arts course of the Royal University of Ireland?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am informed that the cases referred to cannot be specifically enumerated, but that the regulation does not apply to subjects in the first University examination of the Royal University in which the teacher has passed creditably.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—BRAILES ENDOWED SCHOOL—A POLITICAL SCHOOLMASTER.

MR. WILLS asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, If Mr. A. C. Bishop, master of the parish school at Brailes, South Warwickshire, has recently received three months' notice from the school trustees; and, if so, what reasons are assigned for such dismissal; whether Mr. Bishop has held his present mastership nearly nine years, and lately received an advance in salary, and how the work of the school is reported on by Her Majesty's Inspector; if, since the notice was given, the vicar of the parish has signed the usual departmental paper, to the effect that the school managers are satisfied with him; and, whether Mr. Bishop has recently taken part in the formation of a Liberal Club in the village of Brailes?

MR. MUNDELLA: My answer to the different paragraphs of the Question of the hon. Member are in every case in the affirmative; but I have to add that this is an endowed school, and under the scheme the master is precluded from accepting any other office, and is removable "without the assignment of cause." The Trustees object that he has accepted other offices in violation of the scheme, and they also object to his taking a prominent part in politics. I need hardly say that I have no power to interfere.

PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—WORKS AT EASKY AND AUGHRIS.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What is the amount of the estimate by the engineer of the Irish Board of Works for the pier at Easky (county Sligo), and for the pier at Aughris (county Sligo); has the work been given to a contractor; and, if so, for what amount in each case; when are the works to be commenced; and what time, if any, is fixed for their completion; will copies of the plans and specifications in detail be furnished to the county surveyor of Sligo; what is the cause of the delay in proceeding with the Pullendiva (county Sligo) Pier and Harbour improvement works, for which the Fishery Commissioners recommended a grant of £2,600, and for which the Board of Works furnished plans and specifications so long ago as the 22nd of July last year; whether, in constructing the existing works, the Board used concrete in situ instead of concrete blocks, as stated in the specification, and what difference this made in the outlay, whether the Government are aware that, in the present condition of the works, boats cannot be hauled up or beached, nor can they lie inside, and that it is sometimes very dangerous to attempt to land at the steps; and, what will be done to make the works of practical use to the fishing population?

MR. HIBBERT: The estimate for the work at Easky was £4,000, and the contract has been let for £3,553; the corresponding figures for Aughris are £2,000 and £1,898 respectively. The contractors are under bonds to commence the works during the present month, and complete them by November 1 and October 1 next respectively. Plans and specifications will be furnished to the county surveyor, should the Grand Jury so require. As regards Pullendiva, the hon. Member is under a misapprehension, no final recommendation having yet been received from the Fishery Piers and Harbour Commissioners; and, meanwhile, nothing can be done.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND) — MR. SAMUEL DONALDSON, J.P., CO. DONEGAL.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Lord Chancellor of Ireland has received two letters of the 16th of June and 11th of October 1884, addressed to him by Mr. James Kee, of Altnaparte, Welchtown, county Donegal, charging Mr. Samuel Donaldson, a justice of the peace for that county, with having, by fraudulent means, procured from the representative body of the Irish Church a sum of sixty-two pounds; and also with having, in his capacity as registrar of the dispensary district of Cloghan, in the union of Stranorlar, systematically extorted money by overcharging for certificates, in contravention of the law; whether two letters from Mr. D. Blackburn, making similar complaints respecting Mr. Donaldson, were also received by the Lord Chancellor; whether both Mr. Kee and Mr. Blackburn offered, in their letters, to give evidence in verification of the charges; whether the Lord Chancellor ever acknowledged the receipt of any of the letters; whether he made any inquiry into the truth of the allegations; and, if not, for what reason; and, what steps the Government will now take in respect to Mr. Donaldson?

MR. CAMPBELL - BANNERMAN: The Lord Chancellor informs me that he received two letters from Mr. Kee containing charges against Mr. Donaldson. The charges were made in vague and scandalous terms; and as no materials were furnished to show that there were any true grounds for them, the Lord Chancellor declined to take any notice of the letters. The Lord Chancellor only received one letter from Mr. Blackburn. It made no charges whatever; but appeared to the Lord Chancellor to be an attack on Mr. Donaldson's position and calling which was not deserving of notice.

MR. SEXTON: I beg to say that I will forward the right hon. Gentleman a specific statement of facts establishing a charge of fraud against this gentleman.

MR. CAMPBELL - BANNERMAN: If there is any charge of fraud it must be tried in a public Court. The Lord Chancellor would not act on private communication in such a matter.

SUEZ CANAL—THE PROPOSED COMMISSION.

MR. NORWOOD asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he can give the names of the British representatives on the proposed Commission to draw up the agreement for the neutrality of the Suez Canal; and, whether he can lay a copy of their instructions upon the Table of the House?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The British Representatives will be Sir Julian Pauncefote, Permanent Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and Sir Rivers Wilson, Comptroller General of the National Debt. The Instructions cannot be laid on the Table at present.

MR. ONSLOW asked, considering that India had had to pay a very large sum for the maintenance of the Suez Canal, as stated by Her Majesty's Government, whether it would not be proper to put an officer of Indian experience on the Commission?

[No reply.]

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked, whether, before the meeting of the Commission, there would be any Instructions given in the shape of a basis for the conduct of the Commissioners?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE, in reply, said, that the Circular Despatch of Lord Granville, which had long been in the hands of hon. Members, contained the basis of proceedings.

MR. GIBSON: May I ask when the Instructions to the Commission will be laid before Parliament?

[No reply.]

MR. GIBSON: Will Parliament ever be told anything about the Instructions?

[No reply.]

MR. ONSLOW said, he would put a Question on the Paper on the subject.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN said, that, in consequence of the refusal of the noble Lord to answer the Questions, he begged to give Notice that he should move an Address to Her Majesty that, before the agreement with respect to the Suez Canal was concluded, it should be submitted to the House.

MR. GIBSON: I have asked the noble Lord when he will lay the Instructions before Parliament, and he has not given an answer.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I must ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman to put the Question on the Paper.

SUEZ CANAL—NAVIGATION OF THE CANAL — INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

MR. GOURLEY asked the noble Lord to be good enough to inform the House, Whether the new International arrangements regarding the navigation of the Suez Canal will admit of its being used for the passage of ships of war and troops belonging to Powers at war with each other; if so, whether it is intended that they may engage in hostilities within or in the immediate neighbourhood of the mouths of the Canal; and, further, to inquire if the new regulations will be binding upon Turkey and Egypt with Nations with whom they may be at war?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative; to the second, in the negative. In reply to the third part, I have to state that such was the intention of the Circular of January 3, 1883, which is adopted as the basis for the International Agreement.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—ELECTION OF GUARDIANS—DUNFANAGHY UNION.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Why voting papers for the election of guardians in the Dunfanaghy Union have not been issued to forty-four occupiers in the Magheraclogher Division, twenty-nine occupiers in the Munacladdy Division, and fourteen for the Dunlewy Division, who claimed in respect of holdings the valuation of which is higher than the yearly rent; and, why voting papers have not been issued to Hugh O'Donnell, Dunlewy, whose aggregate valuation is £5 10*s.* and to Mr. Heburn, whose tenements in actual occupation are valued at about £60?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Voting papers have not been issued to the persons referred to in the first paragraph of the Question, because they are all valued under £4, and are, therefore, not ratepayers within the meaning of the Act. A voting paper has been sent to Hugh O'Donnell. The Returning Officer states there is no such name as Heburn on the rate book of the Union.

INDIA — THE PERMANENT SETTLEMENT OF BENGAL, BEHAR, AND ORISSA, 1793.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR asked the Under Secretary of State for India, If he will now be able to present to the House as brief a memorandum as the subject will allow, showing the main heads of the arrangements connected with the permanent settlement of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa, entered into in 1793, so as to bring out the nature and extent of the provisions for the protection of the cultivators, also the money settlements between the Zemindars and the Government, the amounts to be paid to Government and amount to be retained by the Zemindars, contrasting these estimates with those of modern times so as to show the differences; and, further, information to be supplied, regarding public functions to be performed and public works to be executed by the Zemindars, and how far these obligations have been fulfilled and works of a character beneficial to the cultivator have been carried out?

MR. J. K. CROSS: On Thursday last I answered a Question very similar to the one now put to me by my hon. and gallant Friend, and asked him to await the presentation of Papers, which I hoped would contain the information he wishes to obtain. I must again repeat my answer, saying, also, that the Secretary of State cannot issue such a Memorandum, as it would necessarily

involve questions of a very controversial character.

EGYPT (FINANCE, &c.)—THE INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENT.

MR. M'COAN asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Where, in either the Declaration or Convention on the subject of Egyptian finance which have been communicated to the House, is to be found any provision precluding "international interference with the affairs of Egypt" which supplies warrant for the statement he was understood to make on Wednesday last, that Her Majesty's Government joined in the guarantee of the proposed new Egyptian loan only on this understanding; and, whether, in the absence of any such provision in the Declaration or Convention, any other, and what, guarantee against such interference has been obtained?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH asked the right hon. Gentleman, Whether his statement that the proposed International Guarantee does not involve International interference with the affairs of Egypt is based on any statement made or assented to by the Powers; and, if so, what that statement is; what were the reservations on the part of Russia which he referred to on Wednesday last, and why they are not included in the formal Declarations; and, whether the whole of Lord Northbrook's Report is included in the Papers to be presented?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): In reply to the hon. Gentleman below the Gangway (Mr. M'Coan), and also to the first part of the Question of the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), I have to say that my words on Wednesday last are correctly quoted by the hon. Gentleman and the right hon. Baronet. I said that the proposed International Guarantee did not involve International interference with the affairs of Egypt, and I referred to the Anglo-French Guarantee of 1855, which we expressly named as our model, and which I stated was a purely financial arrangement, notably giving no right to England or France to interfere in the affairs of Turkey. We did not think it necessary to introduce into the Declaration or the Convention any reference to a claim which had not been put forward, and for which we did not conceive that any occasion had been given. In reply to the second part of the Question of the right hon. Baronet, I have to say that the Russian reservations will be found in Nos. 17, 19, 21, and 24 of the Egyptian Blue Book, which has been, or will be, distributed this afternoon. The third part of the Question has been already answered by my noble Friend the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs some days ago.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: The third part of the Question has not been entirely answered. In the Papers circulated on Saturday there were certain extracts from Lord Northbrook's Report recommending an increase in the financial powers of the Egyptian Government and the improvement of the administration of Egypt. I wish to ask, if the right hon. Gentleman will permit me, whether the whole of Lord Northbrook's recommendations on this subject have now been published, or whether any further extracts from his Report dealing with these matters will be published? With regard to the first part of the Question—the answer to which I am afraid I cannot consider satisfactory—I should like to ask, Whether the House is to understand that no communications have passed between Her Majesty's Government and the Powers on the question whether the proposed Guarantee will or will not involve International interference with the affairs of Egypt?

MR. M'COAN: The right hon. Gentleman does not seem to have answered any single point in the Question which I asked him. The right hon. Gentleman has said that this Convention was framed upon the Turkish Convention of 1855. I read that Convention carefully this morning, and I found nothing whatever that touches the present subject.

MR. GIBSON also rising to interrogate the right hon. Gentleman——

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): I cannot undertake to reply to so many Questions at once.

MR. GIBSON contended that the right hon. Gentleman had not said that any provision in any shape or form had been made to carry out his assurance. In the course of his statement on Wednesday last, the right hon. Gentleman,

referring to the Guarantee, not only said that it did not involve International interference, but used these words—"Neither did we object to it, provided it did not involve International interference." He wished to know how the Government had become satisfied on that point?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, the right hon. Baronet had asked him a very fair Question, and he had answered it. It was not his duty to go beyond the limits of the Question in his reply; and therefore he did not think it necessary to quote other parts of his statement to which the right hon. Gentleman had not referred. The Government had not deemed it necessary to introduce into the Declaration or Convention any reference to a claim which had not been put forward. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. M'Coan) then asked him whether, in the absence of any such provision, any other Guarantee had been obtained. He (Mr. Childers) thought that was clearly covered by his answer, which was "No."

MR. M'COAN: Then I may take it for granted that there is no assurance or Guarantee against International interference?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): No.

MR. GORST hoped the House would receive the fullest information on the subject.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: The hon. Gentleman has not answered my last Question.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, he apologized to the right hon. Baronet for omitting to answer his, among such a shoal of Questions. It was not intended to lay any part of Lord Northbrook's Report on the Table.

PARLIAMENT — PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—THE SMOKING ROOM.

MR. ONSLOW asked the Junior Lord of the Treasury, Whether he would use his influence with the Chief Commissioner of Works, to confer a favour on many Members of the House, by removing the large pictures in the Smoking Room, and to substitute in their place large maps of different portions of Her Majesty's Empire?

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: The First Commissioner would have no objection to comply with the wish of the hon. Member provided that there was a general desire among hon. Members to substitute maps for the pictures now in the Smoking Room. But it does not appear that there is such a desire.

GENERAL GORDON'S DIARIES.

MR. BOURKE asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he has now any statement to make with respect to "handing over to his relatives" Vol. 6 of General Gordon's Journal; whether this has been done; and, whether he has received any replies from General Gordon's relatives on the subject?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I am still in communication with Sir Henry Gordon on this subject, and I hope very shortly to be able to make a statement to the House. It is possible we may not be able finally to consider the question of the disposal of these diaries until the other five are received, which, as we have heard from Lord Wolseley, have been sent by the mail of March 10.

FRANCE AND CHINA—HOSTILITIES—INTERNATIONAL LAW—THE RIGHT OF SEARCH.

MR. BOURKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government will ascertain whether the French Government have given the same directions as to searching German ships on the high seas as those which have been acted upon with respect to British vessels?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The French Government have notified to the German Government their intention to exercise the right of search of neutral vessels. The notifications to this effect, which have been published in the German *Official Gazette*, show that the communications received by the German Government from the French Government are similar to those received by Her Majesty's Government from the French Ambassador in London upon this subject.

SUSPENSION OF EVICTIONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

MR. MACFARLANE asked the Secretary of State for the Home Depart-

ment, If, the Government having decided not to bring in the promised Bill dealing with the land question in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland before Easter, he will be good enough to say how soon after Easter it is proposed to introduce it?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, it was hardly possible for him to fix an exact date; but he hoped it would not be long dalayed.

CENTRAL ASIA — ENGLAND AND RUSSIA—THE RUSSO-AFGHAN FRONTIER.

MR. MACFARLANE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If Her Majesty's Government, having acquiesced in the continued occupation by Russian troops of several places alleged to be within the Afghan frontier, any steps are being taken to ascertain whether those places are within the frontier or not; whether the question is to remain undecided until an agreement has been arrived at between the Russian Commissioner and Sir Peter Lumsden, and if any positive date has been fixed for the arrival of the Commissioner to represent Russia; and, further, what course it is proposed to take in the event of the two Commissioners being unable to agree; if in such case the points in dispute will be referred to some neutral arbitrator?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I do not think that there would be any advantage in my going into these matters at the present moment; and I am, therefore, unable to reply to the hon. Member's Question.

MR. MACFARLANE: May I ask the noble Lord, if the House is to understand that so long as Russia neglects or fails to send a Commissioner to meet Sir Peter Lumsden, so long shall she be allowed to remain in possession of the places she now holds? I wish, also, to ask the noble Lord, if he can answer it without detriment to the public service, if when the original agreement between Russia and this country was made for the appointment of a Delimitation Commission, any approximate date was agreed upon for the Russian Commissioner to meet Sir Peter Lumsden; and, if he will state what that date was—I do not say to a day, but a month—and, whether any, and what, reason Russia has given for not keeping to that date?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: No, Sir; I am afraid I cannot answer that Question.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked, Whether Her Majesty's Government have taken any steps to cause the agreement or arrangement with the Government of Russia, relating to the respective positions of Russian, English, and Afghan troops on the frontier of Afghanistan, and now resting on a verbal assurance by the Russian Minister to the British Ambassador, to be recorded in a formal Document, bearing the signatures of authorized Representatives of the Russian and British Governments; and, if so, whether such a Document has been drawn up and signed?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: No, Sir; Her Majesty's Government have not done so.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: Are we, then, to understand that the agreement or arrangement, on which depends the issue of peace or war, depends upon the verbal assurance of the Foreign Minister of Russia?

[No reply.]

FIJI—MORTALITY, &c.

MR. CROPPER asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether Her Majesty's Government have received any Reports or Despatches from Sir William des Vœux, relative to the mortality alleged to exist among the people of Fiji, and also to the labour questions connected with the Native administration of the Colony; and, if so, whether he would lay such Correspondence upon the Table?

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY, in reply, said, he hoped very shortly to lay the Papers referred to on the Table.

ACCIDENTS IN MINES—REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION.

MR. J. LOWTHER asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, having regard to recent explosions in mines, the Report of the Royal Commission on Accidents in Mines could be accelerated so as to permit of some legislation on the subject being undertaken during the present Session of Parliament?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, he regretted very much the long-continued delay in the presenta-

tion of the Report. He had frequently urged that it should be accelerated, and he had received recently assurances that it might be soon expected, and he hoped that would be fulfilled.

CENTRAL ASIA—THE RUSSO-AFGHAN FRONTIER—REPORTED DISTURBANCE AT PENJDEH.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether there is information of any disturbance at Penjdeh; and, whether Her Majesty's Government have any information that the Russian officers have been exciting disturbances at Penjdeh; and, whether it is true, as reported in *The Daily News*, that Her Majesty's Government are prepared to assent to the Russian occupation of Penjdeh?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: No such information as that referred to in the first part of the hon. Member's Question has reached Her Majesty's Government. In regard to the further Question, of which the hon. Member gave me private Notice just before the House met, I think I must, as usual, ask him for Notice.

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—GENERAL GRAHAM'S FORCES—ACTION NEAR SUAKIN (MARCH 22).

COLONEL STANLEY asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he has received any further news from General Graham; and, whether, without detriment to the public service, he will communicate the same to the House?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I have only received one telegram from General Graham since those which were published in the papers this morning. This telegram has been sent to the newspapers, and has probably been already published in the evening papers. It is as follows:—

"From Lieutenant General Sir Gerald Graham to the Secretary of State for War.

"Suakin, March 23, 1885, 12.5 A.M.

"Following to Wolseley, March 22:—

"Following just received from M'Neill, 9 P.M.:—'Berkshire—Killed, Lieutenant Swinton and 12 men. Marines—eight men killed, 12 wounded. Navy—Killed, Lieutenant Seymour, six men. Royal Engineers—Captain Romilly and Lieutenant Newman killed. Indian Contingent—about 25 killed, including Major Von Beverhondt, and 70 wounded.

"'It is impossible at present to get further information. Enemy broke into square of zereba, which was imperfectly formed. Attack lasted about 20 minutes. Enemy lost near 1,000. Very great loss in transport camels, horses, and mules; and no firing from enemy at present.'

"On first hearing firing, at 2.45 P.M., I ordered out Guards, except one battalion previously despatched to Hasheen with convoy. Remaining battalions, with Horse Artillery, advanced two miles towards zereba, and were retired on receipt of telegram from M'Neill. Two battalions go out to-morrow with further supplies. I shall accompany Guards, and will send further details."

POST OFFICE—SIXPENNY TELEGRAMS.

DR. CAMERON asked the Postmaster General, Whether he is yet in a position to make any communication to the House with regard to the introduction of sixpenny telegrams?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE, in reply, said, that, having found it impossible to deal with the matter without amending the Telegraph Act, he had given Notice that he would to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill on the subject; and if he could bring it on at a reasonable hour he would take the opportunity of stating the intention of Her Majesty's Government.

PARLIAMENT—PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—WESTMINSTER HALL.

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL asked the Junior Lord of the Treasury, Whether he is aware that few honourable Members of this House have seen the complete design of the late Sir Charles Barry for the Houses of Parliament; and, whether he will cause a Copy of the general elevation to be placed in the Library before the Committee now sitting comes to a decision?

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE, in reply, said, all the drawings of the completed Houses of Parliament, according to the design of the late Sir Charles Barry, which are in the custody of the Office of Works, will be placed in the Tea Room.

MR. CAUSTON asked, Whether, in order to enable Members to judge of the effect of the west side of Westminster Hall were the works to be carried out there to be limited to restoring the buttresses and flying buttresses, he will, before the House is asked to decide upon the question of restoration, give instructions to have the painted screens in the two central bays removed, and the fly-

ing buttress flanking them temporarily finished in similar style to the pinnacles now exposed to view?

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: If, after the Westminster Hall Committee has presented its Report, hon. Members are desirous that my hon. Friend's proposal should be carried out, the First Commissioner sees no objection to it.

EGYPT (FINANCE, &c.)—THE INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENT.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I am anxious once more to repeat to the Prime Minister the Question I have put before him more than once; and that is whether he will consent to defer the discussion on the Egyptian Financial Arrangement until after Easter? I will remind the right hon. Gentleman that the Papers, which have been so long promised, are only now in the House, and have not yet been distributed to Members.

MR. GLADSTONE: With regard, Sir, to the question of fact, the bulk of the Papers have been in the hands of hon. Members since Friday evening, and were distributed on Saturday morning. I ought to have said that they have been accessible since Friday evening. A small number are, as I understand, only now accessible.

MR. GIBSON: I asked for the Papers, and was told they were not here.

MR. GLADSTONE (after consulting The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER): Then, Sir, they are not accessible yet; but I believe some portions have been accessible and have been distributed, but, I admit, no circulation of them, and it will begin to-morrow morning. That is the state of the case; but the bulk of the Papers were distributed on Saturday, earlier than the Foreign Office expected to be able to do so. As the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Stafford Northcote) has repeated his Question, I must refer him to the answer which I gave on Friday. I do not enter now into detail, because I believe the right hon. Gentleman intends to give an opportunity which will, perhaps, be more regular.

ADJOURNMENT—NEW RULES OF PROCEDURE (RULE 2).

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Then, Sir, not wishing to interfere with the Business of the House more than I can help, but feeling the great importance of this question, I have to request leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite question of urgent public importance — namely, the arrangements proposed for the discussion of the Draft Convention relating to Egyptian Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER asked, if it was the pleasure of the House that the right hon. Gentleman be heard?

MR. GLADSTONE: We do not object.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Sir, if it were only a question of the convenience of private Members, I should certainly not bring the matter before the House; but I feel that this is really a matter of very great public importance, and unless time is given before the discussion to which we are all looking forward neither the House nor the country will be able properly to become acquainted with the issues that are at stake, and the House will not be in a proper position to deal with the subject. This is not really a question of the interests of the bondholders. If it were a question of a few persons, and we were well acquainted with the circumstances of the case, it might be possible, in the course of a few days, easily to master the subject; but we have to look to matters far beyond the mere arrangement with the bondholders. We have to consider what the effect of such an arrangement before us may be on the future relations of this country with Egypt, and the position of this country with regard to the Suez Canal. We are at present kept to a very great extent in ignorance of what has taken place on this matter; for although the right hon. Gentleman says the bulk of the Papers have been accessible to the House since Friday evening last, there must be a very important section of the Papers with which we have not yet been made acquainted, such as those which refer to the proceedings since the 9th of February until the time of the conclusion of the Convention, on the 17th of March. If we are to depend upon the information we can get by Questions addressed to Ministers, we find very great difficulty indeed in getting that information which really opens the case to us. In this case it is peculiarly important, when we are dealing with that which must affect us in future years, that we should look

carefully into the meaning and probable operation of clauses which have been agreed to after long discussion—a discussion of more than two years, in fact—and of which the motives are not fully explained to us. The right hon. Gentleman, whenever any question is raised with regard to Egypt, is in the habit of referring us back to the fact that all the Egyptian policy took its rise in the policy which established the Dual Control in Egypt. If out of that have grown all our present difficulties, it ought to make us all the more careful how we sanction other arrangements which may prove similarly, or even more disastrous. With regard to the question of the finances of Egypt, we want to know and to judge for ourselves by observation what the arguments of the Foreign Powers were, what the arguments of the British authorities were which brought about the Settlement it took so long to bring about. We are anxious that nothing should be done in this Settlement which will lay us open to the dangers that must attend a Multiple Control or intervention. Are we secure from that, or are we not? When we listened to the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer last Wednesday we imagined that we should find when the Papers were laid before us that the interference or interposition of other Powers was entirely barred; but when we look at the Papers which are presented we have difficulty in finding any reference to the point; and when we ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether there is any definite provision on the subject, he says—"No; it is not necessary." Why, Sir, it is necessary, or it may very easily become necessary, from the circumstances of the case. It is very easy to form some anticipation of what might happen within the next two years which would not only justify but require the Egyptian Government to call for a new Commission, to which all the Powers would be invited, and that Commission would go into the whole of the financial arrangements of Egypt, and, therefore, into the administration of the country. It does seem to me that, as regards the dangerous possibility of any such interposition, it is most necessary that we should have a full opportunity of carefully discussing the subject, and thrashing it out in this House, in order that we may see, and the people of this country may see, what engagements the Government are entering into, and what are the provisions made for guarding against those dangers to which I have referred. I would call the attention of the House to the remarkable fact that not only is there a Convention with regard to the financial arrangements, but that our attention is particularly challenged to the fact that we are about to enter into a new arrangement for establishing regulations with regard to the Suez Canal. That is a matter which is vital to the interests of this country. It is a matter in regard to which we should have something further to guide us than what is contained in Earl Granville's Circular of 1883. That document itself, however, shows the necessity for further information. Its points are full of difficult questions and pitfalls, with respect to which we must be on our guard. If the House will look at the eight parts it contains, they will find that there are questions there which might give trouble every day, every month, every year. I do not know how we are to deal with this matter. The Government are, I admit, within their right; they are acting perfectly in accordance with the usage of Parliament in entering into an Agreement with other Powers without coming, as a preliminary measure, to this House; but when we have notice given that such a thing is going to be done, we are most anxious that we should have full information, and should obtain it while we have, to a certain extent, the power still in our hands; because, although we cannot deal with the Treaty that may be made with respect to the Suez Canal, we can deal with the Convention now before us with respect to financial matters, and are perfectly within our right in asking, before being called upon to discuss this question, to be allowed to discuss the question of the Treaty with regard to the navigation of the Suez Canal. We have a right to ask that before pledging ourselves to the financial question. It is necessary, the Prime Minister says, that the first step should be taken without delay towards sanctioning this financial arrangement. But why should we be in a hurry? He says there will still be time for us to consider the other stages of the Bill. But what is so curious is that the reason he gives for its being important that we

should take the first step now is a reason which almost excludes the possibility, or, at least, renders it extremely difficult, to reopen the question. He says the other Powers are waiting to see what we do. He practically says Parliament must give the first indication of its willingness to accept this Convention, and until it has done that the other Powers will not move. But, if this be so, have we not a right to say, give us time before we commit ourselves? If the right hon. Gentleman is correct in saying that it is necessary we should move early in order to dispose the other Powers to move at all, does it not show how important our first move is? If we are forced to discuss this matter on Thursday or Monday next, without the amount of consideration which the Easter Recess will afford, we shall find that we have committed ourselves in such a manner that, though we may not technically be bound, Her Majesty's Government will have a strong argument to show that we are. I do entreat the right hon. Gentleman to do justice to that which I am sure is the feeling of the great mass of the people of this country, as it is of hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House, and give us an opportunity of considering the important documents bearing on the question. We have had a part of the Papers laid on the Table on Friday. This is not a time when we have much leisure, and we have as yet scarcely had an opportunity of looking at these Papers, and there are still others to come. These are not Papers that can be merely read—they must be read and re-read, and compared backwards and forwards with the negotiations that took place and that proved fruitless some months ago, and with other matters. It is, therefore, extremely important that we should have an opportunity of examining the whole subject and coming to a definite conclusion with regard to it. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Sir Stafford Northcote.*)

MR. GLADSTONE: As the right hon. Gentleman, I hope, understands, I make no objection to his having moved the adjournment on this occasion. I think, if I may say so, that comparing it with other occasions when Motions for Adjournment have been made, it stands in a very favourable position, because it exactly exemplifies the sort of case which the Rule was made to meet. The right hon. Gentleman is quite within his right in raising the question of time, if he thinks it proper that the House should be asked to take into its serious consideration the Convention which has been framed by Her Majesty's Government, and has been signed by the Powers of Europe. What is the point at issue between us? It is not the question whether we should proceed on Thursday or on Monday. We should certainly extremely regret to postpone the preliminary Resolution from Thursday; but I do not say we would not have consented to postponing it to Monday by way of accommodation. But it is of very great importance that we should go on with the preliminary Resolution on Thursday, and I am afraid the stumbling block between us is that, whereas the right hon. Gentleman declines to give any judgment on this question before the Easter Recess, and has signified that Monday, the 13th of April, was the day on which he would be prepared to give a decision, we, speaking on the 23rd of March, three weeks earlier, feel it to be our absolute and bounden duty, as the persons responsible for the conduct of public affairs, to ask the House to consider this question, and to give a definite vote upon it before they separate for the Easter Recess. Sir, I would urge, for the sake of clearness, that we should put out of the way what the right hon. Gentleman has said with regard to the Suez Canal Convention. There is no great haste with regard to the Suez Canal Convention, such as we plead with regard to the main portions of this Agreement. The case of the Suez Canal Convention I will put aside in a few words. In the first place, the House is not called upon to give any vote whatever with respect to our proceedings in relation to the Suez Canal. We proceed in relation to the Suez Canal upon our general responsibility. That is my first point—that the House will neither gain nor lose anything in regard to the Suez Canal by the vote which we ask it to give before the Easter Recess upon the pecuniary operations of the Convention now concluded. Then, of course, arises this suggestion in the minds of hon. Members. They might

say — "You intend to deal with this great commercial subject in the dark, and to give us no opportunity of learning what are your views in respect to it before we find ourselves finally committed." To that question we give the most explicit answer. Upon almost every point of that subject, ever since January 5, 1883, the views of the Government have been definitely before the House in the despatch of Earl Granville, dated on that day. There is, I believe, hardly anything in point of particularity that we could add to that despatch, with the exception of one point, I think, which it would be quite easy to explain to the House at any time, and with regard to which, in my opinion, it is most just and fair that the House should be aware of our views before we proceed to any definite arrangement. Of our views in general it is aware; and I have not learned that there is any disposition to question them, or to enter into any conflict with them. But if there is, the House will have an opportunity, as it has had for two years, and that opportunity has not yet passed away. So much with regard to the Suez Canal part of the arrangement. It has really nothing whatever to do with the point now at issue between the right hon. Gentleman and the Government. The right hon. Gentleman says that it is not an affair of the bondholders only. That is most entirely and absolutely true. The bondholders have a material interest in this Convention; and it is desirable in their interests, no doubt, that the judgments of the different Legislatures should not be delayed. But, as far as they are concerned, their interest in the Convention would certainly not have led the Government to the very positive conclusions at which they had arrived with respect to the necessity of proceeding forthwith in this matter. I do not know whether the right hon. Gentleman meant to make a complaint of the answers given by Ministers to Questions when put as insufficient, or whether he only meant that from their nature they do not admit of giving a full explanation of this subject. I agree that the nature of Question and Answer does not admit of giving a full exposition of the views of the Government in reply; but I must say with some regret that the manner in which the answers of the Government on points of delicacy and importance are now almost habitually received with jeers and shouts—certainly in a portion of the House, but not in the portion in which the right hon. Gentleman sits; and it has not received any countenance whatever from him—but this manner certainly does constitute a serious difficulty and addition to the answering of Questions, and may compel the Government to adopt more restricted rules than they have hitherto, in their desire to accommodate the House, been willing to act upon. The right hon. Gentleman says that now is not the proper time for the people of this country to consider the important matters at issue in this Convention; and I, who am always contending that this House is overdone, and that this country is overdone, and has more work on its hands than it can satisfactorily get through, I am not the man to contend with the right hon. Gentleman that we are not always in a hurry with important questions. There are very few subjects indeed with respect to which that is not true. But these things are relative. What we ask is, that the House should, not less than a week after being in possession of the Papers submitted by the Government, proceed to give a vote upon them. That is the request of the Government. I would not urge that request against the right hon. Gentleman, excepting under the pressure of the most commanding considerations; but I am obliged to urge it, and I am obliged to adhere to it. I contend that, viewing the way in which the House of Commons has to transact its Business, and according to our ordinary rules and usages, those Papers, which are not of very great bulk, and the principal part of which, with the exception of 23 pages, has been in the hands of Members since Saturday—I cannot say that according to Parliamentary usage it can be considered as an insufficient time. We are absolutely bound as far as we are concerned, and it is my declaration to ask the House not to require more than sufficient time. The right hon. Gentleman says we must take care—and he is quite justified in saying it—that some past transactions go back to roots of long standing, and that we must take care that we do not have new roots planted. That is perfectly just and sound; and it expresses the desire we entertain that the most vigilant

care of this House should be applied in every matter relating to this tangled and difficult Egyptian business. But do not let us exaggerate the effect of this Convention. What is it that the House is about to commit itself to? It is about to commit itself to an International Guarantee. The amount to which we are to be committed is not a very large one; I believe the ultimate amount to which we are committed will be only £1,500,000; whereas the Guarantee, being a joint and several one, so far as we are concerned, there is, of course, a liability for the whole sum; and, further, on my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer no doubt will fall the burden of making a working arrangement, just as in 1855 the working arrangement of the Anglo-Turkish Loan devolved on the Chancellor of the Exchequer of that day. So far as I know, the points—the very material points—that the House has to consider, for its own sake, with the despatch which we ask it to observe are, first of all, the Guarantee; and, secondly, that in connection with that Guarantee there is an arrangement that during the period of two years we are to endeavour both to ascertain, and so far as possible to promote, the improvement of the real condition of Egyptian finance, so that there shall be no longer the question of the capacity of Egypt to bear or not to bear this or that charge. That, Sir, I believe, is the arrangement to which we ask the House to commit itself. The right hon. Gentleman says that he expected that the interference of the other Powers would be barred by some condition in the Agreement. I do not follow the right hon. Gentleman into that matter, because I think it is not quite *ad rem*. We are now considering the time at which we should take this question, and not the arrangement itself; otherwise I should be prepared to give a very conclusive answer.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I only used it as an illustration of the difficulty of understanding the point.

MR. GLADSTONE: So I understood it; but the whole argument would likewise be an illustration of the time required for the consideration of the Agreement. Therefore I take the liberty of passing that question by; but I make no reproach. Then we come back to the question—What is it that prevents the Government from acceding to the request of the right hon. Gentleman? I do not wish to argue this in a grudging spirit; but, in the first place, I admit he has every title to urge on his own account, and as the Representative of a large Party in this House, and every title to urge on account of the forbearance which he has shown in waiting patiently for the conclusion of the arrangements, which were not in our hands, but in those of other Powers, and with respect to which Parliament has been subjected to a delay which might have provoked some impatience. The reason why we take our position is this: we do not think that it is fair to expect Foreign Powers to act in this matter until the House of Commons leads the way. We have the principal responsibility. Sir, we have had more than the principal responsibility. For us this has been a matter of anxiety and solicitude all along, reaching to the very highest point; but as to the Foreign Powers it is quite different. Their position has been the position of the man in Lucretius—

"Suave, mari magno, turbantibus æquora ventis,
E terrâ magnum alterius spectare laborem."

To them it was a small matter whether this question went forward at a snail's pace or at a full canter. [MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Hear, hear!] The hon. Member for Eye cheers. He has at last got an inkling of what the matter really is. But for us it was very different indeed; because we were those who were tumbled about upon the sea in the storms and tempests, while the Foreign Powers, if they had chosen, were at liberty to stand on the shore and look on as calm spectators. Why are we in this great anxiety? Because the time has come when every expedient has been exhausted which could honourably be adopted for the purpose of staving off to a future day the financial difficulties of Egypt, and of avoiding Egyptian bankruptcy—Egyptian bankruptcy in a country where financial confusion might come also to mean confusion not financial, and other than financial—and where, whatever consequences ensued, be they financial or be they other than financial, it is upon us—not upon this Government alone, but on the Government of this country, whatever it might be, or the Parliament of this country, whatever it might be—that the whole difficulty really will fall. It comes to

that plain statement of the case. I am concerned to meet the wishes of the right Gentleman; but I cannot undertake to risk Egyptian bankruptcy in order to meet him. It is not at a future and a distant date that these difficulties may occur. Last year we stated, and with perfect truth, that the condition of Egyptian finance was very urgent, and so it was. Still, there were expedients —that of withholding the payments due to the Exchequer of this country, and that of withholding the Sinking Fund, which was undoubtedly a measure of the Egyptian Government which we could not refuse to approve, but which undoubtedly was a very strong measure, and which excited strong adverse feeling in the minds of the Powers of Europe. Whatever were the merits of these measures, they have gone by. We are at the end of our tether; there are no more expedients than can be used; and in the month of April, unless this House gives us the means by its Resolution—and that, we are convinced, will be sufficient—Egypt will be called upon as a matter of public faith to meet demands which she will have no means of meeting unless we are able to make such proper arrangements as are contemplated by this Convention. The other day the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin) observed to me, in the form of a Question, that I appeared to have forgotten that the House of Commons was not bound to approve the arrangement made by the Government, and that it might refuse its assent to the Convention. But I do not think, with all respect, that the hon. Member quite saw the true bearing of his own Question. Sir, if we are responsible for the affairs of this country, we cannot undertake, and we will not undertake, to face Egyptian bankruptcy through a failure to recognize the engagement into which we have conditionally entered. We cannot do it. Perhaps it will be said that others may be ready for that; and I suppose that is the case with an hon. Gentleman of great consideration on the other side of the House—I do not see him in his place—the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Bruce), who had given Notice before I entered the House to-night of a Motion condemning this Agreement. [*Opposition cheers.*] Very well; take care of your cheers, I advise you. ["Oh, oh!"] I do not think that is an uncommon method of advice in this House; and I do not see why I should not give it to the hon. and gallant Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) without being offensive. That hon. and gallant Member will understand my meaning directly. I will tell the hon. and gallant Member for West Sussex that if he is to succeed in his object, and if he induces the House to put a negative on this Agreement, which it is perfectly and absolutely entitled to do—we have done nothing which in the least degree impairs the Constitutional right of the House—it has full power to refuse its sanction to the engagement into which we have conditionally entered. But if it does so, and if in consequence the management of Egyptian finance so pass into hands other than ours, then I tell the hon. and gallant Member for West Sussex, and I tell the right hon. Gentleman opposite, that time is more valuable even to them than it is to us. And when they assume the responsibility which the hon. Member for Portsmouth is so anxious to bring upon them, and undertake to make some better Convention and devise some better arrangement than ours—I tell them they will have neither a week, nor a day, nor an hour to spare. Now, it will be understood why I say that if the House agrees to the Convention and expects us to proceed with Egyptian affairs, hon. Members will not be surprised at our laying before them very explicitly what we believe to be the absolute necessities of the case. But if the House desires that not we but hon. Gentlemen opposite should proceed with the management of those affairs, and that they should take our places for that purpose, it is still more necessary that the vote of the House under which they would receive their title should not be delayed. And I venture to say that if that contingency should come about, not one of the Gentlemen sitting on the opposite Bench, who may doubt now the soundness of the declaration that I am making, will doubt any longer after he has been for 48 hours in contact with the actual necessities of the case. I do not say a word at this moment about the Convention. Let it be the best or the worst that could possibly have been made in the circumstances, I have argued strictly on the question of time. I have said

that nothing but necessity would have led me to decline the request of the right hon. Gentleman. That necessity is absolute and inexorable; and I trust that the House, whatever course it may take on the merits of the Instrument, will recognize that the responsible Ministers of the Crown are not only entitled, but bound, to give their judgment in a case of such gravity and such emergency as to the time and moment at which it is their duty to ask the sanction of the House to the arrangement into which we have conditionally entered.

LORD JOHN MANNERS: The House, I think, will perceive that the real argument of the right hon. Gentleman for opposing the postponement of the discussion on the Convention till after Easter is simply this—We have brought the financial affairs of Egypt into such a state of hopeless confusion that if the House of Commons does not shut its eyes and close its ears and at once accept this Convention Egyptian bankruptcy must necessarily ensue. It is with this pistol held at our heads that the right hon. Gentleman turns round on the House and says—"I cannot give you time to consider this important proposal. You must accept it without further delay." That was really the right hon. Gentleman's principal argument, though no doubt there were minor arguments woven into his most skilful speech. Among them was this—that all the Foreign Powers are now agreed on this proposal; that it is essential that we should take the lead, and that the Powers of Europe are waiting on our deliberations and decisions. I would put this question to the right hon. Gentleman—Is it intended that this Convention, and all the financial arrangements depending on it, shall come into operation as soon as the British House of Commons has given its first vote; or is it intended that the sanction of all the Great Powers of Europe which have Parliaments shall remain subject to a similar Parliamentary vote? If he tells us that the Convention will not come into practical operation until the assent of the Parliaments of France and Italy, for example, has been obtained, then I put this question to the right hon. Gentleman—if we deliberate on this Convention now and give our sanction to it, when will the sanction of the Italian Parliament be obtained? I find from the papers that the Italian Parliament is on the eve of adjourning till a distant date in April. What, then, is to happen to the Convention? The right hon. Gentleman tells us that Egypt will be in a state of bankruptcy in the month of April. But the Italian Parliament will not have an opportunity of considering the Convention until nearly the end of April. And that may also be the case, for aught I know, with respect to the Parliament of France. As to Germany and Austria, I do not feel so confident. But what, then, becomes of this plea of urgency, that England must take the first step and sanction the Convention, and then that all the other Powers will follow? I say that the statement of the right hon. Gentleman cannot be taken without further proof; and that this plea as respects foreign countries requires far greater confirmation than the right hon. Gentleman has given us. But with regard to the condition of the finances of Egypt, can anything be conceived more damaging than the confession which the right hon. Gentleman has made? The finances of Egypt, under his fostering care, are in such a state that not a week or a fortnight's delay can be permitted; and there lies, according to his reasoning, on all who presume even to discuss the question in a serious and practical manner the responsibility of Egyptian bankruptcy. I say, on the contrary, that it is not the House of Commons that will be responsible for the bankruptcy of Egypt, but the responsibility will lie at the doors of that Government which, for the last three years, has so mismanaged Egyptian finance and Egyptian affairs generally that they now come to this House, and, holding a loaded pistol at its head, seek to deprive us of all legitimate opportunity of discussing this great question. But is it correct, as the right hon. Gentleman has represented to us to-night, that this is a mere financial transaction, by which, at the outside, England will only become responsible for something like £1,250,000 sterling? Why, if this were only a financial arrangement, and one involving a responsibility on our part, even for £5,000,000, I have no doubt that the British House of Commons would rise to the emergency and meet the difficulty. But that is not the difficulty or the danger that we apprehend; nor is it the condition of affairs against which we feel bound to

guard. Sir, the danger is—and the right hon. Gentleman said nothing about it in the whole of his speech—the danger is that by this Convention, in order to secure this apparent limitation of the responsibility of England to £1,250,000, engagements shall have been contracted with the Great Powers of Europe, by which the whole of the vast sacrifices which this country has been making, is now making, and will have to make in treasure, and in what is still more important—blood may be thrown away; and that for the sake of that financial easement to the Treasury of Egypt, and for the sake of being able to say to the people of England that, after all, it is only a matter of £1,250,000, future complications with the Powers of Europe may have been entered into. That is the real difficulty that we feel in discussing off-hand the question of this Convention; and that is the real reason why we think it is essential in the interests not only of this Party or of the House of Commons, but in the interests of the country and of the Empire, that further time should be given for the consideration of a question of such great importance.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): Sir, I will pass by—as I think I now ought to do—the political matters that have been introduced by the noble Lord. But I will reply to so much of his speech as referred to the question of the time at which the debate, and what we hope will be the confirmation of the Convention, ought to take place. The noble Lord has spoken of the affairs of Egypt during the last three years as having been the subject of mismanagement on our part. To that he shall have a full answer when the debate comes on. But I wish to remind the House that two years and a-half ago, before the details of the financial administration of Egypt were a matter of care to us, the estimate of the Controllers General, Sir Auckland Colvin and M. Brédif, was that £8,000,000 would have to be raised to put Egyptian affairs straight; and, therefore, the difference in that respect now is a question between £8,000,000 and £9,000,000—a difference which it will very easy to explain when we come to the subject. The noble Lord made an ingenious argument with respect to the necessity of obtaining Parliamentary sanction to the Arrangement. The noble Lord admits the gravity of the occasion, and the urgency of the case. At any rate, he said nothing to dispute it. But he said it would be impossible that any relief to Egyptian finance could take place and come into practical operation until the Parliaments of the Great Powers assenting to that Arrangement had expressed approval of that assent. Now, I wish to say a few words as to what the present state of the matter is. In the early part of next month, as my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister has said, Egypt will be called upon for certain payments, which it is impossible for her to make under the existing circumstances. Now, the noble Lord would say—"Oh, but the Parliament of Italy, possibly the Parliament of Germany, and possibly the Parliament of France, will not meet until May next; or even later." I understood him to say that the Parliament of Italy is about to adjourn, or has adjourned, for a great length of time. But the answer to that is perfectly plain. If this House approves of the Convention, it will be in the power of the Egyptian Government to borrow a sufficient amount of money to carry them through the next three weeks—to carry them for more than three weeks, probably into the month of April or May. But without that sanction on the part of this Parliament the Egyptian Government will not have the security which will enable them to borrow the money. The question, therefore, is a simple and practical one. Will you deny to the Egyptian Government the approval of the proposals of Her Majesty's Government, under which Egypt will be able to borrow a sufficient sum to meet this expenditure, or will you adopt the Arrangement arrived at by Her Majesty's Government, and enable Egypt to tide over the difficulty? It is simply a practical question of bankruptcy or not on the part of Egypt. If Parliament, within the next few days, adopts the Convention it will not be bankruptcy. If, on the other side, it declines to adopt, or postpones the adoption of the Convention, Egypt will be bankrupt, and others will have to deal with the question. On the showing of the noble Lord himself the case is most urgent, and I hope the House will not refuse an early discussion and decision.

MR. O'DONNELL said, he was inclined to wonder at the anxiety displayed on the Conservative Benches for delay in the final signing, sealing, and delivering of the British surrender to International control. Whether that surrender took place on Thursday next, or on Thursday fortnight, he really could not see that it mattered very much to any British Party. Under the able auspices of the Premier, for whom he had the greatest respect, and who was the uncontrolled master of the liberties of the Members of the House of Commons, although his concentrated influence was not worth a feather's weight in the Councils of Europe—under the able auspices of the Premier, they were placed in that position, that they must surrender all their so-called sacrifices in Egypt to the Powers of Europe. This country lost its position in Europe when its Navy bombarded Alexandria, and it was now losing its Indian Empire in the blood-pools of the Soudan. It appeared that the Conservative Members wanted discussion. He thought that they were a patriotic Party, who wished for action. Was it more talk on the Egyptian Question that was necessary? The real fact of the matter was, as he had said, whether this question was settled before the Easter Recess or after it, they must surrender to the Powers. They might talk of opposing the Powers; but they had not sufficient men to garrison even their Indian Empire. This sham was going on from day to day, and it was a fact which made them the laughing-stock of their enemies, and a source of grief and shame to every Englishman who had a shadow of patriotism with whom he had the honour to be acquainted.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, that the Prime Minister took upon himself to rebuke hon. Members sitting on the Opposition side of the House with regard to their treatment of answers given by the Government. He (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) thought a little better example might be set by the Treasury Bench, where he observed that laughing and talking took place while the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War was reading out a list of killed and wounded. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer was, he understood, to be charged with the conduct of the arrangement of this Convention. He (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) did not feel his confidence very much increased in the transaction by that announcement, because anyone more unsuccessful than the right hon. Gentleman in dealing with these Egyptian questions he could not conceive. The right hon. Gentleman was charged with the arrangement of the Suez Canal in the first instance, and there he signally failed; he was not successful in the Conference on Egyptian matters; and he (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) could not see why the right hon. Gentleman should now be chosen as the principal factor in the new arrangement. The right hon. Gentleman had shown complete ignorance of the subject which he was discussing, inasmuch as he had stated that this Guarantee, which they were about to give, was on the same footing as the Anglo-French Guarantee of 1855, with regard to the Turkish Loan. He (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) happened to know a good deal about that arrangement, and he should like to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer and other Ministers to tell the House in what respect the two arrangements were similar? In 1855 there was a clear transaction between England and France to guarantee a loan, the Sultan having assigned certain revenues as security for that loan. In the present case, the Convention referred to the Edict of the Sultan which sanctioned the loan, and the document stated that it was necessary to introduce certain modifications into the Law of Liquidation. It then went on to create new taxes to be raised in Egypt for the purpose of meeting the exigencies of the loan. In addition to that, the Commission of the Caisse, to which had been added Representatives of Russia and Germany, were to furnish accounts and reports of the sums gathered from this new taxation.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): I may as well remind the hon. Gentleman that the new loan is the first charge on the assigned, and virtually on all the Revenues of Egypt.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, he did not say it was not the first charge. That had nothing to do with the question. What he did say was that there were new taxes to be raised for the purpose of meeting the loan. In two years there was to be a final Report

to the Powers; and, meanwhile, it was laid down that the Commissioners of the Treasury of the Debt should, 15 days before each payment was due——

MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. Gentleman that the subject before the House is not the Convention itself, but simply the arrangement for the discussion of the Draft Convention. I hope the hon. Gentleman will see the propriety of confining himself to the Question of the Arrangement as proposed by the Government.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, he was trying to show that it was necessary that the House should have a clear elucidation of the point before they discussed the Arrangement; and his contention was that they had no Papers for elucidating the particular difficulty before them. There was another point upon which he wished to speak. The Prime Minister had stated that the portion of the Arrangement with regard to the Suez Canal need not come under purview of the House; and that, as hon. Members were in possession of the views of the Government, owing to Lord Granville's Circular of 1883, there was no occasion to furnish them with any other information before the Government went into the discussion of the matter. He (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) maintained, however, that the arrangement with regard to the Suez Canal did not come under the same category as ordinary Treaty undertakings. The Crown, he admitted, had a perfect right to enter into such International engagements, provided they did not come under the financial cognizance of that House; but he submitted that everything connected with the Suez Canal must come under the financial cognizance of the House. The English Government being, by the purchase of half the shares in 1876, the proprietors of half the Canal, half the revenues would before long become a portion of the ordinary Revenue of this country. Therefore, any arrangement which they might enter into with regard to the Canal might greatly affect the Canal itself, and as such might affect the pecuniary arrangements of this country. He maintained that the Government could not enter into a political arrangement in which the Suez Canal was concerned without the consent of the House, inasmuch as it might affect the pecuniary value of the shares. He did not know whether that question had been discussed by the Government; but hon. Members could not discuss the arrangement now before them unless they had ample information on the point.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN said, that when the Prime Minister came to the House and stated that the circumstances of the case were so urgent and commanding that they required the House to give its assent to a Convention such as that provisionally effected with the Powers, within a certain time, a private Member was virtually put to silence, and it was scarcely within the right or obligation of such a one to contest the position. For his own part, he did not wish to argue the question of urgency on this occasion. There might be circumstances unknown to the House that compelled the Government to take this peremptory course, and persons like himself were not in a position to pronounce an opinion upon them. But he must say that the force of the Prime Minister's contention was somewhat weakened by the fact that he had made other declarations to a like effect on former occasions. They were told, not once, but several times last year, that the finances of Egypt were in so critical a state that an immediate decision respecting them was absolutely necessary, and that if the House did not consent to certain arrangements her position would be very precarious. But the necessity for that decision had been got over; and, reasoning from what had been done, the present crisis might probably be got over also by an effort, if the Government felt disposed to make it. The demand made upon them was a very small one, and certainly it was a reasonable one. The Government had taken 12 months or more to settle the terms of the Convention; and surely it was not a great deal to ask that the Representatives of the people should have 12 days to deliberate upon it before they gave to it an assent which would be irrevocable. He thought that that was a most modest request, and regretted that the Government did not see their way to accede to it. The Prime Minister's statement came to this —that they were to legislate in this matter under foreign pressure. The position taken up was somewhat disparaged by the Prime Minister himself,

for he had endeavoured to minimize the responsibilities that the Government were about to undertake; but that was not the tone that had been taken on previous occasions when speaking of the Convention, and certainly was not the idea that their Continental critics formed of the Arrangement. They regarded it as a triumph for their diplomacy, and as a defeat for ours. But, however that might be, it was an undoubted fact that the Government were about to create an International Guarantee, and it would not be unreasonable for anyone to suppose that when they consented to this International Guarantee that International Guarantee would carry with it International control. And International control meant International confusion and mischief, discontent, and possibly war. Surely, then, there was nothing exorbitant in the request to allow Parliament time to consider the details of a bargain which covered such momentous consequences to this country, to Egypt, and to Europe. His object, however, was not to discuss the question on its merits, but merely to lodge a protest against the hurry the Government were in in asking for a decision, and to make an inquiry about the Suez Canal. The House knew that the Convention carried with it the right to hold a Conference to re-adjust the position of the Canal—in a word, to internationalize it. They were told, also, that the basis on which the Government would ask for this Internationalization had been set out in the Circular Despatch of Lord Granville. This was all well enough as far as England was concerned, and there might not be much objection to most of the points that had been laid down by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; but he would like some Minister to inform the House whether the other Powers had agreed that Lord Granville's Despatch should be taken by them as the basis of negotiations in the same way as it was taken by England? If this was not the case, the country would go into a Conference about the Suez Canal, without any guarantee as to the arrangements that might be effected. These arrangements might very seriously concern, not only special interests, but the nation at large.

Mr. GORST said, that the question before the House was a question of time, and upon that question the Government had completely driven the House into a corner. This was not the first time that had been done. The Government were extremely fond of driving them into a corner; and, in doing so, they showed most distinctly the contempt in which they held the House of Commons. He (Mr. Gorst) did not know that the House of Commons deserved much better treatment at the hands of the Government; because when time was given it for the discussion of the Egyptian Question, though many criticisms were delivered, yet, as a whole, it tamely endorsed any course which the Government had hitherto thought fit to pursue. But he would ask the House to contrast the time accorded to it with the time the Government had themselves taken to consider the matter. When Lord Northbrook came back from Egypt, the Government had not only before them the Report given to the House of Commons, but they had full Reports besides. Did they make up their minds in a week, for that was the time they gave the House of Commons to consider the question? The Government, with full and complete information before them, took considerably more than a week before making their propositions to the Powers of Europe. It was more than five months since Lord Northbrook returned, and more than four months since his full Reports were placed in writing before the Government, and the Government had taken all that time to formulate their plans. It seemed to show but little respect for the House of Commons to ask them to form their judgment within a week. He would like that the House should contrast the time given to the House of Commons with the time given to the Government of France. The Government of France had a whole month given them to consider the propositions of the Government before the Government even pressed them for any reply. When they pressed them they took another fortnight. Why did not the Government then explain to the Government of France the extreme urgency of time? [Sir William Harcourt: They did.] Why should they allow the Government of France to have an entire six weeks before giving a reply? When the Government of France did give their reply, it certainly did not take a long time for the Govern-

ment to make up their minds; for on February 4 they issued their last despatch, which was a complete surrender to France. From that time down to the present had been taken up by some sort of negotiations with the Government of France, which they could not at present understand—though perhaps it might be explained in the Papers to be circulated to-morrow—before coming to an agreement. When so much time had been given to the Government of France, it was rather hard to ask the House of Commons, under pain of causing bankruptcy to Egypt, to give their consent in one week. If that was the first time in which the Government had acted in that way there might be some excuse for it; but when they were coming perpetually to the House of Commons, asking them to give an important decision at once, that was a very different matter.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: The hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) said that Her Majesty's Government had driven the House of Commons into a corner. That may be so; and my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister has expressed his great regret that it should be so. But the real truth is, the Government have themselves been driven into a corner. The hon. and learned Member said that one of the great faults of the Government was that they allowed the Government of France to delay their answer. I want to know what is the view of the hon. Member as to the relation of the Government of this country to that of France?

MR. GORST said, he did not say "allow." What he said was that the Government had given France more time.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Yes, you did; I took the word down at the time. I refer to it, because it is an admirable example of the way in which the hon. and learned Gentleman would have us speak to Foreign Governments—of the way in which he expects the Government of England to treat Foreign Powers, and deal with foreign affairs. The reason of the delay, as everyone knows, is our desire to arrange financial matters with the Governments of Europe, and because they have a right to a voice in the matter. But when the hon. and learned Member and the Conservative Opposition jeer the Government, and ask, What do you mean by allowing the Government of France so many weeks for their answer? I wonder what sort of tone it is intended and expected the Government of England is to take upon this question. The hon. and learned Member asks how long Her Majesty's Government have taken to make up their minds? Why, it is months ago since we made up our minds as to the proposals we should offer to Europe; and if we had been in the position which, no doubt, the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Gorst) will be able to take when he comes to conduct the affairs of this country—to go to France, Germany, Russia, and Italy, and say—"Here are our proposals, and mind you answer them to-morrow. We will not give you another day," then there would have been some ground for the sort of speech which the hon. and learned Gentleman has made on this occasion. Her Majesty's Government, unfortunately, are not in that position. They cannot say to France or Germany, "You must answer to-morrow, or we shall have nothing to say to you." We placed before them the proposals we thought it right to offer, and that was done weeks and months ago. There were differences of opinion which had to be considered and reconciled, and that was all the cause of the delay which has occurred; but it is a delay which has reduced Egypt to the brink of financial ruin. The hon. and learned Gentleman argues as if it were for us to say how many weeks one Power and another should take, and how many weeks the House of Commons should take to consider the matter. But the Government has no power of controlling any of these Governments. Did it never occur to the hon. and learned Member that if the Government had not had the consent of the Foreign Powers, this Loan could never have been made a first charge on the Sinking Fund; and that there was only the option of coming to an agreement with them, in order that the Loan might be a first charge upon the Fund, or a charge at all? It is obvious that the Foreign Powers had to be consulted; but it is also obvious that they should be the masters, in saying what time they should have before they gave their answers. So much for this charge against the Government, that they al-

lowed the Government of France to take so much time. Well, this delay having taken place in receiving the answers of the Powers, we had no option in the matter except to accept and present the Arrangement as soon as it was concluded with the Powers of Europe, and to tell the House of Commons that the matter did not admit of a lengthened delay. And now a word upon the remarks of the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. Joseph Cowen). The hon. Member says he must have time to consider the matter. There may be people in this House who want time to consider it; but the hon. Member is not one of these. He does not generally want time to form his opinion. That opinion, made up, as it is, at the first moment, I I am sorry to say, is generally not very favourable to Her Majesty's Government. What does the hon. Member want time for? The hon. Member says that an International Guarantee means an International Control, which will be the cause of confusion and every kind of evil. Well, the hon. Member has made up his mind as to that, and therefore there can be no reason for delay in his case. He has condemned the Convention to-night; why, then, does he put in a plea for delay? He does not want Papers. The position in which we are placed is not one of our own making. We have been obliged, against our will, having to deal with a great many European Powers, to delay until a period which brings Egyptian finance to the verge of a very dangerous state of things. We have now, under the circumstances, only to ask the House on their responsibility to come to an early decision upon the subject, because it is absolutely necessary that the affairs of Egypt should not be thrown into inextricable confusion.

MR. BOURKE said, he hoped the House would not be led away by threats of consequences, which he did not believe would follow. The right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down (Sir William Harcourt) had striven to show that the Government had been driven into a corner. But all the consequences of delay, which they were now told would be so terrible, were before Earl Granville in November last, who seemed then to be perfectly calm upon the subject. When asked by the French Government to come to a decision upon the subject of Egyptian finance, he did not seem to be at all in a hurry, or to seem to think that there was the least cause for haste. At that time, when the French Ambassador pressed Earl Granville to state what the English Government intended to do, the noble Earl said that they had been so unsuccessful in their attempts to come to an agreement with France, that there did not seem any use in making propositions. All the confusion which the House was now told was inevitable must have been in the mind of Earl Granville, and must have been seen by him as the existing condition of things, so that if anybody was responsible for the present state of affairs it was the Foreign Office itself, and if blame was to be attached to anybody, it must attach to them for not expediting the negotiations. The right hon. Gentleman also said that months since Her Majesty's Government made up their minds as to the proposals they would submit to Europe. They did make proposals to Europe, it was true, but Europe treated them with perfect contempt; and the extraordinary nature of those proposals, and the manner in which they were received by the Powers, was one of the strongest reasons why the House should ask for full time for consideration. If Her Majesty's Government would but place themselves in the position of the House of Commons, they would, he believed, be amongst the most determined advocates of delay. But it must be remembered that the Government had ample means of obtaining information upon the matter. They had had 14 or 15 months to consider the matter, and they had had experts and other gentlemen at their command, who could set them right upon questions which, like this, involved enormous gravity and difficulty. But even experts themselves differed now upon the most vital points, and the very Agreement the House was called upon to ratify was actually impaired by the admissions of Her Majesty's Government. It was substantially a French Agreement, and Sir Evelyn Baring had said, over and over again, that the estimates of the French experts were altogether untrustworthy. These calculations were so complicated, that it was impossible for the House of Commons to give them their true value without ample time for consideration. They were told that the Agreement was

only a financial one; but he did not think anybody could be taken in by that statement. If it were so, the Powers of Europe would not be so anxious to share in it; and it would be the most unjust thing which could be done, because we were face to face with that difficulty which the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. Joseph Cowen) seemed to deplore —namely, International Agreement and International Control. With regard to the question of the Suez Canal, that might possibly be, as the right hon. Gentleman had said, beyond the financial question. He doubted, however, whether the French Government would not consider that to be part and parcel of the entire question, and that they would not agree with us on one of these questions apart from the other. He thought, therefore, the House should not be hurried into a decision upon a subject involving such grave issues. He believed that, under the circumstances, any decision which the House might come to at the present time would be of no value, and would only lead to further complications, and land this country in a serious difficulty.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY said, that, in his opinion, it was not so much time for consideration of the Agreement that right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite required, as a policy. They wanted an opportunity of going to the country to ascertain whether they could find support for views opposed to the Convention which had been proposed by the Government. The Papers which had been presented to Parliament were by no means voluminous, and could be mastered by anyone of average intelligence in a few hours. The right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down (Mr. Bourke) had evidently mastered them; but, in the course of his speech, had carefully kept out of sight the points which told in favour of the Government. Her Majesty's Government had repeatedly been accused of vacillation; but the Papers showed clearly that they had, in this instance, been exceptionally firm, and very unwillingly granted part of what France demanded. They had, it was true, admitted that if, in two years' time, the finances of Egypt should not have improved by the paltry amount of £200,000, an inquiry might be held; but who could doubt that, under the fostering care of England, such an improvement as that would be effected? Another thing evident by the Papers was the extraordinary activity of the Foreign Office; and he thought Lord Lyons must have been hard put to it to find words in which to clothe the hints and instructions given to him to hurry on the French Government to a decision. He believed that this Convention would be happy in its results both for England and Egypt.

MR. SPEAKER called the hon. Member to Order, saying that he was not entitled to pursue that course on a Motion for the adjournment of the House.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY, in conclusion, said, if it were merely a question of time to enable hon. Gentlemen to make up their minds, he should be happy to assent it; but, feeling that delay was not necessary for that purpose, he should oppose the Motion for the adjournment of the House.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON said, he rose for the purpose of making a practical suggestion. The Government were in a corner, and asked the House of Commons to get them out of it. The dilemma in which the Government put the House of Commons was that either they must assent to the proposal contained in the Convention, with all the complications that followed in its train, or, as they were told, precipitate the bankruptcy of Egypt. But there was nothing in the Papers to show that the financial affairs of Egypt could not be carried on for a few days, while the House of Commons was considering the important matter placed before them, neither had the Government proved that the payments the Egyptian Government would be called upon to make in the next fortnight were of a pressing and urgent character. On Friday, the Prime Minister used words which clearly indicated that those payments were not of a pressing character, when he said—

> "So strongly has the condition of the persons entitled to indemnities been felt that it has been arranged in the Agreement that the payment of them shall rank as a first charge."

It was self-evident that the postponement of payment of the indemnities, which had stood over for 18 months, for another 18 days would not make Egypt bankrupt. What, then, were these pressing payments? Having looked through the Papers, he was very sceptical as to the necessity of their assent-

ing to the arrangement for the purpose of keeping the country from bankruptcy. He thought they were entitled to ask the Government to telegraph to Sir Evelyn Baring, and ask him what was the excess of payments for the next fortnight over and above the Revenue which the Egyptian Government would have to make. Supposing the Egyptian Government might possibly want an advance of £100,000, would it not be better that some arrangement should be made for advancing such a sum temporarily, for the purpose of carrying on the financial business for the next fortnight, even at the risk of losing it? But, looking at the matter as a business transaction, was it not most extraordinary that the Prime Minister should come down and say—"You are to advance £9,000,000 to a Government; and, because that Government is bankrupt, you are not to inquire into the circumstances under which you make the advance." If this transaction stood by itself it would not so much matter; but, unfortunately, it was remarkable that all the financial proposals of Her Majesty's present Advisers were laid before Parliament under such circumstances as to prevent their being discussed. He thought, therefore, the House was entitled to a reply from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, or the Prime Minister, undertaking to obtain from the Egyptian Government a definite statement as to what these pressing payments were, and as to the amount that would be actually required by the Egyptian Government within the next few weeks.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, he did not think that hon. Gentlemen opposite had made out their case for delay. Surely they did not do themselves justice when they said they would not be able to master the details of the Papers to be distributed to-morrow morning before next Thursday. His own impression was that hon. Gentlemen opposite had already made up their minds upon the question, and all they wanted to know was what the country thought of it, so as to enable them to come back after the Recess with a policy before committing themselves upon the matter. The strongest argument in favour of the contention of the Opposition had been used by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, when he told the House that if they did not agree to this Convention before Easter, Egypt would be bankrupt. Why should not Egypt be bankrupt? He thought it would be a most desirable thing. The errors of the present Government were due to the main fault that they had committed in endeavouring to save the sick man from the consequences of his own acts. There had been a revolution in Egypt; and one advantage of a revolution was that it made a clean sweep of all financial liabilities. Bankruptcy for the Egyptians meant that they would be able to devote their resources to improving their own country, and would not be obliged to pay those large amounts to the bondholders they now had to pay. Sooner or later, he trusted Egypt would be bankrupt, for then she would not come to this country to back her bills.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT said, the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department had affected great regard for the rights of the Powers with respect to Egyptian finance; but the right hon. Gentleman forgot that, by the action of the present Government, a great affront was offered to the Powers by the arbitrary suspension of the Sinking Fund last September. He wished to make a protest against the ignominious language used by the Prime Minister at the close of his speech. The Prime Minister thought the House and the country were under an imperious necessity to ratify the Agreement before Easter. Did he mean that this country was now under the coercion of Foreign Powers in this matter? ["Oh, oh!"] Although the Prime Minister could not undertake that the House of Commons should assent to the Agreement, he (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett) understood that some such promise had been made to a Foreign Power, and that it was upon that statement that the Agreement was entered into. He could not avoid smiling when the right hon. Gentleman assured the House that it was impossible to ask the Powers for delay, and then proceeded to answer his own argument by stating, through the medium of a well-worn Latin quotation, that the matter was very trifling to them, but of great interest to England. He protested against Parliament being asked to assent to this arrangement without due consideration, when a satisfactory settlement might have been made at any

time during the past two years. The House of Commons was asked to vote with its eyes shut, and to assent to the establishment of an insane Internationalization and a Multiple Control, which would be equally fatal to our interests and the interests of the people of Egypt.

MR. LAING said, he wished to say two words in support of a speedy decision of the question. He did not do so from any Party motive, or any general approval of the policy of the Government in Egypt. But he thought the position of Egypt was so critical that it was the duty of everyone to throw aside all other considerations, and to look simply at what might be proper for the country. He was glad the Government, after what he might almost call the hostile attitude of the European Powers, had come back to that which ought to have been the keystone of the policy of this country—a cordial understanding with Germany. That friendship, however, had only been recently renewed, and the position was still too strained and critical to play any tricks with it. There was no doubt the London Conference caused a great deal of irritation amongst the European Powers, as they felt they were invited upon a fool's errand. What would be the feeling of the Powers now, especially if Egypt were allowed to fall into bankruptcy, simply because hon. Gentlemen opposite wanted an extra fortnight to try to evolve a policy of their own out of the Blue Books? This was not a question which required time. As a matter of fact, there was nothing in the Blue Books which had not been perfectly well known to the country for the last month or six weeks. The question was between adopting this Convention, or else they had got to face the very much larger question by which we would have to guarantee the whole Egyptian Debt. It seemed to him unpatriotic to run any risks, especially of misunderstanding with those Powers with whom it must be recollected we were bound by international obligations, simply because hon. Gentlemen opposite wanted a little more time to study the Blue Books. A decision ought to be come to on this question, even though Members had to sacrifice their Easter Holidays. He hoped the House would do nothing by which it would expose itself to be misunderstood. When the discussion came on, he would see whether a better policy could be devised; but whatever was done, it was essential that it should be done quickly. He should certainly not assent to the Motion, until he heard what was the alternative policy of the Opposition.

MR. MACARTNEY said, that the Prime Minister had shown a great deal of irritation at the jeers he had evoked earlier in the discussion, and the Secretary of State for the Home Department had read them a lecture on the mode in which they should conduct their relations with Foreign Powers. He thought all such manifestations were out of place. They did not want to eat humble pie, and they had no intention of bullying foreign countries. He supported the Motion, on the ground of the enormous magnitude of the issues involved in the question which the House were to be asked to dispose of at short notice.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE asked leave to withdraw the Motion for the Adjournment.

MR. GLADSTONE inquired, whether the right hon. Gentleman would prefer the discussion on the Arrangement being taken on Thursday or Monday?

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I think either day too early for the proper discussion; but as I understand that Thursday will suit the Government best, I am, therefore, ready to accept Thursday.

MR. GLADSTONE said: It may, then, be taken as settled that Thursday is fixed for this purpose.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (REDISTRIBUTION) (*re-committed*) BILL.—[BILL 49.]

(*Mr. Gladstone, The Marquess of Hartington, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Attorney General, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 20th March.*]

[EIGHTH NIGHT.]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

SECOND SCHEDULE.

BOROUGHS TO LOSE ONE MEMBER.

[*Eighth Night.*]

MR. KENNY moved, in page 15, column 2, line 22, to leave out "Limerick." The hon. Gentleman said, that the object of the Amendment was to omit from the Schedule the City of Limerick in order to preserve to it the two seats which it now enjoyed. That city differed, in many essential respects, from any of the Irish boroughs which had already been discussed in connection with the Bill, and therefore he was not at all discouraged by the series of failures which had attended the efforts of his hon. Friends who had endeavoured to secure their continued representation. Limerick was one of the three cities which it was proposed to deprive of one half of its representation, leaving, of course, the other half. The other two were Galway and Waterford. The proposal with regard to the City of Limerick, although it appeared, on the face of it, to be a perfectly reasonable, and, perhaps, a perfectly just one, would, if the circumstances of its surroundings were carefully examined, be admitted to be one of extraordinary hardship. The population of Limerick was very slightly short of the limit which, under the Bill, was necessary to entitle it to retain its present representation. The population of Limerick at the Census of 1881 was 49,000, or only 1,000 short of the number that was necessary to entitle it to retain a second Member. But it would be remembered that when the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister asked leave to introduce the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill, he distinctly stated that no hard-and-fast line would be drawn. The right hon. Gentleman also assigned a reason on the same occasion, in words which he would quote, as it was that reason which induced him (Mr. Kenny) to bring forward this Motion. The right hon. Gentleman said that there were one or two cases where the towns proposed to be dealt with were within a few hundreds of the limit, and they would be considered as actually touching the limit. In accordance with that explanation exceptions had been made in the Bill, and no statement had been made, either by the Prime Minister or the President of the Local Government Board during the continuance of these discussions, to lead the House to believe that the Government had come to a determination to exclude constituencies nearly up to the limit, in regard to which a fair case could be made out. The peculiar circumstances connected with the City of Limerick were, first, that it was exceptionally situated. It was the centre of an extremely prosperous district, and it possessed great natural advantages which, if properly attended to, were susceptible of enormous development. It was situated on one of the finest rivers in the Kingdom, and at a point of the river where its expansion would enable the navigation to be carried on to an extent fully as great, if the circumstances of Ireland would permit, as the navigation now carried on at Liverpool. Its commercial importance, therefore, if these natural advantages were developed, might be greatly extended. Some of these natural advantages had been utilized to a greater extent, probably, than in any other port of Ireland, with the exception of Dublin and Belfast. Another point entitling Limerick to favourable consideration was this—it had been constantly increasing in population since 1881. It seemed at that time to have touched bottom, and to have become a decreasing population; but since that year a steady increase had taken place. It must also be remembered that the City of Limerick was the capital of a large district comprising at least four counties, and the city itself extended partly into the county of Clare and partly into the county of Limerick. Under the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill, however, the representation of those districts had been very much cut down, and they presented a most unfavourable contrast with other portions of Ireland. The population of the united districts of Clare and Limerick, to which he referred, and in which the City of Limerick was situated, was 332,000, and that large population in future, as arranged by the present Bill, would be represented by only five Members, thus giving one Member to every 65,000 inhabitants. That was most unfavourable when contrasted with the representation of almost any other portion of Ireland. Let hon. Members take, for instance, the population and representation of the county of Kerry, and it would be found that a population of about 200,000 would return four Members to the House of Commons, giving one Member to every 55,000 people. The population of the county

of Galway was 241,660, and in future it was to be represented by five Members, giving one to every 48,500 of the population. Tyrone had a population, including the boroughs, of 197,200, and it was to be represented in future in the ratio of one Member to every 49,000 inhabitants. If a similar basis of representation as that adapted in Tyrone were allowed to prevail in the district of Clare and Limerick, the difference in population in Clare and Limerick, as compared with that of Tyrone, would be 125,000, and yet it was proposed under the present Bill that it should be represented by one Member only. That was the proportion he had arrived at by various processes of calculation, and it certainly presented an anomaly which he thought it was almost impossible to equal, not only in Ireland, but in England or Scotland. A further circumstance in connection with this district was that the county of Clare would, under the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill, be more unrepresented than any other portion of Ireland. The unit of representation in the county would be 70,200 under the Bill, while with an additional Member it would be considerably over 60,000, thus giving a population of more than 65,000 to each Member under the Bill. The President of the Local Government Board would, no doubt, take exception to any argument he might advance with regard to the under-representation of the Irish boroughs. The right hon. Gentleman had already, in the course of the discussion, endeavoured to point out that the Irish boroughs would even, under the present Bill, be still over-represented. Now, he thought that, to arrive at a fair argument and decision upon the particular case which he wished to submit to the Committee, it should be argued, not so much upon the future representation of the Irish boroughs as upon their present representation, and the proportion which it bore to the representation of the Irish counties under the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman told them that the future representation of the Irish counties would be one Member for every 52,000 persons, and in the boroughs one Member for 47,000 persons. That was what it would be under the Bill; but as it at present existed the proportion of representation in the Irish counties presented a very curious and striking anomaly, seeing that there was one Member in the counties for a population of 81,000, whereas in the boroughs there was one Member for a population of 19,000. But the circumstances of Ireland in this respect did not present anything in the nature of an unusual anomaly, because in the whole of the United Kingdom the proportion of representation in the counties was one Member for 47,000, and in the boroughs one for 41,000. He maintained that in regard to the Irish boroughs exceptional indulgence should be extended to them, especially at a time which was marked as an era of returning commercial and manufacturing prosperity. It would be most unfortunate for these constituencies if, under such circumstances, the representation of the principal cities of Ireland was to be reduced. He made no complaint of the elimination which the Prime Minister proposed to make of the small boroughs. Those small boroughs had no special commercial claims or interests which deserved special representation, and it was only fair and just to merge them in county districts. But it was quite different in the case of the large cities and important towns like Limerick, which had interests altogether distinct from those of the surrounding agricultural districts. It had large shipping and manufacturing interests, which were showing signs every day of returning and awakening prosperity. Probably another reason which the President of the Local Government Board would advance against his appeal on behalf of the City of Limerick was that the present boundaries in the city were extensive, and that to extend them further was an idea that was quite untenable, and could not be accepted. It was perfectly true that the present boundaries of the City of Limerick were somewhat extended into the rural portion of the county; but he maintained that that was no argument whatever against a further extension, because the proposal which he intended to make, and which he had down on the Paper, as a consequential Amendment, if the present Amendment were accepted, was that a portion of the district should be admitted within the boundaries of the City of Limerick, which was entirely an urban district—namely, the parish of Castleconnell—as closely allied to Limerick as Rathmines was to the City of Dublin, or any of the suburban districts

of London to any part of the Metropolis proper. He therefore thought that any argument on this head advanced against him by the right hon. Gentleman would be completely met by the fact that where the boundaries extended pretty far into the rural districts the extension would only exclude places that contained a purely urban population. He thought that fact would fairly meet the objection which he was probably right in anticipating from the right hon. Gentleman. A further circumstance connected with the City of Limerick, which he thought entitled it to fair consideration under the Bill, was the peculiarly favourable geographical and commercial position it enjoyed. He had already said it was most favourably situated for the purposes of commerce; and that was so much the case that when it was contrasted with other Irish cities, the stable industries of which had declined—as, for instance, the City of Galway—it would be found that the great flour trade of Limerick had doubled and trebled within the last 20 years. That enormous increase of an important industry in Ireland was entirely owing to the favourable position and the advantages possessed by Limerick. But that was only one of the innumerable evidences there were of the increasing prosperity of the city. At present there was exported from Limerick more agricultural produce than from any other city in Ireland; certainly there was only one—the City of Dublin—which could possibly compete with it. He believed, however, that the amount of exports from Limerick by railway and by river was larger than from any other city in Ireland. There were many other claims which might be put forward on behalf of Limerick. For instance, it was exceedingly well situated for the development of the shipping industry. At the present moment it possessed a considerable number of floating docks, and a fine graving dock, and it was capable of admitting vessels of something like 5,000 tons burden. Further, the Harbour Board of Limerick were introducing a system of dock accommodation which would place them in so favourable a commercial position that they would be able to bring up in future, within a reasonable distance of Limerick, vessels of more than 6,000 tons. It might, therefore, be admitted that the day of Limerick's approaching prosperity had already dawned. He did not know whether anything in connection with its historical celebrity would entitle the City of Limerick to special regard or attention from either the President of the Local Government Board or the Postmaster General. He thought it would be of very little use to appeal to the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade upon such a ground as that of historical interest, because the right hon. Gentleman had a mind which was of an exceedingly practical and unemotional description. But when the Prime Minister asked leave to introduce the Bill, it would be found reported in *Hansard* that he said the Bill would neither be regardless of history nor destructive of ancient rights. The right hon. Gentleman distinctly made that declaration; and if all the constituencies of the United Kingdom were taken into consideration, there was not one that could exceed the historical and ancient associations of the City of Limerick. It was as old as the Irish Parliament, and was entitled to return two Members to the Irish Parliament. No doubt, under the Act of Union that proportion was reduced; but the reduction was admitted to be so unjust that on the passing of the Reform Bill of 1832 the old representation was restored. He had pointed out already that since that time, although Limerick might have fallen off in population, it had increased in prosperity. The decrease in population had already ceased, and the turning-point had been reached. If he might refer, for a moment, to the historical claims of the City of Limerick, although it had not the same distinction Drogheda could boast of an account of its massacre, or of being dear to the people on account of that massacre, it was certainly much more endeared to the Irish people on account of its successful resistance to tyranny and despotism. Its citizens succeeded in escaping massacre by repelling those who endeavoured to oppress them, and it was one of the memorable circumstances of Irish history that if Limerick was forced to yield it yielded on terms that were honourable to itself and to Ireland. There were many other considerations which would lead Irishmen to hope that the Government would see their way to allowing the City of Limerick to retain its present representation. He was not

one of those who would be supposed to pay deference to any mere argument in favour of historical distinction on behalf of a constituency. He would prefer to base his argument and appeal upon the present position of the city—upon its reviving industry, upon its increased hopes of future prosperity, and upon the situation it occupied in regard to the surrounding districts. Any person who knew Limerick would recognize the marvellous change for the better which had taken place there within the last six years. A great many of the mud hovels which formerly disfigured the outskirts had given way to larger and more improved residences. The general condition of the people was one of increased contentment, and there was a spirit of enterprize abroad among the merchants. Nothing, therefore, could be more fatal, nothing more calculated to repress the development of the industry and enterprize of the city, than to deprive it of its full share of representation. He would further urge upon the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board, that in considering the question he ought to consider Limerick, not only in itself, but as the centre of a great and important district. It was in the centre of a district which under the Bill was grossly under-represented. He had endeavoured to show that whereas the district of which Limerick was the capital was only represented in the proportion of one Member to 65,000 population, almost every other district in Ireland was represented under far more favourable conditions, although there were very few districts which were able to contrast favourably with the district of which Limerick was the commercial centre. The City of Limerick, as the Committee well knew, was possessed of a vigorous and spirited municipality. It was showing signs of its recognition of the duty which was thrown upon the people of Ireland to help and aid themselves, by reviving Irish industries which for 100 or 150 years had been strangled by unjustifiable legislation. These were only some of the considerations which might be advanced on behalf of the claims of Limerick. He very much regretted that his hon. Friend the Member for Carlow (Mr. Dawson), who was a native of Limerick, and had been brought up there from his boyhood, and was well acquainted with every item of interest in connection with the city, with its trade, its commerce, and its shipping, was at that moment absent in Ireland. His hon. Friend had an Amendment upon the Paper to the same effect as his own, and if his hon. Friend could have been there to move it, a better case might have been made out for retaining the representation of Limerick. However, in the absence of his hon. Friend, he would urge the Government to take into favourable consideration the claims of Limerick, on account of its present position, on account of its awakening prosperity, and on account of the position it occupied with regard to the surrounding districts, together with the unfavourable conditions in which the surrounding districts would be placed in consequence of the arrangements of the present Bill. He begged to move the Amendment he had placed upon the Paper.

Amendment proposed, in page 15, column 2, line 22, to leave out "Limerick."—(*Mr. Kenny.*)

Question proposed, "That 'Limerick' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the hon. Member who had moved the Amendment had argued as if Limerick were an increasing place. That, however, was not the case.

MR. KENNY remarked, that it had been increasing for the last four years.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had made inquiries on the subject since the Notices of Amendments in regard to Limerick were first given, and he was informed by the Irish Registration Office that it was not the case that there had been any increase in the population of Limerick since the last Census. On the whole, although the borough population of Ireland generally was increasing, and was very considerable in the three largest towns—namely, Dublin, Belfast, and Cork—yet if those towns were taken away the increase was very slight. The Returns showed that in the population of Ireland generally there was a decrease, but that in the borough population there was a large increase. Nevertheless, if the population of the three large towns were taken out of the calculation, Limerick would have no part in the slight increase which would still remain. On the contrary, it would be

found that the population of Limerick had become slightly less. There was, therefore, no force in the argument that an additional Member should be retained for Limerick, because, although the population was now below the general limit which had been fixed, it was a growing population. His next objection to the proposal was, as the hon. Member for Ennis (Mr. Kenny) had anticipated, in reference to the extraordinary size of the area proposed to be included within the boundaries of Limerick. Limerick was already the largest borough, except one, that would be left in the Bill.

MR. SEXTON asked what was the other one?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, it was either the town of Galway or Cork. Limerick was far larger in area than any borough in England that would be left in the Bill, and far larger than any borough which had not been turned into a county district. It embraced an area of between 33,000 and 34,000 acres. Almost the whole of its population lived in a very small part of that area. Indeed, it was a very concentrated population; 39,000 people lived in an area of 2,000 acres, and the rest of the population lived outside in an area of 31,000 acres. The proposal now made was to extend the boundaries of Limerick in a manner which was entirely unknown elsewhere. Already the borough of Limerick was virtually a small county district, and a large agricultural district formed part of the borough for Parliamentary purposes. It would be converted into a real county district if they were to attach to it the village of Castleconnell, which the hon. Member for Ennis (Mr. Kenny) proposed to add. No doubt, Castleconnell contained an urban population; but if they went on extending the boundaries of a borough they must inevitably, some time or other, come to some urban population. Having made use of these special arguments as to the case of Limerick, which the hon. Member had rightly anticipated that he would make use of, he must remind the Committee that there was still a further view of the case. If they were to give a second Member to Limerick it could only be done at the expense of some other constituency, and probably at the expense of one of the Irish counties, and he did not think it had any just claim to such exceptional treatment. Why should they give to a population of 49,000 persons a Member taken from a county with a much larger population?

MR. SYNAN said, that his excuse for intervening was that he had an Amendment on the Paper upon the same subject. He could not say that he was at all sorry that the Members for the City of Limerick, who ought to have been present to defend that city, were conspicuous by their absence, and that the task had fallen upon his hon. Friend, whose sympathies for Limerick were very strong, but who himself represented the borough of Ennis. He thought the arguments of the President of the Local Government Board fell very far short of those which ought to have been addressed to the Committee in defence of the proposal contained in the Bill, which amounted substantially to the disfranchisement of a population of 49,000. The right hon. Gentleman had not told the Committee why the arbitrary limit of 50,000 was laid down in the Bill, nor had he told them whether any departure from that limit of 50,000 was to be allowed. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman, who could answer the question because he was entitled to speak again, whether, instead of being short of the 50,000 limit by 1,000, Limerick had only been short of it by one, or two, or 10 persons, would the Government have taken one Member from it, and have conferred the seat upon another constituency? He thought some Member of the Government ought to state to the Committee distinctly upon what principle the Bill proceeded. He could understand a Bill being brought in upon either of two principles—either upon the principle of equal electoral districts, or upon the principle of going upon the old lines of the Constitution. If they adopted the former and would add together the county and city of Limerick, they would have a population entitling the City of Limerick to two Members, and the population of the county and city to four Members, because the population of the county of Limerick exceeded the fixed limit which the compact between the two sides of the House gave by 26,000, and if they threw the 26,000 into the City of Limerick, and adopted the principle of equal electoral districts, Limerick, county and city together, would certainly be entitled

to four Members. The Government could only justify their present proceeding by the fact that they had not adopted a scheme of equal electoral districts. Under the compact they laid down an arbitrary line which struck a heavy blow at the City of Limerick, and gave an additional grievance to the borough population of Ireland. Then, again, what would have been the result if they had gone upon the old lines of the Constitution? If they had framed the Bill on Constitutional lines, he defied the right hon. Gentleman and the Government he represented to deprive an ancient borough, as old as King John, enjoying a representation in Ireland as old as the Irish Parliament, and a representation in the British Parliament as old as the British Parliament—he defied the right hon. Gentleman on Constitutional grounds to deprive the City of Limerick of one of its Members. It appeared, however, that in order to please the Opposition, Her Majesty's Government had entered into a compact by which an arbitrary line was struck, with the result of throwing the Constitution into a kind of hotch-potch. He maintained that the Government had framed their Bill upon no principle whatever. Why had they fixed the 50,000 limit? Did they arrive at that figure by a toss up. It was a curious circumstance that in the town represented by his hon. Friend (Ennis) a jury, was recently sent back twice by a Judge to consider their verdict, and because they did not agree they were sent back a third time; when they came back they immediately delivered a verdict. Astonished at the rapidity with which they did so, the Judge expressed his surprise, when a member of the jury told him that it was a very easy matter seeing that they had tossed up. Upon that announcement the learned Judge lectured them, abused them, and finally drove them out of the jury-box. Upon leaving the box one of the jury remarked to the Judge that he thought they had quite as much right to toss up for a verdict as the Government had to toss up for a 50,000 limit, and thus disfranchise Limerick. His complaint was that the arbitrary limit of 50,000 laid down by the Bill struck the City of Limerick very hardly, because it was only just under the limit, and it might have been placed above it by a very legitimate extension of its boundaries for half-a-mile in one direction. Already, as the right hon. Gentleman had pointed out, the Parliamentary limits of the borough of Limerick extended for four miles outside the borough, and they had so existed from the days of Henry VII., when the city sent Members to the Irish Parliament. What the hon. Member for Ennis (Mr. Kenny) asked was that the boundary should be extended so as to include Castleconnell, which would add some hundreds more of a homogeneous population. What was the statement made to the Committee by the right hon. Gentleman a fortnight ago? The right hon. Gentleman told them, in dealing with the Instructions given to the Boundary Commissioners, that the English Commissioners had directions where they found a homogeneous population to extend the limits of the borough to that population, so long as it did not interfere with any other arrangement. Now, if the limits of the borough of Limerick were extended to Castleconnell, a place well known to anglers from England, the Boundary Commissioners would have obtained at once a population of more than 50,000. Then, why had they not done in Ireland what they had done in England? In connection with the English boroughs, the Boundary Commissioners had been instructed to take evidence with the view of extending the area of a borough, so that it might include places where a homogeneous population could be found. In this case the extension of the boundary for half-a-mile would have secured the necessary 50,000, and Limerick need not have been disfranchised. Why, then, had the Government declined to give similar Instructions to the Boundary Commissioners for Ireland, and had placed no discretionary powers in their hands? As a matter of fact, when this point was brought before the Boundary Commissioners at Limerick they rejected the evidence tendered to them, and said they could not entertain it. The only place in Ireland where the Boundary Commissioners had been allowed to exercise a discretion was the borough of Belfast, and he certainly could not see how the exception in that case could be defended. By what argument could it be contended that an area was so large that it ought not to be extended when the extension was simply undertaken with a view of

including a homogeneous population? There could be no question that Castleconnel contained a homogeneous population, and if the evidence which the people of Limerick were prepared to produce had been received, the Commissioners would have been bound to admit that a good case had been made out. The third objection of the right hon. Gentleman to the Amendment was of a most arbitrary kind. The right hon. Gentleman said—"Where are we to find the Member?" It was the case of Mrs. Glass's hare over again—they must first catch their hare. Surely it ought not to be difficult for the Government themselves to find a Member. Whose act was it that had deprived the Government of the power of giving Limerick an additional Member? There were two disfranchised boroughs in Ireland already, and surely one seat might have been given from them to Limerick. Then, again, there were two Members for Trinity College, Dublin, and one of those seats might have been given to Limerick. But by their compact with the Opposition, the Government had negatived the Motion to reduce the representation of Trinity College to one Member, and now they took advantage of their own wrong for the purpose of limiting the representation of Limerick. Was that a proceeding they could justify; and was it worth while defending a grievance which could not upon any principle be justified? The hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) would sustain no injury by losing the additional Member for Limerick. The loss would be to the Government themselves, in making a grievance which they might have avoided—a special grievance that would irritate and provoke a population of 232,000 persons in the county and city of Limerick, and the county of Clare. He was afraid there was no use in discussing the question; but he should like to ask what argument had been advanced by the Government in defence of their Bill? There was only the arbitrary declaration that no Member could be found unless they robbed some other constituency. It was all very well to talk of robbing Peter to pay Paul; but why had they robbed Paul? The robbery was their own act, and they were taking advantage of it in order to say that under the compact they found themselves powerless in the matter. Surely, if they had entered into a compact, it was still competent for the parties to that compact to alter its terms. Had they the courage to alter it; and why had they not, when they were called upon to remedy a grievance which could be sustained by no argument whatever? Why was a population of 232,000 in the counties of Limerick and Clare to be left with two Members for 60,000 persons each; and why was Limerick, because it fell short of 50,000 by a few hundreds, to have an arbitrary rule applied to it, and be deprived of one-half of its representation? He failed to see why the county and city together should not have the advantage of the surplus population. It was not necessary to argue the matter further. He did not know what course his hon. Friend meant to pursue—whether he meant to go to a division or not; but, with the few body of supporters he saw around him, he did not think his hon. Friend would gain much by a division, except it were taken by way of a protest. Of course, under any circumstances, the Government would act in this case as they had acted in regard to all other protests.

DR. LYONS said, the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board, in dealing with the question, had addressed himself solely to the question of population. It was quite true that the population of Limerick had decreased somewhat considerably from what it was at the time of the first Reform Bill. But anyone who was familiar with the City of Limerick must know that in many material respects it had exhibited a great advance. There had been an advance in commerce and in industrial pursuits of all kinds, and it was still at the present day continuing to make rapid progress. There could not be any doubt that when that revival took place which he trusted soon to see in regard to the manufacturing industries of Ireland, Limerick was one of the cities which was bound to advance in a very rapid ratio. The right hon. Gentleman had pointed out that very few cities possessed a larger area. No doubt, Limerick covered a very large space of ground besides the rural district to which the right hon. Gentleman referred, and there could be no doubt whatever that the facilities which existed at hand for the erection of residences, factories, and works of all kinds,

would be made available whenever a proper stimulus was applied in order to bring about the further development of the industry of that city. There would then be such an advance in the population as would fairly entitle it to two Members. How was the City of Limerick treated at the time of the Great Reform Bill? Its importance in every point of view was taken into account, although there were at the time a considerable number of claims for representation. A distinguished statesman (Mr. Stanley) made these pertinent observations upon the state of things at that time. He stated—

"The additional Members are given to Cork, Belfast, and Waterford, not on account of the increased population of 60,000, 48,000, and 28,000 in those places, but because there are great and important interests in those towns which require representation."

He (Dr. Lyons) maintained that those great and important interests which Mr. Stanley referred to still remained, and, as far as those interests were concerned, Limerick was as much entitled to representation now as it was when it possessed a population of 60,000. It must be borne in mind—and this was a point which, in dealing with the question of Irish representation as based upon population, he thought the Government ought to take very seriously to heart—that the population of Ireland, under what he would venture to call an improper stimulus to emigration, had been reduced below its natural limits. If there had not been such an artificial stimulus, it was extremely probable that not only the City of Limerick, but many other districts in Ireland, would have had a population much beyond that which they were enjoying at the present day. He had always thought, at the time the Imperial Government first addressed itself to the stimulating emigration from Ireland, that the day might come when the diminished population of the country would be brought forward as an argument for depriving Ireland of some of its legislative rights in connection with its representation. That day had now arrived, and he was sorry to see so many arguments in the direction of restricting the representation based upon the fact of the decreased population of the country. It was quite true that the population of Limerick, as well as of many other important cities in Ireland, had fallen below the mechanical limit fixed by the Government for depriving particular constituencies of their political power. In this case the deprivation only involved the cutting off of one Member; and speaking in all frankness upon the subject, because he believed he was not altogether in accord with the views of the hon. Members who now represented that city, he was certainly of opinion that considerations of that kind ought properly to be kept out of view in dealing with the representation of Ireland. He spoke upon the question simply as one of principle, and he begged to add his voice to those of hon. Members opposite in pressing upon the Government the important claims of Limerick to a fuller consideration than it had met with in reference to the retention of the two Representatives which it at present enjoyed. It was quite true that by including within the limits of the borough a population which really belonged to it a very fair method would be afforded for getting out of the difficulty—a difficulty which, after all, was a mere mechanical one, relating only to the question of population. He entertained no doubt in his own mind that the prosperity of Ireland would be completely revived before the end of the century, and that the City of Limerick would very soon be entitled, even in point of population, to the privilege it now asked for.

MR. SEXTON said, he had not yet abandoned the hope that the representations which had been made by his hon. Friends might soften the determination of the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill. Perhaps it might have been in vain to hope that any appeal addressed to him from those Benches might have had the slightest effect upon his decision; but, on the other hand, the right hon. Baronet might not be insensible to the appeal of so devoted a follower of Her Majesty's Government as the hon. Gentleman who had just addressed the Committee. The speech of the hon. Gentleman was somewhat remarkable. It contained an admission that Her Majesty's Government had adopted an improper system in the stimulus they had given to Irish emigration, especially as it was a system of emigration produced and brought about by unjust and cruel laws. Even so slight an admission as that—that the stimulus

which had been given by Her Majesty's Government to emigration was an improper stimulus—was a startling admission coming from that quarter of the House. He regretted that the hon. Members for Limerick were not present; but, at the same time, he thought the City of Limerick had lost nothing from the fact that their case had been placed in the hands of his hon. Friend the Member for Ennis (Mr. Kenny). His hon. Friend had addressed the Committee in a practical and exhaustive speech, in which he had brought forward nothing but relative facts. The right hon. Baronet in dealing with the case relied upon one principle, and one principle only; and so far as the principle was concerned, it was one on which he (Mr. Sexton) was bound to say he agreed with the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman pointed out that the average of county representation in Ireland as laid down in the Bill was a population of 52,000 for each Member, and that it would be improper to take any portion of that representation away from the county in order to give it to a place with a less population. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman in that principle as a general rule; but the arguments of his hon. Friend, in introducing the Amendment, had relation also to the present position of the very important urban district of Limerick, which was increasing rapidly in population, and which in a very short time would have reached the limit laid down in the Bill for representation by two Members. In looking over the maps which were appended to the Reports of the Boundary Commissioners for England, he could not see that there had been any serious objection to the enlargement of a borough boundary. Let them take the case of Warwick. There they had a town which was a simple dot in the centre of a large area. Beyond it was another town also surrounded by a large rural area, and the two towns of Warwick and Leamington were separated by a road at least a mile and a-half long. Yet it was proposed in the Bill to effect a junction between those two towns, and to continue the representation of Warwick. Then, again, let them take the case of the borough of Sheffield, which some years ago they were told contained an area of nearly 20,000 acres. In point of fact, there were numerous bodies in England which would run Limerick pretty close, and if hon. Members would study the maps they would soon see that numerous boroughs had had their boundaries extended for the special purposes of this Bill, without any particular captious reference being make to the size of the areas. His hon. Friend the Member for Ennis (Mr. Kenny) proposed that the already large area of Limerick should be still further increased. The objections expressed to that proposition were, no doubt, of considerable force; but all that his hon. Friend proposed was to take in a village standing on the very verge of the present Parliamentary area —a watering place, and a place of recreation and retirement for the people of the City of Limerick. It was a place which had no interests separate and distinct from those of Limerick itself; and, in point of fact, it was a mere annex to Limerick. His hon. Friend proposed to add that place to the present Parliamentary borough. Therefore, when the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board, with his usual accuracy, stated that the constituency of Limerick, as suggested by the hon. Member for Ennis (Mr. Kenny), would include many thousands of acres, it was really somewhat late in the day, and might even deserve the epithet "paltry," to object to an addition which only involved an extra 1,000 acres. The right hon. Gentleman was virtually straining at a gnat in the case of Limerick, while in reference to other boroughs, such as Warwick, he was chivalrously swallowing a camel. The right hon. Gentleman stated that the population of Limerick was not increasing; but the right hon. Gentleman upon that point had not spoken with his usual precision. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to some Returns and information which he had received from the Office of the Registrar General for Ireland; but it would have been much more satisfactory if the right hon. Gentleman could have quoted figures in support of his contention. If hon. Gentlemen had referred to a Petition which had been presented to the House on behalf of the Corporation of Warwick, they would have found that the population of Warwick was not nearly so large as had been stated, whereas the population of Limerick was rapidly increasing, and was likely to be

augmented by a variety of causes, among which was the decline of tillage. There could be no doubt of the fact that at the present moment the people were being driven from the rural districts into the towns for refuge or employment. At any rate, some better argument than the quotation of some vague Return should be offered to the Committee. His (Mr. Sexton's) assertion was that the population was increasing, and in that assertion he was supported by the Corporation of Limerick; and in regard to the steady decline of tillage in the Province of Munster it was likely to go on increasing, seeing that a large number of persons were constantly giving up rural occupations and going into the city for the means of obtaining a livelihood. A reference had been made to the population of the city in 1832, when the Reform Act re-affirmed the claim of Limerick to have two Members. At that time the population of the city was 60,000; no doubt it had very much decreased since; but the fact which was stated in the Memorial from the city could not be denied—that the tonnage of the port was increasing, and that the advantages of Limerick as a commercial and shipping centre were now becoming fully recognized, and should not be forgotten in considering the claims of the city to Parliamentary representation. In 1832 the tonnage of the vessels frequenting the port was only 50,000; last year it was 180,000 tons, or within 20,000 tons of having been quadrupled in a little more than half-a-century. It was a great railway centre; it was the site of the four great Munster fairs; it was throwing out important suburbs; and in every respect it deserved consideration at the hands of Parliament. There was another argument which deserved some consideration, although no doubt it would receive very little sympathy from the Committee. He referred to the fact that the state of Limerick had lately been conspicuously affected by the action of the Irish Executive. It had been made the seat of one of the Hibernian Pashas whom the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) sent over to rule the country a few years ago, and the consequence had been that the additional police force quartered upon the locality, and the attempt to levy an excessive Police Tax, had been the cause of much heartburning and indignation. The questions arising out of the action of the Irish Government had not yet been settled, and yet it was sought to deprive the city of one-half of its representation. Personally, he felt satisfied that however that matter was dealt with, and if Limerick were altogether deprived of a voice in Parliament, its citizens would be fully able to give a good account of themselves. Another argument in favour of the City of Limerick was that it was the principal port on the Western Coast of Ireland. No one would deny that hitherto the Western ports had been badly treated by the Treasury, and that they had suffered greatly from neglect. They had not been able to obtain those loans from the Treasury which had been freely granted else; in developing their resources they had been hampered and impeded in every way, and they had not been able to compete, on equal terms, with the ports on the Eastern Coast of Ireland. Nevertheless, there were five or six of those ports which had long been struggling to maintain a commercial position—Limerick, Galway, Sligo, Tralee, and others, represented only by eight Members. Sligo had already been disfranchised; it was proposed under the present Bill to disfranchise Tralee; a Member each was to be taken away from Limerick and Galway; so that the Western seaports, with a population of more than 200,000, and extending over eight or nine counties, would in future only possess two borough Members—one for Limerick and one for Galway—a position most deplorable in which to place important interests which pre-eminently demanded the personal attention of Representatives in Parliament. In these days the ports of the Western Coast of Ireland constituted a special interest altogether distinct from the agricultural interest which predominated in Ireland; and if it could be avoided, without inflicting unjustifiable injury upon other interests, not only ought the representation of those seaport towns to be prevented from falling into such a contemptible minimum as to numbers, but it ought to be further increased. He did not ask that any Member should be taken from a county and given to the City of Limerick. It might be asked where he would propose to take a Member from. The hon. Member for

Ennis (Mr. Kenny) had referred to Trinity College. In the course of the discussions upon this Bill, everybody referred to Trinity College, because, no matter how bad a case might be made out for any other place, the case of Trinity College was worse. The Irish Members could, therefore, always ask for a Member from Trinity College, quite certain that the balance of equity would be on their side. Trinity College, with its 4,000 electors, returned two Members. Limerick, with a population of 49,000, was to return only one. Surely the right hon. Gentleman would admit that it would be much more equitable if the two cases were reversed, and that Trinity College, with 4,000 electors, should return only one Member, while Limerick, with more than 8,000 electors, should return two. If the Government were not prepared to get a Member from Trinity College, it would be easy to take one from the disfranchised boroughs of Sligo and Cashel. It was at present proposed to give the seats formerly enjoyed by those boroughs to England; but why should they be given to England? He maintained, in the first place, that the Government had no right to disfranchise those boroughs at all, and if they had a right to disfranchise them at the time they committed the offences, their *status* as Parliamentary boroughs ought long ago to have been restored. Seventeen years had passed away since those Irish boroughs had sinned against the mandates of Parliamentary Electoral Law. What was their sin? Some half-dozen people offered bribes, and, perhaps, half-a-score of the electors took them. They were now widely extending the franchise in Ireland, and they had the audacity to wipe a borough like Sligo off the electoral roll, while they retained upon the English roll in England boroughs which had been proved to be sinks of political infamy. It was not necessary to name the places to which he referred; but hon. Members knew very well that there were boroughs in England in which the bribers were numbered by hundreds, and in which the persons who took the bribes might be counted by thousands. Certainly, if they were to take away the seats from the boroughs already disfranchised for bribery in Ireland, they did not do so on the ground of any moral superiority among the English constituencies. If they compared the Election Petitions from England with those from Ireland, and if the principle were admitted that where superiority prevailed a borough should be entitled to enfranchisement, he might claim that all the seats taken from the English boroughs should be given to Ireland, instead of those taken from the Irish boroughs being handed over to England. Personally, he saw no reason why the settlement arrived at in the Act of 1832 should be disturbed. So far as the decrease of population was concerned, the reduction had been brought about by misgovernment on the part of the Rulers of the Irish people, and that certainly ought to form no reason for the disfranchisement of a single constituency in Ireland. He maintained that the representation of the towns in Ireland, and especially of the seaport towns, constituted a special interest, and he would point out that the moment selected for disfranchising this interest was the moment when the House had actually appointed the Committee to consider the best means of developing the almost extinguished manufacturing industries of Ireland. It was also a moment when the minds and energies of the Irish people were directed to the development of their manufacturing industries. Everyone had come to the conclusion that the country could not continue to go on with agriculture alone, and it would be a most unfortunate thing if at such a moment the House of Commons cut down the representation of the Irish boroughs to such a point that the views and interests of the Irish people would have no prospect of being clearly enunciated in Parliament.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he thought the Committee would be of opinion that the City of Limerick had lost nothing in consequence of the absence from the House of its Representatives, because the two hon. Members for Ennis (Mr. Kenny) and Sligo (Mr. Sexton) had advocated the cause of that city with great force and ability. For his own part, he had not been aware that so much could have been said for Limerick. A complaint was made against the Government that they had not defined the principles of their Bill. There were five or six Amendments upon the Paper containing a similar proposal to that which was now made

with regard to Limerick, and as the Government had been unable to accept proposals similar to that now made in respect of other boroughs, it would be seen that they could not now accede to the application which was made in the case of Limerick. He thought it must be taken as agreed to by both sides of the House that the limit of 50,000, fixed by the Bill, must be the limit entitling a town to return two Members. The hon. Member for Ennis (Mr. Kenny) proposed to add to Limerick another place; but the only question was whether Limerick had a fair ground for being excepted from the rule. What was the real position of the City of Limerick? It had already been pointed out that Limerick, instead of having an urban population of 50,000, had only an urban population of 39,000; and if they gave Limerick another Member, they would have to reduce the borough representation elsewhere, or take a Member from some county. It was now proposed to extend the boundaries of Limerick by including Castleconnell within them, Castleconnell being, as the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) had himself admitted, a mere village. Indeed, he (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) very much doubted whether the inclusion of Castleconnell would add 1,000 to the population of the borough. Some years ago he had spent some days there fishing upon the Shannon, and a very pleasant time he had. The hon. Member, however, was quite right in describing it as a mere village. It certainly did not contain a population of 1,000; and he very much doubted whether, if all the surrounding parishes were added, the population of 39,000 would be swelled up to 50,000. But the Committee had already, in various cases, refused other claims on behalf of other places, and the Government had not acceded to a claim for extended boundaries either in the case of a single or a two-Membered constituency. The real question was, whether it was possible, in a matter of this kind, to give an additional Member, that would involve the taking away of a Member elsewhere. The hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) admitted, himself, that if it were a question of giving Limerick an additional Member, or taking one away from any Irish county, there was no argument in favour of it. But there was no other way of moving in the matter. The House had already rejected the proposal to take a Member from Trinity College. It was contended that Trinity College was over-represented. No doubt that was a very convenient argument, and it had been somewhat frequently handled; but there was no getting over the fact that the House had already decided to leave Trinity College, Dublin, with its two Members. Therefore, the only possibility of giving Limerick another Member would be either to reduce the borough representation elsewhere, or to take a Member from some Irish county. Hon. Members below the Gangway admitted that they did not want, nor was it possible to reduce the county representation of Ireland; and, therefore, they must be relegated to the plan of taking the additional Member from the borough representation, and he confessed that if the borough representation was to be increased, there were some other places with much stronger claims than Limerick. For instance, the claim which had been made on behalf of Drogheda, for one Member, was a much stronger one than the claim of Limerick for a second Member. The case of Limerick had not been sustained, and under the circumstances he felt bound to ask the Committee to reject the Amendment.

MR. O'BRIEN said, the argument of the right hon. Gentleman seemed to him to amount to this—that there were many other places in the same position as Limerick; and, therefore, in order to retain a second Member for that city, it would be necessary to commit an act of injustice elsewhere. The right hon. Gentleman had made no attempt whatever to reply to the arguments of his hon. Friends the Members for Ennis (Mr. Kenny) and Sligo (Mr. Sexton), and it was, therefore, idle to prolong the discussion; but he felt bound to protest, in the strongest possible way, against the slur proposed to be inflicted upon Limerick by this partial disfranchisement. Limerick was going to lose one of its Members for the very reason which the Prime Minister had refused to recognize as a reason for reducing the representation—namely, the temporary reduction of population by the enforced emigration and lack of employment which had materially reduced the population of the country from what it was at the time of the Union. The right hon. Gentleman

who had just spoken seemed to recognize the theory that the decline in the population of the Irish seats was to go on perpetually under English rule. He had not had the advantage of listening to the statistics of the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board; but he knew Limerick intimately, and he strongly supported the view taken by the Corporation of Limerick that the population of that city, within the last four or five years, instead of declining, had been rapidly increasing, while its commercial importance and its trade had unquestionably been growing. It was not a matter of very much consequence to the Irish Representatives whether a particular county or city in the South of Ireland had an additional Member. They were not contending for any political advantage in the matter at all; but they must all recognize that it was not for the public advantage that a commercial community of this kind, which, as his hon. Friend the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) had pointed out, was the chief of the Western seaports of Ireland, should be completely swamped by the agricultural community which surrounded it. Under the new arrangement, Limerick would be the only urban constituency within a radius of something like 60 miles. Within that area was the disfranchised borough of Cashel, and he regretted that the Postmaster General had not noticed the alternative proposed by the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton)—that a seat should be secured for Limerick by retaining one of the two seats of which Ireland had already been unjustly deprived. The population of Limerick, up to within a few years ago, was fully up to the standard which would have entitled it to two Members, and it was almost certain that it would be so again. Even a small slice of the immediate neighbourhood—namely, the parish of Castleconnell, would bring it up to the requisite 50,000; and he thought the Government would do a graceful and a wise thing, and a thing which no one would raise any objection to, if they could, by some such arrangement, retain for Limerick its two Members. The people of Ireland could not help thinking that if the population of Limerick had been true blues, and as amenable to Castle discipline as was the case in Belfast, the Government would have found some means of enlarging its boundaries and of retaining its Representatives.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND remarked, that after the very exhaustive way in which his hon. Friends had put forward the claims of the City of Limerick to continue its right of returning two Members, he could not hope to say anything further that was likely to influence the Government in the decision which they already appeared to have arrived at. At the same time, he wished to state briefly that he thought the Government, in not accepting the Amendment of the hon. Member for Ennis (Mr. Kenny), were refusing to do an act which would have been received as a very gracious act of justice by the people of Ireland, and the people of Limerick especially. It was generally considered throughout Ireland that one of the greatest blots in the Reform Bill was to be found in the fact that the city and borough population of Ireland did not receive that proportion of representation which their numbers entitled them to. And of all the cases of injustice done by the Bill to the boroughs and cities of Ireland, there was none more grievous than the proposal contained in the measure with regard to the City of Limerick. It had been pointed out very clearly and very strongly, both by the hon. Member for Ennis (Mr. Kenny) and later on by the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton), that Limerick possessed an overwhelming claim to the right of returning two Members to Parliament. He had been struck by the strength and the force of the observations which had just fallen from his hon. Friend the Member for Mallow. There was not a shadow of a doubt in the minds of the Irish Members that if the City of Limerick, instead of being a National city, had been a stronghold of Orangeism and of landlordism—a city composed of men who were altogether in favour of British rule—the mere difference of 1,000 below the 50,000 limit would not have prevented Her Majesty's Government from retaining for Limerick her two Members. Surely it was a monstrous thing to say that a city should be deprived of half its representation which next year, or a few years later, would be fully up to the required standard, as far as population was concerned. There was every reason to hope

that the population of Limerick would be quite up to 50,000 in a very short time, and while the limit of 50,000 was taken as the standard for disfranchising a city, no provision was made for continuing the representation in the case of cities and boroughs whose population was rapidly growing. He thought some provision ought to be inserted in the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill to provide that when a city or borough reached the required standard of population it should have its full complement of Members. The town he had the honour to represent (Wexford) would probably, in the course of a few years, reach upwards of 15,000 inhabitants, and yet it was to be disfranchised. Although it was admitted that every town with 50,000 population should have a Member, when Wexford reached that number there was no provision in the Bill for restoring the representation it would have lost. He certainly thought that the City of Limerick should be made an exception to the 50,000 limit. The right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General appeared to think that a conclusive argument against giving Limerick two Members was that it would be objectionable to take a Member from any of the agricultural districts of Ireland. He did not think, however, that hon. Members on that side of the House at all intended to convey the impression that it would be unfair to take Members from certain counties in the North of Ireland in order to give them to cities such as Limerick. At the same time, it would be undesirable, no doubt, to interfere with the present redistribution of seats in the counties of the South of Ireland; but if they did not take one from Trinity College, whose rights had already been saved, they might, upon every ground of justice, go to certain quarters of the North of Ireland and take a seat from the Orangemen, because the Orangemen already had a far greater share in the representation in that House than their numbers entitled them to. He thought, when the news reached Ireland to-morrow that the Government were determined to draw such a hard-and fast line, and that they would not make an exception even in the case of Limerick, it would be received with very much the same feeling as that with which the people of Ireland received the news of another transaction a good many years ago, on the part of the British Government, with which the City of Limerick was not altogether unconnected.

MR. KENNY said, he had no wish to trouble the Committee with any further remarks, or to press the Amendment to a division. He would only say that the City of Limerick was very hardly dealt with by the Bill. If the district in which the City of Limerick was situated were divided into equal electoral districts, instead of having four Members, it would be entitled to five and a-half, so that by the present Bill it was losing its right to one and a-half more. However, seeing that it was hopeless to expect to carry the Amendment, after the determined stand made against it by Her Majesty's Government, he would ask the leave of the Committee to withdraw it.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Schedule *agreed to.*

THIRD SCHEDULE.

BOROUGHS TO HAVE ADDITIONAL MEMBERS.

SIR EARDLEY WILMOT moved, in page 15, line 30, to leave out "Seven," and insert "Five." The hon. Member said, he did not bring forward the Amendment with any hope of success; but he moved it more as a protest against the mode in which the Bill had been prepared than with any hope that the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would accept it. On a late occasion, when he proposed an Amendment to limit the number of Members of that House to 658, he was taunted by the right hon. Gentleman opposite with not having proposed some method by which on the present occasion the 12 additional Members would be supplied. He quite admitted that Scotland well deserved additional Representatives, and he was prepared to propose Amendments by which 12 additional Members would be supplied without increasing the number of the House. The object of the present Amendment was to reduce the number of Members proposed for the borough of Birmingham from seven to five. He entertained great objection to the inordinate power given by the Bill to the Metropolis, and also to the large towns. He thought, judging from had occurred

in other countries, that there was great danger in giving largely increased power to the Metropolis and to great cities, because in turbulent times it might occasion great trouble. That, however, was not the main reason which induced him to propose an alteration in the Government scheme in regard to Birmingham from seven to five. His reason was that the town of Birmingham did not really require so many Members as seven. He was a Warwickshire man himself, and he had an opportunity of hearing everything that went on in that part of the country. What was now stated was that with seven Members Birmingham would not be able to find gentlemen to fill the seats. The argument was that while the Bill would increase the quantity it would reduce the quality of the Members. He need not remind right hon. Gentlemen who sat on the Treasury Bench that when the supply exceeded the demand the value of the article necessarily went down. He, therefore, maintained that by increasing the quantity and lowering the quality of the representation they were running the risk of having men returned who would enter Parliament for what they could get out of the country rather than what they might bring to it. If the Committee would consent to reduce the number of Members proposed to be given to Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, and some other boroughs, they would obtain eight seats, and four more could readily be obtained from other boroughs of the United Kingdom, which would give Scotland all the additional representation she required, and would prevent that which almost every Member of the House regarded as a great grievance—namely, the proposed increased in the number of the House itself. The Amendment he had proposed the other day was not largely supported in the Lobby, but it was, nevertheless, supported by many men of thought and intelligence; and he happened to know that many who voted against him fully shared the views which he entertained. There would, he thought, be a difficulty in finding proper men for these large towns, according to the scale of representation laid down in the Schedule, and the splitting up of a constituency into wards would lead to a great deal of extra expense. This was not a case in which the Conservative interests were concerned, as under the present system there was no chance of those interests being represented at all. The right hon. Baronet had to deal with the anomaly that notwithstanding recent legislation for the purpose of reducing the expenditure at elections the expenses of candidates on both sides would be largely increased, inasmuch as the candidate would have to fight the battle single-handed. The right hon. Baronet would say that the area of representation would be diminished. Granted; but what diminished the expenses at elections was not reduction of area, but the union of candidates, who agreed to share the expenses between them, which enabled them to come to the House of Commons at much less expense than would otherwise be the case. He said that it would be far better to give Birmingham five Members as a whole than to divide it into many parts, which would amount, under the present scheme, to the representation of seven single wards in that great city. Finally, he protested strongly, and he should take every opportunity of making his protest against action on the part of the Government, the principle of which he believed to be fraught with danger to the Constitution. As there was little chance of his Amendment being accepted by the Government, he did not propose to divide the Committee upon it. He should, however, move the Amendment, to give the right hon. Baronet an opportunity of making a statement on the subject.

Amendment proposed, in page 15, line 30, to leave out the word "Seven," and insert the word "Five,"—(*Sir Eardley Wilmot,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'Seven' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the hon. Baronet had addressed some observations to the Committee on the subject of the single-Member system, into which he should not follow him, inasmuch as that matter had been decided by the House itself. The hon. Baronet proposed to reduce large boroughs in such a way as would only allow them one Member to about every 100,000 inhabitants; but he made no proposal to reduce the county representation. In the hon. Baronet's own county of Warwick the proportion of Members to population was one to 47,000. [SIR EARDLEY

WILMOT: I repudiated numbers altogether in this matter.] The main principle of the Bill was to rectify the disproportion between the representation of boroughs and of counties; and as the Amendment of the hon. Baronet was opposed to that principle he was unable to agree to it.

SIR EARDLEY WILMOT said, although he did not admit the argument of the right hon. Baronet, he would ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

SIR EDWARD J. REED said, he felt it his duty to call the attention of the Committee to the omission of the name of Cardiff from the Schedule of boroughs to have an additional Member. The case of Cardiff differed greatly from that of many other boroughs for which an additional Member was claimed; for whereas those boroughs for which the claim was preferred were almost stationary in respect of population, the claim which he ventured to urge on the Committee arose entirely out of the rapid growth of the town of Cardiff. If the Committee would allow him, he would show what that growth had been during the last 70 years in respect of the town of Cardiff alone. In 1811 the population was 2,557; in 1821, 3,521; in 1831, 6,187; in 1841, 10,007; in 1851, 18,351; in 1861, 32,954; in 1871, 56,911; and in 1881, 82,761. Adding the small contributory boroughs of Cowbridge and Llantrissant, the population amounted to 85,862 for the Parliamentary borough. But, besides that, there was the population of Llandough, Cogan, and Penarth, which had to be taken into account. He considered that the question of boundaries had been very unsatisfactorily dealt with in cases of this kind; because here was a town of 82,761 inhabitants with a number of places having a large and similar population adjacent to it—places which one would have supposed in any Reform Bill worthy of the name would have been included in the Parliamentary borough—and yet this Bill did nothing to bring those places into the Parliamentary borough of Cardiff. He thought that the system of limiting the representation of such towns to one Member an unfair one, and that the requirement that in order to entitle the borough to two Members the population must have increased to 100,000 was also unfair; because, while he could understand some representation of ancient towns being maintained notwithstanding their small populations, he was at a loss to understand why one town of 50,000 inhabitants should be represented by one Member, and another with a prospective population of 100,000 should also be represented by one Member. But the case of Cardiff rested upon its extraordinary development, of which the Bill took no account. In 1881 there were in Cardiff 12,185 inhabited houses; at present there were considerably over 16,000 inhabited houses in the town. So that since the last Census the population of Cardiff had increased from 82,761 in 1881 to the present estimated population of 109.067; and adding to that the present estimated population of Cowbridge and Llantrissant, 3,101, even without adding 8,150 for the population of Llandough, Cogan, and Penarth, this fact resulted—that at the present moment the Parliamentary borough of Cardiff contained a population of 112,168. And the Bill proposed to leave that borough with a single Representative. But there were circumstances which made it not only probable, but certain, that the population would go on increasing for some time to come, and that, at least, at the rate it had increased at hitherto; and he did not know what his right hon. Friend (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would think if, when the next Census was taken, he found that this town, with its 160,000 inhabitants—to which he ventured to say it would attain in 1891—was still represented by one Member. He had said that the town would go on increasing, and that statement was based upon facts well known to the Committee. In the first place, Cardiff was the outlet of a very large coal-mining area, from which about 10,000,000 tons of coal were exported every year; and this town, with an enormous export and a considerable import trade besides, was to remain under this measure represented by one Member. But there were other circumstances which strongly invited the attention of the Government in considering the claims of Cardiff to due Parliamentary representation. In the first place, Cardiff was by all acknowledged

the principal town in South Wales. Recently there had been great competition between Swansea and Cardiff; and when the question as to the University College was under consideration it was decided by the arbitrators that the proper position for the College was Cardiff. He believed his hon. Friend the Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn), and his hon. Friend the Member for Glamorganshire (Sir Hussey Vivian), would admit that in the time which had elapsed since the College was established there the town had done everything that could possibly be done for its development. Again, the questions with regard to the Clerk of the Peace and the County Treasurer had been decided in favour of the town. In addition to that, he would mention the large internal trade of Cardiff, the fact that it was the place of residence of three Consuls and 14 Vice Consuls; and, finally, that the colliery meetings and the Government examinations were held there. Now, he thought that all those things went to show that for a town so circumstanced and selected by the Government and by persons of high standing for such distinctions as he had described, with a present population of 112,000, and with the near prospect of having 50,000 added, representation by a single Member was not a very satisfactory arrangement. The population of Wales in 1881 was 1,359,895; it had 30 Representatives, which gave one Member for every 45,296 inhabitants. As he had shown, in 1881 the population of the Parliamentary borough almost touched that figure which, on the basis of the whole population of Wales, entitled it to a second Member; and if the population of additional areas, which might be taken into account for the purpose of giving homogeneity to the whole area represented, were added, it was then fully entitled to two Members. Looking at the figures, he was bound to express his belief that if this most reasonable and moderate proposal to give two Members to Cardiff were adopted by the Government, it would be found that before the Bill, when it became law, had been very long in operation, those two Members would represent a larger population than any other two Members in the county of Glamorganshire. That was his conviction, although the right hon. Baronet might, perhaps, take a different view of the case. He believed the House was not entirely satisfied with being bound hand and foot by the compact entered into by the Leaders of the two Parties, and that if they had had the opportunity of taking the case of Cardiff into consideration they would have found that the proposed arrangement with regard to its representation constituted a great blot and anomaly in the Bill. If his Amendment, which the right hon. Baronet had given him very little encouragement to think would be accepted, were not adopted, he felt sure that, in the course of four or five years, at any rate, it would be discovered that a great mistake had been made. He would, having thanked the Committee for their attention to his statement, only say that if this Bill was to leave populous towns that were in a state of vigorous growth and progress, as was the case with Cardiff, in the hopeless position in which that great town would remain if the Government proposal were carried out, then he thought the Bill ought to have gone beyond its present provisions. He thought the Bill ought to have contained some provision, at any rate, for increasing the representation of growing towns. True, in his opinion, it was highly probable that after the great and valuable change which would be brought about by the Representation of the People Act and the present measure, minor Reform Bills would be much more frequently brought forward than they had been in the past. But whether his Amendment were agreed to or not, he had felt it his duty to call attention to an evil which existed, and which he trusted before long would be remedied. He earnestly hoped, however, that his Amendment would be accepted.

Amendment proposed,

In Schedule 3, page 15, column 1, after the words "Bristol—Four" (line 32), to insert the words "Cardiff—Two."—(*Sir Edward J. Reed.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he must admit that the figures quoted by his hon. Friend showed a large increase in the population of Cardiff; but he had not discussed the scheme developed by his Amendment. He had left them rather in the dark as to whether he in-

tended the Committee to take his scheme as a whole or not. In the one case, he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would have to discuss it a little; in the other, he should have to ask the hon. Member where he proposed to get his Member from? The hon. Member proposed to re-divide Glamorganshire; and he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) should assume, unless they were told that it was not so, that the hon. Member intended to adhere to that proposal. The hon. Member had pointed out that Cardiff was a town which was increasing very rapidly indeed, and had told them that the population was somewhere about 100,000. The hon. Member proposed to take from it the contributory boroughs of Cowbridge and Llantrissant, and add to the Census population of 82,000 a district containing 6,000, which would bring Cardiff up to 88,000. The hon. Member and himself (Sir Charles W. Dilke) were rather fellow-sufferers in this matter, because the borough for the representation of which he had declared his intention of becoming a candidate was a borough of the same population—namely, 88,000—and was rapidly increasing, like Cardiff. The hon. Member had spoken very strongly indeed about the increase of the town of Cardiff, but had told them nothing about the increase of the county of Glamorgan, his object being to decrease the representation of the county for the benefit of the town. He (Sir Charles W. Dilke) must ask the hon. Member to turn his attention to the extraordinary increase which had taken place in the population of the county. The population was now estimated at 270,000, and the rate of increase had, for a good many years, been greater than that of the borough. The increase which had taken place in Swansea, for instance, had been considerable, and in the Rhondda Valley it had gone on at an extraordinary pace; in fact, he should think that the rate of increase in the county was from 2 to 4 per cent higher than that of Cardiff. Therefore, he thought that for the purposes of this discussion they could very well afford to ignore the point of the increase of population. This question of increase was very doubtful, calculations based upon the number of inhabited houses being very liable to error. The proportion of people to houses varied in towns, even in the same places, from time to time, and the difference as between town and town was sometimes very remarkable. From what he could gather, the increase of population in Glamorganshire had been very rapid; in fact, he believed that, with the exception of the increase in the proposed new borough of Fulham, the increase in Glamorganshire had been more rapid than anywhere else. There could be no doubt that the increase of population in Fulham, Glamorganshire, and Cardiff had been more rapid than in any other place affected by the Bill. The hon. Member had proposed a redivision of the county, in order to gain a seat for Cardiff from Glamorganshire; but, by the figures of the Census, that proposal was not justified, nor was it justified by any of the general principles by which they were guided. The county of Glamorgan was a little more favourably treated than some other counties; still, it was treated on the same principle, and it was but a mere accident that its treatment was a little more favourable than that of other places. If they took away one Member from the county its treatment would then be less favourable than that of other counties of the same size. He certainly could not be a party to the taking away of one Member from that county. He should be glad if he could see his way, and he was sure the Committee would be glad if it could see its way, to increase the representation of Cardiff in the manner proposed by the hon. Member. There was no doubt in the world that it was one of the most rapidly increasing seaport towns in the country. It was certain to continue to increase for a great number of years, and it must be considered as one of those places to which the Committee would gladly give a larger representation if it were possible. Whenever they left the line of population, and began to speculate, they got upon very uncertain and unsafe grounds, and his own belief was that they were justified in going upon the line of the Census population, rather than going upon fancy as to the future. The scheme his hon. Friend had placed upon the Paper did not appear to be one which had been entirely worked out in detail. He would call the hon. Member's attention to a fact which he dared say had not escaped the attention of the county Member—namely, that one Petty Sessional Division, that of Kibbor, though

it was shown in the map prepared by the friends of the hon. Member, was not included in the hon. Member's Amendment; so that, should the hon. Member succeed in defeating the Government on this occasion, he would have to amend his Amendment by providing for the Petty Sessional Division, which he had entirely left out in the calculation. However, he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) trusted the Committee would support the Government in the proposal made in the Bill, and would leave the representation of Glamorgan and Cardiff untouched. The Committee would, he was sure, be glad to give a larger representation to the latter place if it could; but they must, all round, go by the Census as a basis of representation. The bringing in of a large population into the Cardiff district was a thing which might be approved of in principle. It was easy to extend a boundary, and bring in a large urban population in some cases, where only a small amount of such population stretched into adjoining urban districts across a county. But in densely populated counties, such as the county of Glamorgan, it was often difficult to extend boundaries, for the reason that when they once commenced they did not know where to stop. It was impossible to lay down a general principle in the matter. There were cases where Parliament had already created districts out of boroughs adjoining one another. They had done this, for instance, in the Potteries; but, on the whole, they had thought it desirable in the case of large, densely populated, urban districts, like the county of Glamorgan, to deal with a large portion of the population on the single-Member principle. That was why Glamorgan had been deal with in this way under the Bill. He was sorry that it appeared to press hardly upon Cardiff; but he did not see his way to diminish the representation of Glamorgan in order to increase that of Cardiff.

MR. R. N. FOWLER said, he had listened with great interest to the speech of the hon. Member opposite (Sir Edward J. Reed), and he thought that a very strong case had been made out for the increase in the representation of the borough of Cardiff; but, at the same time, he could not support the hon. Member if he carried his Amendment to a division. He would make the hon. Member a promise, however. Some hon. Members thought that the measure which had been passed by the Attorney General dealing with elections would put an end to corruption. He was not quite so sure about that, because he believed that boroughs would, in the future as in the past, be disfranchised for corruption. If he had the privilege of being a Member of the next Parliament, and if any borough was disfranchised for corruption, and if the hon. Member would bring in a Bill to transfer that seat to Cardiff, he would have the greatest pleasure in supporting that proposal.

SIR HUSSEY VIVIAN said, that the case had been so strongly put by the right hon. Baronet who had charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke) that there was no necessity for him to say much about it. He should have been delighted to support the proposal of his hon. Friend for giving another Member to Cardiff, for he thought that Cardiff was fully entitled to a second Member. He believed that in a very short time it would be found a great anomaly that a place which was increasing as rapidly as Cardiff should not have a second Member. But he was constrained to vote against his hon. Friend, because of the proposition put forward of reducing the representation of Glamorganshire in order to effect the operation. The hon. Member had not stated the case upon which he based his attack upon Glamorganshire; and why had he not stated it? Why, for a very good reason—because he had no case to state. The case stood in the simplest possible manner, and he (Sir Hussey Vivian) would venture to give it to the Committee in two or three words. If Cardiff had two Members, each one would represent 43,000 inhabitants, while Glamorgan, which had a population of 235,000, and five Members, had one Member for each 47,000. On what ground was a borough which would have 43,000 inhabitants per Member to take away a Member from a county that had 47,000 per Member? If they did accept the hon. Member's proposal, the result would be that Cardiff would have one Member for every 43,000 inhabitants, whilst Glamorgan would only have one for every 59,000. What justice would there be in that? Then, again, a great deal had been said by his hon. Friend in reference to the

increase of the population of Cardiff; but how did the matter stand? Cardiff between 1871 and 1881 increased at the rate of 42·9 per cent—no doubt a very great increase—but the county of Glamorgan, outside the boroughs, had increased at the rate of 45·41 per cent; therefore, the county of Glamorgan had increased 5 per cent more than the borough of Cardiff. Of course, the hon. Member had no case, and therefore he had completely failed to show any justification for asking the Committee to take away a Member from the county of Glamorgan. If the hon. Member had attacked some of the other anomalies in the Bill, such as the small constituencies—there were five in England with a population of under 16,000 possessing a Representative—on the ground that Cardiff should have one Member for 43,000 population, it would have been perfectly right, and he (Sir Hussey Vivian) would have been able to support him. Or, again, if the hon. Member had taken some smaller Welsh constituency, supposing Wales to be limited to its 30 Members, and had proposed to hand over its seat to Cardiff, he (Sir Hussey Vivian) might have been satisfied. There was, for instance, the county of Denbigh, with a population of 88,800 and its two Members. That county had a Member for each 44,400, and it was only increasing in population at the rate of 4½ per cent, against the 43 per cent at Cardiff; and there might, therefore, have been some case made out for giving one of the seats of that county to the town in question. The hon. Member, however, had not proposed that, but had made an attack upon probably one of the strongest constituencies in the whole of Wales; and it was quite impossible for him (Sir Hussey Vivian), much as he desired to see Cardiff with another Member, to support the Amendment.

MR. RAIKES said, he had no personal interest in Glamorganshire, although he had considerable interest in the adjoining county of Monmouthshire; but he could not help thinking that the Committee would do well to pause before they rejected the Amendment which had been moved by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cardiff (Sir Edward J. Reed). The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had made what appeared to him (Mr. Raikes) a somewhat confused statement with regard to the boundaries between borough and county. The right hon. Gentleman had said that if they divided the Census population of Cardiff by two, they would get one Member for 42,000; and if they divided the Census population of the county by five, they would get one Member for 47,000; and the right hon. Gentleman argued that those figures did not entitle the borough of Cardiff to a better position. But if the county population were divided by four, they would get one Member for 59,000; while the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) seemed to forget that by the existing state of things they perpetuated the system under which the county had one Member for every 47,000 people, and the borough of Cardiff had only one Member for 85,000. That made all the difference with regard to the comparative claims of the county of Glamorgan and the town of Cardiff. It appeared to him that the difficulty might be met in a way different from that which was suggested by the hon. Member for Cardiff (Sir Edward J. Reed) in a subsequent Amendment he had upon the Paper. He (Mr. Raikes) did not approve of that Amendment; and if the hon. Gentleman carried this Amendment to a division he (Mr. Raikes) should vote with him on this occasion, but vote against him on the next occasion. Now, the county of Glamorgan contained 235,000 people, and by the Bill it was proposed to divide the county into five districts. There was the borough of Swansea, with a population of 73,000; but two or three minor boroughs which were connected with Swansea brought the population of the constituency to just over 100,000. Then there was a curious mining district composed of a series of mining villages—in this district there was nothing that could be called a large town—which enjoyed the *status* of a Parliamentary borough under the name of Merthyr Tydvil, with 90,000 inhabitants; and also the great town of Cardiff, with 93,000 inhabitants. It seemed unfair that in an important and populous county like Glamorgan there should be three considerable urban constituencies, and that the largest should return only one Member, and the other two return two each, simply because they were associated

with some neighbouring town or borough which brought them up to the population entitled to two Representatives in Parliament. It appeared to him that the true solution of the difficulty of finding an additional Member for Cardiff was not by taking one of the Members away from Swansea, not by confusing the districts which had been provided by the Boundary Commissioners, but simply by throwing the mining district known as the Rhondda Valley into the borough of Merthyr Tydvil. If that course were adopted, the borough of Merthyr Tydvil would be the largest in the county of Glamorgan; it would contain 134,000 inhabitants, but it would not be larger than Leicester, not much larger than Portsmouth or larger than Brighton. A second Member could be given to Cardiff by allotting to it the Member which the Bill proposed to give to the Rhondda Valley. They would thus have Merthyr Tydvil, with 134,000 inhabitants, returning two Members; Swansea, with 105,000 inhabitants, returning two Members, and Cardiff, with about 100,000 inhabitants, returning two Members—a system far more just as between those large towns and the representation of the county than that which the Bill proposed. If his suggestion were agreed to, the representation of the boroughs would amount to one Member for every 50,000 people, while the representation of the county would still remain one Member for every 47,000 people. With regard to the Rhondda Valley itself, he should say that, although marked in the county district, it was considerably smaller in area than the existing borough of Merthyr Tydvil. It was inhabited by a population absolutely homogeneous with that constituency; and by adopting his suggestion they would simply be extending somewhat the area of a district which at present, as he had already stated to the Committee, was composed largely of a number of industrial populations scattered over a very wide district of country, and creating or extending a constituency which would in every way be precisely the sort of constituency which the Boundary Commissioners were instructed to form where they were told to have regard to the pursuits and classes of the inhabitants. He maintained that, without increasing the representation of Wales, which, he admitted, was somewhat large, without doing any injustice to the rival town of Swansea, without doing any injustice to the mining population, whom he would prefer to group together, and without disturbing the arrangements of the Boundary Commissioners, it would be possible, by the adoption of the course he proposed, to give to Cardiff that which was only its due—namely, a second Representative. Cardiff had wealth, intelligence, and importance; it was a place which was growing, and it certainly deserved every consideration from the Committee. He ventured to believe that in the suggestion he had made a real solution of the difficulty would be found; and if his hon. Friend (Sir Edward J. Reed) was fortunate enough to carry his present Amendment, he (Mr. Raikes) would be happy to bring forward the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

MR. PULESTON considered that his right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Raikes) had shown how very easily an additional Member for Cardiff could be obtained; but that, after all, was not the question they were now called upon to discuss. All the Committee had now to determine was whether they should insert after "Bristol—Four" the words "Cardiff—Two." They might differ as to how the additional Member was to be found; but at present they were not required to enter into the matter. Now, it appeared to him that if the hon. Baronet the Member for Glamorganshire (Sir Hussey Vivian) wished to be consistent and logical, he must go into the Lobby with the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cardiff (Sir Edward J. Reed). The anomalies of the Bill were very glaring; but he (Mr. Puleston) thought that none was more glaring than the one with reference to Cardiff. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Stafford Northcote) who led the Opposition would be able to tell the Committee that if they voted for the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman (Sir Edward J. Reed) they would not be voting against anything which was considered vital. If it was intended that the Bill should stand the test of any considerable time, the sooner they did away with such anomalies as the one which had been exposed the better. He hoped hon. Members on both sides of the House would have no difficulty in going into

he Lobby with the hon. Gentleman Sir Edward J. Reed).

MR. MORGAN LLOYD said, that, as n abstract proposition, he should be uite prepared to agree with his hon. riend the Member for Cardiff (Sir dward J. Reed), because he thought hat Cardiff was entitled to two Repre- entatives; but the proposition could ot be taken by itself. Before adopting his Amendment it was necessary they hould determine where the additional Member was to come from. He had lready expressed his opinion that Wales was entitled to retain its 30 Members; ut he was afraid that if it was proposed o give an additional Member to Wales, nd to take that Member from another art of the United Kingdom, great op- osition would be raised. There was o doubt, therefore, that they were con- ined to Wales to find the Member which was to be given to Cardiff. Now, where was the Member to come from? t had been suggested that one Member hould be taken from Glamorganshire nd added to Cardiff. The objection to hat was quite evident; because the population of Glamorganshire increased s rapidly, if not more rapidly, than the population of Cardiff itself. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Raikes) suggested that the Rhondda Valley ought not to have a Representative of its own. He did not know whether his right hon. Friend (Mr. Raikes) had been through the Rhondda Valley. If he had not, he had something yet to see. He (Mr. Morgan Lloyd) had been through that Valley, and he was con- vinced that a more populous district that was not actually a town could not be found in any part of the Kingdom. The population was large now, and it was increasing very rapidly; it was, in- deed, increasing much more rapidly than the population of Cardiff; and therefore it was absurd to propose that the Member for the Rhondda Valley should be taken away in order that an additional Member should be given to Cardiff. It might be said that a Member might be taken from some other part of Wales. But where from? Breconshire had now two Mem- bers; but in future it was only to have one, and that Member would re- present about 55,000 inhabitants. If they took one Member from Carmar- thenshire they would create a greater anomaly than the one which existed now with regard to Cardiff. If they took a Member from Pembrokeshire they would create an equally great ano- maly. Cardiganshire had already a grievance, because, since the borough had lost their Member, there would be a population of over 70,000 with one Member only. Therefore, there was no means of getting a second Member for Cardiff unless they were to disfranchise the county of Radnor. That, he ad- mitted, was a very small constituency; but they had already taken away one Member, and it would be an extraordi- nary anomaly if they were to leave a county, either in England or Wales, without a single Member. It therefore amounted to this—that unless a Member could be brought into Wales from some other part of the United Kingdom a second Member could not be given to Cardiff. Although in the abstract he was in favour of the proposal, he was driven to vote against it, simply because it was impossible to find the Member to give to Cardiff. Under the circum- stances, he did not think the Bill in this respect could be improved. There was this to be said with regard to Cardiff—that the area within the Parliamentary limits of the borough was not large. If the town increased, it would very soon extend beyond the boundary of the borough, and in the county itself, where it would be represented by the Member for that division of the county. He felt bound to oppose the Amendment for the reasons he had given.

SIR HUSSEY VIVIAN said, he could not allow the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Univer- sity of Cambridge (Mr. Raikes) to pass without a word. The right hon. Gen- tleman seemed to be under some misap- prehension in regard to the number of population. If the proposal to add the parish of Ystradyfodwg to Merthyr were to be carried out, the population, accord- ing to the Census, would be 134,113. According to the present existing popu- lation of the Rhondda Valley, which was increasing more rapidly than that of any other part of the United Kingdom, the population of the borough would be 150,564. Moreover, the right hon. Gen- tleman forgot that there was a high mountain between the borough of Mer- thyr and the Rhondda Valley, and that

the inhabitants of the Rhondda Valley had to go round this for some 15 or 20 miles to get to Merthyr. The right hon. Gentleman was entirely mistaken in his description of Merthyr. It consisted of two dense populations — the town of Merthyr and the town of Aberdare. He (Sir Hussey Vivian) protested against such an arrangement as the right hon. Gentleman proposed; for, in his opinion, it was the most extraordinary conception that had ever entered into the mind of anyone.

MR. RAIKES said, he held in his hand a Return which was the latest authority on the subject of the population of the two constituencies. The hon. Baronet (Sir Hussey Vivian) corrected him because he said the united population of Merthyr and the Rhondda Valley —he could pronounce the name of the parish, Ystradyfodwg, quite as well as the hon. Baronet—was 151,000. He had made up the total of 134,000 thus— Merthyr, 91,373; and the Rhondda Valley, 44,046; together, 135,000.

MR. ELTON said, he was acquainted with the neighbourhood of Cardiff, and he was glad to give his support to his right hon. Friend (Mr. Raikes). He did not imagine the inhabitants of the Rhondda Valley would find any difficulty in climbing the high mountain between them and Cardiff; but he would support a proposal to climb a mountain twice as high to get over the enormous anomaly which had been exposed by the discussion. Whether on the ground of historical position or of commercial importance, Cardiff being at the head of the steam coal trade; or whether, in the face of the remarkable fact that Cardiff was increasing rapidly on every side, quite as rapidly as any part of the county of Glamorgan, he would be glad to support the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Raikes).

SIR EDWARD J. REED desired to say a few words in reply to his hon. Friend (Sir Hussey Vivian) before going to a division. He could not assent to the statement of that hon. Gentleman as to the proportionate improvement of Glamorganshire and the town of Cardiff. The hon. Gentleman was ingenious in the use of his figures, for what he had done was that, while his (Sir Edward J. Reed's) statement was based on the actual growth of Cardiff, the hon. Gentleman had based his on the growth of the Parliamentary borough, knowing well that Cardiff was mated with two unprogressive towns a considerable distance from it—namely, Cowbridge and Llantrissant. He (Sir Edward J. Reed) spoke of the actual growth of Cardiff; and, upon re-examination of his figures, he could say that, with less than a fourth of the population of the county, the growth of Cardiff was equal to more than a third of the county increase in the period to which he had referred. The right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) was very moderate in his statements, and seemed well-disposed towards Cardiff; but he was not fair in one phrase he used. He had spoken of "fancies" in regard to the future. Not wishing to detain the Committee by going into the whole question, he (Sir Edward J. Reed) ventured to say that if there was anything like certainty in relation to increase, it was so in the case of Cardiff, owing to all the circumstances connected with the town. The right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) spoke of the difficulty with regard to the proposed additions to the borough; but there could be no sort of difficulty, for there were populations lying most unreasonably outside the Parliamentary borough, and practically belonging to the town, and in no way differing in character. Finding his proposal had met with a considerable measure of support, and as this was the only Amendment raised in regard to Cardiff, he would carry his Amendment to a vote. He would leave the question of finding a Member untouched, and hoped he might claim the vote of his hon. Friend (Sir Hussey Vivian), who promised that if he (Sir Edward J. Reed) would not confine himself to his own particular mode of finding a Member he (Sir Hussey Vivian) would be prepared to vote for him.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 50; Noes 113: Majority 63.—(Div. List, No. 75.)

MR. RAIKES now ventured to submit to the Committee the first of a series of Amendments which were directed towards, as he thought, improving the scheme of the Government as regarded the Metropolis. The scheme of the Government, which the Committee was

upon, aimed at dividing the Metropolis into a very great number of comparatively small constituencies. It was proposed to abolish those large Metropolitan boroughs, with which they were all familiar, or at least to reduce them, as far as their names were concerned, to very shrunken dimensions, and it was proposed to establish over the whole Metropolitan area a very large number of comparatively small constituencies, returning, in many cases, only one Member each. Now, he had no desire to interfere with the system of single-Member districts; but when he put his Amendment on the Paper he aimed at the preservation of the existing structure of the Metropolitan boroughs, so far as the nomenclature and limits of the present constituencies were concerned, and then dividing these large communities in precisely the same way as the Bill proposed with reference to Liverpool, Glasgow, Manchester, and Birmingham. They were all of them acquainted with the names of the Metropolitan boroughs, most of which, from their first institution, had been represented by very distinguished men. He need not go further in proof of this than mention the right hon. Gentleman who was in charge of this Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke), and the Prime Minister himself, who, throughout two Parliaments, represented in that House the Metropolitan borough of Greenwich. He thought they might say that the Metropolitan boroughs had justified their existence by returning eminent men in almost every case. There was also this reason for retaining them—they formed the area of election for the London School Board; and if they were broken up into smaller areas for Parliamentary purposes, a new distinction of area would be created for which there was no justification or excuse. He did not see why a number of Members should not be known as representing different divisions of the same place, and preserving the name of the constituency by making it common to all the Members, rather than cutting the constituency up and introducing such new boroughs as "Clerkenwell," "Newington," and other places of that sort. He did not see any advantage to be gained from this new class of names. There were two of these Metropolitan boroughs which were constituencies of considerable antiquity. He referred to the City of Westminster and the borough of Southwark. Westminster, he presumed, was as ancient a constituency as any in the Realm, and Southwark was closely connected with the history of mediæval England. If the Government would not consent to give all the Metropolitan boroughs the same treatment as they gave Liverpool and Manchester, stronger claims could be made out for Westminster and Southwark than for the other constituencies. At the same time he thought that a very strong case could be shown for some of the others. Let them take, for instance, the borough of Finsbury. There might be good reason for dissociating the great parish of Islington from Finsbury, just as there was some time ago for dissociating the great parish of Hackney from the Tower Hamlets; but why should not the borough of Finsbury remain otherwise unaltered? It might be desirable that great districts like some of those in the Metropolis, which had to return more than one Member, should be separated from the existing constituencies. He recognized this also in the case of St. Pancras, and also in regard to the great parish of Camberwell; but why could not the existing constituencies remain otherwise unaltered? They divided what was left of Finsbury into three constituencies, and called the two new creations respectively Clerkenwell and Holborn; but he could not understand that any special advantage would be gained by returning Members for Clerkenwell and Holborn. Coming to the case of the Tower Hamlets, he would point out that it contained a population who were proud of their connection with the Tower, and who would sooner be constituents of the existing borough than of a new creation such as Limehouse and Mile End Old Town. His Amendment had, in a special degree, reference to the City of Westminster. That constituency which, under the Bill, was to be cut up into three divisions, each returning one Member, had a population of from 220,000 to 230,000 inhabitants, and was, consequently, entitled to four Members. Therefore, if the ancient condition of the constituencies were reverted to, it would be fairly entitled to another Member, which, by the artificial arrangement proposed by the Bill, it was likely to lose. He knew, however, that

he should not appeal in vain in the case of Westminster. He did not wish to press that part of his Amendment which related to Chelsea, Hackney, and Lambeth; but he would still ask the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board if he could not see his way to do something in the cases of Westminster, Southwark, Finsbury, and the Tower Hamlets, which had been associated with so many distinguished men, to keep them, as far as practicable, in their old position. In conclusion, he begged to move, as a matter of form at the present moment, the Amendment which stood on the Paper in his name.

Amendment proposed, in Schedule 3, page 15, column 1, after "Bristol—four" (line 32), insert "Chelsea."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Chelsea' be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the right hon. Gentleman had appealed to him to make a statement in regard to the general Metropolitan scheme of the Government, and it might be for the convenience of the Committee if he did so. He might not be in Order; but with the leave of the Committee he would make a statement. Now, the Metropolitan scheme of the Bill had been attacked from two different quarters. There had been a certain amount of hostile criticism from those who, like the right hon. Member opposite, wished to retain the existing Parliamentary boroughs of the Metropolis and then to divide them, and it was also attacked by those who wished to divide the whole of the Metropolitan constituencies into districts of equal size. Those two sets of criticisms to some extent answered each other. The Bill showed a middle course between those two views, and was, therefore, attacked from both extremes. Still, there were certain points in which he thought it would be possible to improve the scheme embodied in the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman had made out a strong case with regard to the retention of the unity of two of the existing constituencies — namely, the City of Westminster and the borough of Southwark. Those were two boroughs which were exceedingly ancient constituencies with their present boundaries; and he agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that there was a greater case for retaining the unity of Westminster and Southwark than there was in any of the other cases he had mentioned. Those were really the only two Metropolitan constituencies who could boast of antiquity in their present shape. Some of the Metropolitan boroughs—for instance, his own (Chelsea)—were completely modern creations, and had not existed long enough for the different parts to have grown together. In the case of Chelsea also there was no desire on the part of anybody to preserve the identity and unity of the present constituency. He did not think, however, that much weight could be attached to the School Board argument which had been advanced by the right hon. Gentleman, because the School Board electoral boundaries could easily be altered at any time. But the City of Westminster, no doubt, was a very large constituency, and as ancient as any in the country. It had great claims upon them, and as an ancient borough with its old boundary it was a constituency which he thought the Committee would be desirous to preserve. Therefore, he hoped he should be able to see his way to retain it as one borough, and divide it into electoral districts. The scheme of the Bill had been the grouping of local government districts where they had a population of under 40,000, and by dividing them and giving them separate representation where they had a population over 50,000. If they were to adopt a different plan for the Metropolis from the general plan of the Bill they would have one difficulty which he did not see his way to meet. There would, for instance, be the difficulty of having no constituted authority to prepare the Registers, and that would create great confusion, especially in the present year. According to the scheme of the Bill as it stood, out of the 59 Metropolitan seats, no fewer than 55 would have the Registers made up by only one authority. In considering what they should do in regard to retaining the old constituencies of Westminster and Southwark, he thought it desirable that they should not attempt to put the boundaries of those boroughs in the Bill at present, but should refer the matter to those gentlemen whose services had been retained to give advice on the subject—namely, Sir John Lambert and Sir Francis Sandford, with Colonel Owen Jones to assist them in

this matter. Those Gentlemen would report in time for the Government to place Amendments on the Paper for consideration at the stage of Report. It would then be open to the House to discuss the matter with a full scheme before them. This proposal, however, involved the Government in one difficulty. As the right hon. Gentleman had very fairly stated, Westminster, as divided by the Bill, would have only three Members; but if treated as one constituency it would become, on account of its population, entitled to four Members instead of three. He had considered this matter very carefully, and had taken into consideration the various parts of London in reference to one another in order to see if there was any possibility of meeting this difficulty. With regard to Finsbury, the right hon. Gentleman had proposed to treat the southern end of that constituency exceptionally; but he thought Finsbury would, under any scheme, be entitled to the proposed representation; and he did not suppose that the right hon. Gentleman would suggest any change there. But there were a number of small districts South of Clerkenwell which might be considered, and he would confer with Sir John Lambert and Sir Francis Sandford with the object of throwing those districts into St. Luke's rather than leave them with Holborn. Such a proceeding, however, would offer no help in the case of Westminster. With regard to the Tower Hamlets, the unity of which the right hon. Gentleman proposed to retain, he would rather not commit himself to any proposals which the Government might find it advisable to suggest on the Report. What was commonly known as the "West End" of the Metropolis was, by the mere accident of numbers, under-represented according to the Bill, as compared with what was commonly called the "East End." The City of Westminster, and the parishes of Kensington and Chelsea, contained almost all of what was commonly called the "West End," and they had six Members by this Bill for a population of 480,000. On the other hand, what was commonly called the East End —namely, Bethnal Green, the Tower Hamlets, St. George's-in-the-East, Mile End Old Town, and Limehouse, altogether had seven Members for 410,000 population; so that what was commonly called the East End was over-represented as compared with what was commonly called the West End. If they took the East End in the wider sense of the word—that was, containing the whole of Hackney, the Tower Hamlets and Poplar, as well as the districts he had mentioned—the representation of that district under the Bill was also rather high—namely, one Member to 63,000 of the population, which was above the Metropolitan average, of one for every 65,000. If one Member could be saved from that portion of London, its representation would then be a little below the average, as it was now considerably above it, and it would be still more favourably represented than the average of Metropolitan boroughs. The West End in the wider sense, including the whole of the extreme West, Hammersmith and Fulham, and in the North West, Hampstead and Paddington, was also under-represented as compared with the East End in the wider sense, having only one Member to every 69,000 of its population. Having looked at this matter over and over again, and worked it out in every possible way, he had come to the conclusion that the mere accident of figures had led them to over-represent the East End as compared with the West End. Accordingly he proposed to accept the view of the right hon. Gentleman who had made the Motion, and insert Westminster and Southwark in the Schedule as boroughs to be divided; and he would consider between this and the Report stage, with the assistance of Sir John Lambert and Sir Francis Sandford, what suggestions could be made in regard to the representation of the East End in order to meet the case of the City of Westminster.

MR. W. M. TORRENS said, he thought it in many respects preferable that the present borough of Finsbury should be divided into two portions, one of them being that which was created in 1832, and which was properly called Finsbury. The borough had borne that name ever since, and he should be sorry to see it obliterated. He had been asked by the inhabitants of that portion of the borough of Finsbury called Bloomsbury, which contained within itself a wealthy and highly educated population, to put forward a claim to distinct representation. He would remind the Committee that Bloomsbury contained within its area Lincoln's Inn

and the British Museum, and some of the greatest Institutions in the Kingdom; and, that being so, it was not unreasonable that the inhabitants should have a voice in that House.

LORD ALGERNON PERCY said, as he had himself placed a Notice on the Paper with the view of preserving the City of Westminster intact, and giving it increased representation, he had much satisfaction on hearing the statement of the right hon. Baronet. There had been a strong feeling in Westminster amongst both political Parties that under this Bill the City of Westminster was not receiving justice. Setting aside its antiquity and the historical position of the City of Westminster, and taking the basis of population, and having regard to its voting power or rating value, it was under this Bill greatly under-represented by comparison with other portions of the Metropolis; and he was glad that the right hon. Baronet had seen the justice of the claim for increasing its representation, and was ready to grant it.

MR. RITCHIE said, he must congratulate the City of Westminster on obtaining four Members, to which it was absolutely entitled. With regard to the Tower Hamlets, although he did not think there was any very strong feeling in the remoter parts of the Tower Hamlets, yet he felt sure that the inhabitants of those nearer town would be glad to retain the ancient designation rather than have the new title, which, however respectable it might be in itself, did not suggest the ancient traditions which were conveyed by its association with the Tower. Whilst approving of that, and also the addition to the representation of Westminster, he was bound to say that he had listened with some amount of dissatisfaction to the suggestion made by the right hon. Baronet as to the place from which he was to get the additional Member to be given to Westminster. When they were discussing in Committee an Amendment on a previous portion of this Bill, and he (Mr. Ritchie) was charging the right hon. Baronet with not having agreed to any Amendments, the right hon. Baronet replied that when they came to the Schedule he would not be so rigid as he had been with respect to the clauses of the Bill; but he (Mr. Ritchie) little thought that the first Amendment which the right hon. Baronet proposed to make in the Schedules of the Bill would be directed against the constituency which he (Mr. Ritchie) represented. Now, he did not at all admire the justice of taking a Member from the Tower Hamlets in any shape or form; on the contrary, he contended that there was not the slightest ground or justification for anything of the kind. The right hon. Baronet had spoken of a portion of the Tower Hamlets—Mile End Old Town, Whitechapel, Limehouse, St. George's-in-the-East—and said it might be considered that they were a little over-represented; but he forgot altogether to include in his estimate of numbers that rising portion of the Tower Hamlets. the borough of Poplar.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he mentioned the district in such a manner as to include Poplar.

MR. RITCHIE: But surely the right hon. Baronet would admit that Poplar, taken by itself, was much more under-estimated than over-estimated. It was a borough of 156,500 inhabitants, and that would give 78,000 inhabitants to each Member. The borough was, therefore, under-represented. He contended that for the purpose of this Bill they must consider the Tower Hamlets as a whole; and, taking them as a whole, the borough had a population of 437,000, which would give 63,000 inhabitants to each of the seven Members it was proposed that it should have. The right hon. Baronet would find that there were a great many other boroughs which were very considerably below the lowest borough in the Tower Hamlets—he referred to St. George's-in-the-East; all those boroughs had populations under 40,000 inhabitants; and, therefore, he thought that the right hon. Baronet would admit that, taking the Tower Hamlets as a whole, it was not over-represented by having one Member to 63,000 inhabitants. If, as the right hon. Baronet hinted, he should take away that one Member, there would remain six Members with 73.000 inhabitants for each Member, which he contended would be distinctly an under-representation. If the right hon. Baronet wanted to get a Member from London and from the Eastern parts of London, he would recommend that his attention should be directed to the borough of Hackney. It was proposed to

give to the borough of Hackney, which had a population of 417,000 inhabitants, seven Members, which would be at the rate of 60,000 inhabitants to each Member, whereas the Tower Hamlets had under the Bill as it stood 63,000 inhabitants to each Member. But if one Member were taken away, there would result the anomaly that Hackney would have one Member for every 60,000 inhabitants, and the Tower Hamlets would only have one Member for every 73,000 inhabitants. He was sure the right hon. Baronet was not the man to say that, because a district was a comparatively poor district, it ought to be imposed on. He should contend that the poverty which existed in some parts of the Tower Hamlets, together with the bad condition of things there, showed the necessity for more representation, in order that the grievances of the inhabitants might be laid before the House of Commons. He regretted that the right hon. Baronet had not told them at that stage of the Bill what he proposed to do in this matter, because he had really had plenty of time to consider the question; and it seemed to him to be essentially a question to be dealt with in Committee, and not on the Report. He would not further detain the Committee on the speech of the right hon. Baronet, because they did not know what his proposals might be; and he would, therefore, simply repeat his hope that the extra Member to be given to Westminster would not be taken away from the Tower Hamlets, and that the attention of the right hon. Baronet would be directed rather to increasing than diminishing their proposed representation.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he hoped the hon. Member opposite would not press him to make a definite statement on the subject at that moment. He might, however, remind the hon. Member that one portion of the Tower Hamlets was more over-represented than the borough of Hackney. He had promised to give the subject his closest attention. He had stated that he would ask Sir John Lambert and Sir Francis Sandford to look into the question, and form an opinion between then and the Report, the result of which he would frankly state to the House, together with his reasons for dissenting or otherwise from the view taken. He might, however, again remind the hon. Member that one portion of the Tower Hamlets was more over-represented than the borough of Hackney; and even on the hon. Member's own showing the Tower Hamlets were over-represented as compared with the West End.

MR. ARTHUR COHEN said, he was obliged to take objection to the political division described in the Schedule with regard to the borough of Southwark, because it united St. Saviour's with Rotherhithe, and St. Saviour's had always been united from time immemorial with the borough of Southwark. On the whole, he must admit that the great majority of his constituents were rather unfavourable to the divisions proposed in the Bill than in favour of them. He expressed his pleasure at the arrangement which had been made by the right hon. Baronet, as he believed that the able Commissioners who had been appointed would report to the satisfaction of his constituents.

MR. W. H. SMITH said, he desired to express his satisfaction with the statement of the right hon. Baronet. With respect to the City of Westminster, it had a population of 229,740 according to the last Census. The right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board had said there had been some reduction; but he thought he would find that had not been the case, for the number of workmen's dwellings erected during the last four years had, in his opinion, more than balanced the removals caused by the action of the Metropolitan Board of Works. But the City of Westminster was certainly entitled, on any scale that was carried out in the Bill, to four Members instead of three, and it was also entitled, in his opinion, to retain its ancient authority. There was a strong feeling in Westminster that it ought not to be divided, which would be the case if the scheme in the Bill with regard to Westminster were carried out. The City of Westminster was rated to a larger amount for the area it covered, and the population which it included than any other borough of the Metropolis except the City of London, or any other portion of the United Kingdom. Its rating mounted to £3,800,000, which was more than double that of any other constituency in the Metropolis except the City of London. He would not pursue that subject; the justice of the claim

had been admitted in a handsome manner, and he felt convinced that the ultimate arrangement made would be satisfactory.

MR. FIRTH said, he could not agree with all the opinions expressed by the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken. The rating of Westminster was between £3,000,000 and £4,000,000, and the rating of Chelsea was also between £3,000,000 and £4,000,000. He understood that certain boroughs—namely, those of Westminster, Southwark, possibly Finsbury, and perhaps the Tower Hamlets, were to retain their old names, which would, no doubt, be satisfactory to the inhabitants of those districts. The people in Chelsea were not anxious, however, to retain the name of Chelsea, which included Kensington as well as Fulham and Hammersmith. There was no historical or other continuity which it was useful for them to preserve. The only suggestion made with regard to them was that made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Raikes) with respect to the School Board area. This discussion had shown clearly the under-representation which the Bill proposed to give to London. They were accustomed to hear Members from various parts of London complaining of under-representation. The hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ritchie) complained that if one Member was taken away from that constituency the inhabitants would only be represented in the proportion of one Member for every 73,000. His own opinion was, that the East End of London should be more fully represented than the West, because it was necessary and right that the interests of the poor should be thoroughly represented, and the rich could get abundant representation in every way. Therefore, to that extent he agreed with what had fallen from the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ritchie). He regretted that nothing had been said in the course of these discussions with regard to increasing populations, although he remembered that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge did exact a pledge from the Government that this would be taken into account. If the borough of Chelsea was to have five Members there would be an average of more than 80,000 inhabitants for each Member, and in the particular district of North Kensington there were now no less than 95,000 people. Therefore, whilst he gladly accepted this measure as applicable to London, it could not be expected that it should be looked upon as final. He did not grudge Westminster an additional Member; but he pointed out that in giving it four Members for 229,740 people it would have a representation of something like one Member to every 57,000 inhabitants, whereas Chelsea was only to have five Members, although if they had six they would not have less than 57,000 inhabitants for each Member. The longer this debate went on the more forcibly was the conclusion thrust upon them that London must have a larger representation than it had at the present time.

MR. LEWIS said, that on a former occasion he had taken the liberty of calling attention to anomalies in the Bill with respect to the representation of the Metropolis. He was bound to say that the alterations suggested by the right hon. Baronet removed some of the most glaring of these anomalies, such, for instance, as those pointed out with regard to Holborn, Finsbury, Hanover Square, and St. George's-in-the-East. Unfortunately, however, the suggestion of the right hon. Baronet did not cover the whole of the ground. He thought it was to be regretted that, in making this new departure with regard to the representation of London, they should not have made representation on the basis of population somewhat more even than was proposed. The borough of Lewisham had a population of 86,000, and Hampstead a population of 45,000. They were both new constituencies taken out of the counties. What could be said of Lewisham could be said of Hampstead—that they were both largely increasing in population, and that they were very similar in character. It appeared to him that in these cases they were creating a great anomaly which was not likely to rectify itself, and which would be a blot on the representation of London as constructed by this Bill. He could not help expressing regret that when the Government had taken the subject of the representation of London in hand they did not make some more detailed and refined effort to create something like a real proportional representation of the Metropolis.

MR. FRANCIS BUXTON said, he believed that the announcement that the Government would become responsible for the due representation of Westminster would give general satisfaction. There had already been a considerable feeling expressed in Westminster that the constituency would be greatly under-represented, especially as compared with the City of London. In one of the new divisions of the City of Westminster—namely, St. George's Hanover Square, there would be a population of 90,000 returning one Member, whereas another part of London returned two Members for 60,000 inhabitants. The right hon. Baronet would find it no easy task to decide whence the additional Member for Westminster was to come. Whatever might be the decision of the Government, he could only express the pleasure he felt at the intimation given by the right hon. Baronet; and he hoped that the new arrangement under the scheme proposed by the right hon. Gentleman would be satisfactory.

MR. RAIKES said, he merely rose to tender his acknowledgments to the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill. Though the right hon. Baronet had not given him quite all he wished, he had given him almost more than he had hoped for—at least, quite as much, he was sure, as the right hon. Baronet felt it was possible for him to concede. The Committee, he thought, was indebted to the right hon. Baronet for the very frank and considerate way in which he had met the Amendment. He (Mr. Raikes) would now withdraw the Amendment immediately before the Committee; and, in doing so, would ask the right hon. Baronet whether it would be in accordance with his convenience if it were now moved to insert in the Schedule the words "Southwark 3, Westminster 4," and leave the other question to be dealt with on Report? [SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Yes.] Then I will do it.

MR. EDWARD CLARKE said, that before the Amendment was withdrawn he should like to say a word. He quite appreciated the desire that the names Southwark and Finsbury should be retained in the same divisions which were to be constituted; and he confessed he thought that in both cases it would be desirable that these names should belong each to two divisions only. As regarded Southwark, it would be well to have a Rotherhithe division, and then two divisions of Southwark—East and West; and, as regarded Finsbury, there should be two divisions of that name, and one Holborn division. There were two matters he should like to understand. Southwark was to retain its present boundary, and to be divided into three districts. That was what had been done already. The division had been agreed upon by the Boundary Commissioners.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: No; in the Bill, not by the Commissioners.

MR. EDWARD CLARKE said, the division had been specified in the Bill, and had been discussed by the different bodies of persons interested in the matter. If any new arrangement was proposed, he thought ample notice should be given of it to suit the convenience of the Southwark people.

MR. R. N. FOWLER said, he should not have taken part in the discussion if it had not been for the speech of the hon. Member for Andover (Mr. Francis Buxton), who was an active Member of the Liberal Party in the City of London. He should think the Liberal Party in the City would be surprised to hear that the hon. Member had come down to tell the Committee that the City was over-represented.

MR. FRANCIS BUXTON: What I said was that my experience in Westminster was that there was a certain feeling there that they were under-represented still, whilst other parts of the City of London were over-represented.

MR. R. N. FOWLER: At all events, the hon. Member used the term "over-represented." I want to know who represents the Liberal Party in the City of London? Is it the hon. Baronet the Member for the University of London (Sir John Lubbock), who, I believe, is President of the Liberal Association in the City? Is it the hon. Member for Tewkesbury (Mr. R. Biddulph Martin), who was a candidate for the City at the last election, or is it the hon. Member for Andover, who is going about using all his exertions to get up a contest in the City at the next election? I trust that what has transpired during this debate will become known outside the House, and that the Liberals of the City will know that one of their most active Members, the hon. Member for Andover, comes down and tells us, in defiance of

what I believe to be the feeling of the Liberal part of the constituency, that the City is over-represented.

MR. THOROLD ROGERS said, he did not think the question of the City of London, and the utterances of the hon. Member for Andover (Mr. Francis Buxton), worth considering. In consequence of some words which had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) but which, unfortunately, he (Mr. Thorold Rogers) had not heard, having been prevented from attending until that moment, he was obliged to say a word or two. The point he was about to explain had not, he thought, been considered in relation to the question which the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Plymouth (Mr. E. Clarke) had referred to. Southwark and Westminster were, no doubt, two of the ancient boroughs of the Metropolis. Southwark had existed in its present form, so to speak, since the Reformation. In the arrangement of 1549 the City of London were bidden to elect Aldermen for Southwark, and they did not do it. They put in a Member of their body as Alderman for the Bridge Without, or some rubbish of that kind. They excluded this district of Southwark, and in default of anything like a legitimate municipal government the local government of Southwark had been carried on by bodies of men whose labour and intelligence, he would venture to say, were as praiseworthy as those of any men who could be found elsewhere. He said that with the greatest confidence, and, no doubt, it would be credited, because he believed that the greater part of the gentlemen who carried on the local government of the several parishes of Southwark were not, politically speaking, very particular friends of his. The services these gentlemen had rendered the district were very great—in fact, in the absence of anything like legitimate municipal institutions in Southwark a very good substitute had been set up there; and he could not help hoping that when the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board dealt—as he understood he intended to do—with the reconsideration of the boundaries, he would bear in mind that the unity and the reality of local government had been carried on in this particular district. With regard to the arrangement made in the first draft of the Bill, it was to be regretted that in the volume of plans the Government had not given them plans showing the boundaries of the boroughs of London. They had not been given in the Blue Books which had been circulated amongst Members, and it was therefore difficult to make out the geographical lines of the new arrangement. He apprehended, from what had fallen from the right hon. Baronet, that the original proposal would be modified. He ventured to think that these two boroughs of Southwark and Westminster stood on a different footing to the other boroughs, and consideration should be had for them. What had happened in Southwark was this. The Vestry of Bermondsey had memorialized the right hon. Baronet—it certainly had himself (Mr. Thorold Rogers)—in favour of the details laid down in the Bill, and that district had been extremely self-denying in the matter, as its population of 86,000 would make it one of the largest districts in the United Kingdom—especially when they compared the case of Southwark with the charming arrangement of giving two Members to a county with only 50,000 inhabitants in it. He was speaking of the county of Huntingdon, to his mind one of the most scandalous anomalies in that Bill. Southwark contained a population of some 230,000, and had an assessment of £7,000,000 sterling; and yet, on the whole, it was satisfied with the proposed arrangement. There were, no doubt, small districts which were dissatisfied, such as St. Olave's and St. Saviour's. Some consideration, he maintained, should be shown for Local Bodies which had existed for centuries, and which had conducted their business in a way which was above praise.

MR. WARTON wished to know whether it was intended, on Report, to persevere with the 3rd sub-section of the 8th clause? It would be recollected that by an unfortunate accident the question was not raised in time; and he, therefore, wished now to ask whether the 8th clause would take effect in Westminster and Southwark as it did in other parts of the Metropolis? When the Parliamentary boroughs were divided, would persons be registered as entitled to vote in each division if they possessed duplicate qualifications? He wished to know whether the right hon. Baronet

was going to take advantage of the fact that Westminster would still be called the City of Westminster, though divided, and that persons who had two businesses or more in the two parts of that wealthy district would not be able to vote for the respective parts? If that were so there would be a singular difference made between this part of the Metropolis and other parts.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that the sub-section to which the hon. and learned Member referred was a subject upon which the House would be free to adopt what course it chose on Report. The matter had nothing to do with the agreement between the two Parties, and was entirely for the consideration of the House. His own impression was favourable to continuing the duplicate qualifications; but many of the voters would still have residential qualifications in Middlesex and elsewhere, and the change would be an enfranchising operation in one direction as well as a disfranchising operation in another.

MR. BRYCE said, that considering what had been said with regard to the representation of the West End of London he felt bound to say a few words on behalf of the East End. Whatever might be the claims of Westminster, and wherever else it might look for additional representation, at any rate it ought not to look to the East End—certainly not to the Tower Hamlets. The Tower Hamlets was not over-represented. If there was to be any difference between one part of London and another it was reasonable that those parts of London which brought the least influence to bear directly on Parliament should enjoy a larger representation in the House than districts more favourably circumstanced in this respect. They all knew that the Prime Minister, when giving the outlines of the Bill last year, had used most copiously the argument that those parts most remote from the centre of Government were entitled to a proportionately larger share of representation. The districts around Hyde Park Corner could bring a large amount of influence to bear upon the House—in fact, four-fifths of the Members of the House lived in Westminster, and were affected by its opinion; whereas the Tower Hamlets was less known to, and less capable of affecting, Members than a district in Lancashire or Scotland. The district of Westminster had a population of 229,000, and, as the Bill stood, would have one Member for every 76,000 persons. If, however, it had four Members, it would have one for every 57,000. The Tower Hamlets would have an average, on the present scale, of one Member to each 63,000; but if its number of Members were reduced to six the population would be 72,000 per Member. That figure would give a much larger average than London generally, which was one Member for each 65,000; whereas, under the Bill as it at present stood, it would have a trifle below the average number. The injustice to the Tower Hamlets, if a Member were taken from it for Westminster, would be very gross, for Westminster, with its more influential population, would have one Member for every 55,000 persons—a very low number (for London) to receive a Member—whilst, as he had said, the Tower Hamlets would only have one for each 72,000, or 17,000 more than Westminster. It would, therefore, be a serious and substantial injustice to the East End, with its constantly increasing population, to deprive it of a Member. If a Member was wanted for the West End there were many boroughs—there were even Metropolitan boroughs, although London was, as a whole, under-represented—better able to spare it than the Tower Hamlets. He hoped the Committee would reject any suggestion such as that proposed, and to which he regretted to see the Government giving any countenance.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

MR. RAIKES said he did not propose to move any Amendment until he came to the one, "Schedule 3, page 15, column 1, after 'Sheffield' (line 39), insert 'Southwark three.'"

MR. WARTON said, he should like to know what the right hon. Baronet's reason was for inserting line 37?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Nottingham has an enormously increased borough population.

MR. WARTON: There is nothing on the face of the Bill to show how it has increased.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Yes; in the 5th Schedule; and there is a Return before the House showing the increase. It has been enormous.

[*Eighth Night.*]

MR. RAIKES: I beg to move my Amendment here.

Amendment proposed, in Schedule 3, page 15, column 1, after "Sheffield" (line 39), insert "Southwark—Three."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I agree to that, and also to the Amendment in line 40, after "Swansea District," to insert "Westminster—Four."

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed, in Schedule 3, page 15, column 1, after "Swansea District" (line 40), insert "Westminster—Four."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. LYULPH STANLEY said, it should be thoroughly understood that the extra Member from Westminster must not come from the rest of the Metropolis.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: This is a portion of the offer I made to the Committee, and which was accepted.

MR. LYULPH STANLEY said, that if another Member were given to Westminster it should be taken from some small county or town like Ipswich. They should disfranchise some small town of 16,000 inhabitants, or take a second Member from some town of 50,000, or a second Member from some small county. They certainly should not take it from a place returning a Member for 60,000, reducing the representation to 78,000 per Member. Hon. Members ought to be free to vote against any special disfranchisement, and to propose any other special disfranchisement they preferred.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. FIRTH wished to draw attention to line 41, and to ask why Wolverhampton was to have three Members, whilst Kensington, with the same population, was to have only two?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Wolverhampton is the smallest constituency possessing three Members. The line has been drawn just between these two places.

MR. LEWIS: I have given Notice of my intention to move to take a Member from Wolverhampton.

DR. CAMERON said, he had an Amendment on the Paper to leave out, from Schedule 3, page 15, column 2, sub-head "Scotland," after "Glasgow," the word "seven," and insert "ten." Some of his hon. Friends, when they saw his Notice on the Paper, had said it was rather a "large order;" but it was not so in reality. The Members were there, and the districts were there; and all he wanted was that, instead of calling them districts of counties, they should call them districts of Glasgow. They were really suburban districts, and he wished them to be districts of the city, and not of the county. They were districts contiguous to Glasgow, and contained a population of 160,000. All Glasgow wished to have these districts united to it; and with regard to the inhabitants, many, at least, of the inhabitants of the surrounding boroughs were of the same way of thinking. When the Boundary Commissioners were at Glasgow they were pressed to receive evidence as to whether it was expedient to unite those boroughs with Glasgow for Parliamentary purposes; but they held that they were precluded by the terms of their Commission from accepting evidence of that character. All the other large towns in the Kingdom of anything like the importance of Glasgow were embraced in Schedule 5, and were to have increased representation with enlarged boundaries. But Glasgow had not been placed in that Schedule, and the reason assigned by the Prime Minister for dealing exceptionally with it was contained in his speech in moving for leave to bring in the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman had said—

> "The addition in the case of Glasgow will be four Members, which, added to the three it now possesses, will make a total of seven. The House is probably aware that the case of Glasgow, with reference to its suburban districts, is rather peculiar. There are many parts of those suburban districts which, though parts of Glasgow, for many purposes, are not ambitious—at least, they have not hitherto been ambitious—to be included in the Municipality."—(3 *Hansard*, [294] 376.)

That was the impression of the right hon. Gentleman. When the Commissioners had gone down they held that they were precluded by the terms of

their Commission from inquiring into the matter. The reason, he ventured to say, given by the Prime Minister for removing Glasgow from the possibility of having the question of the extension of its boundaries considered was founded entirely upon a misapprehension. In 1868, when a proposal was made by the Conservative Government to extend the boundaries of Glasgow, it was opposed by the Liberal Party and defeated. But a great many things had happened since then, and they had now to deal with a very different state of affairs. It made a great difference when a different franchise existed in the counties from that which existed in the towns, and when it was of importance whether a constituency was urban or rural, town or country. It made a difference to the political Parties in those days. But now both the political Parties entertained the same views on the subject. The lion and the lamb were lying down together for the first time, he supposed, in the history of Glasgow. The Liberal Association of Glasgow and the Conservative Association had both petitioned Parliament to allow the boundary of Glasgow, for Parliamentary purposes, to be extended. There was an objection urged, for, as he had said, opinion was not unanimous in the outside burghs. The magistrates and the officials in those burghs did not like the idea of annexation for Parliamentary purposes; but if anyone would take the trouble to read the literature they had circulated on the point it was evident that their objection was to municipal annexation. He was not arguing the question of municipal annexation, and he maintained that municipal extension and Parliamentary extension were perfectly distinct. At the present moment the municipal boundary of Glasgow was considerably larger than the Parliamentary boundary; and in the case of London the Government was committed to a proposal to unite a great number of district Parliamentary boundaries and constituencies into one great Municipality. It was complained that Glasgow was exceptionally treated in this matter. Liverpool had had its boundaries enormously increased, and Bristol was another example of the extreme increase of the boundaries for Parliamentary purposes. They in Glasgow wished to be dealt with similarly. His proposal was that the two districts of Lanarkshire, Partick and Govan, which were purely urban districts, and which by a stranger would be taken for parts of the City of Glasgow, should be for Parliamentary purposes districts of Glasgow, and not of the county of Lanarkshire, and that the portion of Renfrewshire in respect of which a third Member had been allotted, and which was constituted to a large extent of burghs contiguous to Glasgow—should also be united to Glasgow for Parliamentary purposes. He had no doubt that an objection would be raised to the boundaries he proposed for those districts in a subsequent Amendment; but everything except the first Question that the Chairman would put was purely a skeleton proposal on his part. He had placed this Amendment on the Paper simply for the purpose of showing that he proposed an increase of Membership for Glasgow, not on account of any under-representation of his constituency—although it was probably the most hardly dealt with constituency in that respect in the entire Kingdom—but he asked for increased representation with the intention of embracing the three districts he had mentioned. The Question that the Chairman would have to put would be that the word "seven" stand part of the Schedule; and if hon. Members who intended to speak on the matter would confine themselves to that, he thought it would greatly simplify the issue before the Committee. He merely raised the question of the expediency of extending the Parliamentary boundaries of Glasgow, and accompanying the extension with a proportional increase in the city representation. If his Motion were rejected all the subsequent Amendments would fall to the ground. Even if this Amendment were carried, he did not propose to shove the subsequent ones down the throat of the Government. He merely asked the Government to grant an inquiry—to send down Commissioners, as they proposed to do in Westminster and the Metropolitan constituencies, to take evidence on that portion of the case on which they felt themselves precluded from entering by the terms of their Commission. He was authorized by all the different parties in Glasgow concerned to say they would be satisfied with the result of such an investigation. It might be said there

would be some difficulty in joining to Glasgow, for example, a portion of Renfrewshire. Well, that would be for the Commissioners to judge. There could be no difficulty about joining the two portions of Lanarkshire which he asked to have annexed to Glasgow for Parliamentary purposes. The change he proposed would have no political effect. The Liberal and Conservative Associations in Glasgow had petitioned in favour of what he proposed; but there had been Petitions against it from two Liberal and Conservative Associations in the country. Meetings of the inhabitants had been held in the districts proposed to be annexed in favour of the scheme, and Memorials had been presented and deputations had been sent up, though he was bound to say those expressions of opinion on the part of the inhabitants had been repudiated by the authorities of those districts. What he wanted, and what the people wanted, was simple inquiry. It might be asked, what difference did it make whether the people of those districts voted in the burghs or in the counties? It made to the political situation no difference whatever. To 157,000 out of the 160,000 persons proposed to be annexed to the Parliamentary burgh of Glasgow it would make no difference. They would have their votes in the one case as in the other. To 3,000 out of the 160,000 who, in the case of their dwelling places being included in the county, would have a vote in the city and one in the county, it would make a difference; they would be reduced to one vote; but a large number had expressed their perfect willingness to forego the exceptional privilege of a second vote for the sake of what they considered a more equitable arrangement. As to Glasgow, the question was, whether they were to control their own representation, or whether one-seventh of the representation was to be handed over to outsiders. The communities concerned were urban and not rural. They had a community of interests for Parliamentary purposes with Glasgow, and not with the county. Their natural base as districts was to be found in Glasgow. When this matter was discussed in Glasgow they heard a good deal about the laudable and natural ambition they had to rank as the second city of the Empire. But he was not going to argue the case to the Committee on sentimental grounds. The ground he took up was the gross injustice proposed to be inflicted upon Glasgow by the present arrangement—a gross and substantial injustice. The object of this Bill was to secure *bonâ fide* representation of localities. With that object seven seats had been allotted to Glasgow. The right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had just told the Committee that the unit of representation in the Metropolitan district was one Member to 65,000; in Birmingham it was one to 62,000; in Liverpool one to 64,000; in Manchester it was one to 70,000. In Glasgow it was one to 73,000. Well, that was bad enough; but if they were to be swamped so far as one-seventh of their representation was concerned by outsiders, the case became a very hard one indeed. It was proposed to divide Glasgow into districts. One of them would be the Central or business district. That district comprised five municipal wards, three of them chiefly business wards, and in those wards 3,768 persons were enrolled as voters in respect of the occupancy of business premises, against 1,700 enrolled in respect of being householders. The disparity between householders and occupiers of business premises was annually increasing. Since 1875 the number of persons enrolled in respect of the occupancy of business premises had increased 13 per cent, whilst the number of those enrolled in respect of being householders had diminished by 27 per cent. Now, of the 4,000 persons who in this Central District were enrolled as voters in respect of the occupation of business premises, about one-fourth resided in other parts of Glasgow. They resided mostly in the West End or College District. Now, those people would vote either in the College or Central District. They took their choice, because they would only be entitled to one single vote. But the 3,000 persons who lived outside would be entitled to a second vote. Now, in the Central District there were 2,800 electors living outside the Municipality and in the burghs which he wished to annex for Parliamentary purposes, and who were enrolled in the Central District in respect of the occupancy of business premises. The residential part of the constituency was only 10,500; but the outside voters enrolled in respect of the occupancy of business premises was each year increas-

Dr. Cameron

ing. For many years past that portion of the electorate had been increasing at the rate of 5 per cent per annum. If the arrangement laid down by the Bill was authorized, the first election which took place in Glasgow would find in this Central District 3,000 outside voters who would be able to control the representation of the district, not on account of superior wealth and intelligence, because the 1,000 persons, of precisely the same position in the community, who lived in Glasgow would not have a second vote in respect of their business premises, but because the districts for whose annexation he contended were arbitrarily classed as county districts instead of as districts of Glasgow. This state would arise simply because, on imperfect information, the Prime Minister thought fit to treat Glasgow exceptionally when constructing his scheme. If, on the other hand, those districts which were purely urban, which consisted of residential burghs, were constituted districts of Glasgow—a position they would naturally fall into—the injustice he complained of would be entirely obviated. But if the Bill were allowed to remain as it stood, a phalanx of 3,000 outsiders would, as he had said, control one-seventh of the entire representation of Glasgow. From the sympathy the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had expressed in favour of the "one-man one-vote" principle, he thought the right hon. Gentleman ought to support his (Dr. Cameron's) proposal. All he asked was that Commissioners should be sent down to take evidence as to the expediency of extending for Parliamentary purposes the boundaries of the city—a duty which the last Commissioners were precluded by the terms of their Commission from undertaking. The Leader of the Opposition (Sir Stafford Northcote) was a citizen of Glasgow, and on that ground he claimed that right hon. Gentleman's sympathy. The Conservative Party in Glasgow had been making tremendous capital out of the fact that when the Bill of 1868 was before the House they were entirely in favour of extension. If the right hon. Gentleman declared against this proposal, he would certainly deal to them a heavy blow and sore discouragement. He (Dr. Cameron) did not want anything unreasonable; all he wanted was that the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) should do in the case of Glasgow what he had just promised to do in the case of London constituencies—institute an inquiry. He begged to move his Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

In page 15, column 2, line 34, after the word "Glasgow," to leave out the word "seven," in order to insert the word "ten,"—(*Dr. Cameron,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'seven' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he did not know what might be the effect on the mind of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Devon (Sir Stafford Northcote) of the hon. Gentleman's observation as to his being a citizen of Glasgow; but he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would like to state to the Committee that his mind in respect to this matter was very largely affected by the question of convenience. His hon. Friend had told them they were dealing exceptionally in the case of Glasgow. He (Sir Charles W. Dilke) could not admit that that was the case. As a general rule the Bill did not deal with very large cities by extending their boundaries, but by dividing them into single-Member constituencies. The Bill dealt in that respect with Glasgow as it dealt with London. They did not by this Bill extend the boundaries of the Metropolis so as to bring in all the urban population; but they created single-Member county districts of small areas. As he had told the Committee several times in the course of those discussions, it was very difficult in many cases to include suburban populations within the limits of the towns. The urban populations frequently stretched along roads, so that to include them in the towns or cities would involve boundaries of very singular form; there were dense populations in the immediate neighbourhood of the City of Glasgow, but there was a good deal of doubt as to what was the wish of the inhabitants of the districts with regard to their inclusion in the city. It must be admitted there was a considerable difference of opinion as to their inclusion or non-inclusion. Possibly, if the inhabitants thought that the Parliamentary question would be settled without any reference to the municipal question, and

that the settlement would not afterwards be used as a ground for the extension of the municipal limits so as to include them within the municipal boundaries, they might be more inclined to be included then they were at present. Be that as it might, there was no doubt there was a very considerable difference of opinion amongst those outside communities with respect to the proposal now made by his hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron). His hon. Friend had held out the bait that if the Government granted inquiry in regard to the matter the inhabitants of Glasgow would be satisfied. They only demanded an inquiry. Well, there was an inquiry, and an inquiry. If the Government were to have a full inquiry at Glasgow into such a matter as this by a Commission sent down for the purpose it would be a very formidable affair. He had no doubt that all these police burghs would have to be heard, not only in the person of their magistrates or their official representatives, but by individuals of different shades of opinion. Judging from the great mass of evidence one way and the other, he ventured to assert that any inquiry would interrupt the proceedings in connection with the progress of the Bill in the House. Then it would be impossible to limit inquiries of that character to Glasgow, or to any single case; while in respect to Glasgow itself, it would only raise false hopes as to the possibility of doing that which perhaps could not be done. It might, no doubt, be possible to have an inquiry of a less elaborate character than the one he had described. They might, for instance, ask Sir John Lambert and Sir Francis Sandford to give the House their opinion on the subject; and if it were the general desire of the House that that should be done, no doubt it could very easily and very properly be done. But even then that would be open to the objection of raising expectations which perhaps could not be realized, and of creating a great deal of unnecessary irritation, in addition to the very considerable amount which already existed on the subject. He had thought it right to state these considerations. On the whole, he thought it would be undesirable to hold an inquiry; but he should be glad to hear the views of the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Stafford Northcote) upon the question.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) wished that he should express his opinion on this subject; and of course, after the reference made to him by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) he was doubly bound to do so. He was afraid he was not able to concur with the views taken by the hon. Gentleman in the matter. He had heard a great deal on the subject, and had had a great many representations from different classes of persons who were interested in the question; and he was bound to say that, although the evidence was rather conflicting, the impression left on his mind was that it would be wiser and better to stand by the decision which had been arrived at by the Boundary Commissioners, and which had been embodied in the Bill. [DR. CAMERON: The Commissioners did not take evidence.] He quite understood the objection of the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) to instituting an inquiry into the whole subject. No doubt, if they were to send down Commissioners they would undo a great deal of work, and lead themselves into what would really be a very large and elaborate inquiry. If they did in the case of Glasgow what was proposed, they would probably have to do the same thing in the case of a great many other places, for there were certainly several important places in regard to which similar suggestions to the present had been made. Personally, he was not of opinion that it was desirable to disturb the arrangement before them, because to do so would lead to great delay. Even the modified suggestion of the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would, he thought, be open to very much the same objection. He had, therefore, though not without some hesitation, arrived at the same conclusion as the right hon. Baronet with respect to this Amendment.

SIR EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, he could not give an opinion upon any form of inquiry without knowing what the scope of the inquiry would be. The hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) had said that his only desire was that the Parliamentary boundaries of the city should be extended; but in regard to that matter he (Sir Edward Colebrooke) did not think the hon. Gentleman spoke

or the city which he represented, for the uthorities who appeared before the Commissioners stated their objection to an xtension of the boundaries. It would be quite impossible to hold the proposed inquiry without raising the whole question of municipal government. This was not a new question; it had been before the country for nearly than 20 years. It was very true, as stated by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron), that in the year 1867, when the Reform Bill was brought in, there was a vote taken upon this subject; but in the following year the question was brought forward in a form in which the city desired—namely, an extension of the municipal boundaries. The latter proposal was thrown out upon his (Sir Edward Colebrooke's) Motion; and though the question had since been argued again and again, it had never been raised in a definite form. In spite of what his hon. Friend said, he (Sir Edward Colebrooke) did not think, if this Amendment were adopted, that six months would elapse before a Bill was introduced into Parliament for the purpose of extending the municipal boundaries of the city. That certainly was the belief of his constituents. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had said there was considerable difference of opinion upon this subject in the urban districts it was proposed should be annexed to Glasgow. That, no doubt, was the case. The burghs which had been mentioned were, he admitted, part of the overflow of the City. When they were first formed they were not; 20 years ago they were distinct communities, and had their existence in their proximity to a great navigable river and great mineral fields. In the burgh of Govan there was a population of 60,000, and 11,000 rateable persons. The feeling there was most decidedly adverse to the present proposal, for the meeting at which a resolution in favour of the proposed annexation was adopted was only attended by 753 people. No doubt, there was considerable apathy on the subject throughout the different districts concerned; but that was owing to the belief that the Government would stand by the decision of the Commissioners. He deprecated very strongly the raising of this question under the present Bill. If the inquiry asked for were granted, the door would be opened for a very wide discussion, and in all probability the end of that discussion would not be seen by the time the Bill was ready to receive the Royal Assent. Moreover, there was another and proper tribunal for dealing with questions affecting the extension of boundaries; and so long as that tribunal was open he objected in the name of his constituents to the subject being raised in the present manner. The division of the county was very satisfactory, and it ought not to be upset unless very strong reason was shown.

MR. T. RUSSELL said, he would like to say just one word as to what had fallen from the hon. Member for North Lanarkshire (Sir Edward Colebrooke) as to the municipal extension of Glasgow, being involved in its Parliamentary extension. He denied that that would be so. The question now before the Committee had really nothing to do with municipal extension. It was simply a question of Parliamentary extension; and although there was a feeling that municipal extension would be acceptable, there was at present no general movement in that direction. The districts proposed to be comprised within the constituency included nine police burghs and several other districts not yet constituted. Several public meetings had been held in these burghs; and they had universally, by a majority, expressed a desire to be included within the City of Glasgow. The population proposed to be included was 160,000, of which 80,000 was wholly residential—that was to say, the residents came to Glasgow daily. The shipbuilding districts of Govan and Partick were urban in their nature, and quite homogeneous. As one who was present at the public meeting held by the Commissioner, he could testify to the serious feeling of disappointment which was entertained at the Commissioner being limited so in his inquiry. That feeling was shared by men of both political Parties, and by those outside as well as inside the burgh. They were universally agreed that the inclusion within the city of certain outlying districts would be a very desirable thing. To show the inconvenience of this, he need only mention one circumstance. In one case the electors belonging to a population of over 5,000 would have to walk two miles

through the City of Glasgow in order to reach their own polling place. In another district, in which he resided himself, 9,000 people had signified their wish to be included within Glasgow. He thought that perhaps there would be a little difficulty about further inquiry; but that difficulty had been greatly magnified. In fact, inquiry had been made already. Investigations had been going on for some time; and information was now in the hands of the citizens, and ready to be submitted to a Commissioner, if one should be sent down. He therefore submitted that the inquiry asked for would be very acceptable to the City of Glasgow and the surrounding districts; and he was sure that whatever decision the Commissioner might come to would be acquiesced in.

SIR JOHN HAY said, he was sorry that his right hon. Friend (Sir Stafford Northcote) agreed with the proposal of the Government. The shipbuilding interest was represented on both sides of the City of Glasgow; and in his opinion they ought to be either boroughs by themselves, or united to Glasgow, with which all their business was connected. All the shipbuilding firms had their houses in Glasgow. They were, in fact, entirely connected with Glasgow, and not with the county. It seemed to him, therefore, that the same rule ought to be extended to Glasgow by including its industries, as had been adopted in Liverpool and other cities which had had their boundaries enlarged for that very purpose. The population of Glasgow was almost identical with that of Liverpool; but the number of Members given to Glasgow was only seven, whereas Liverpool had nine. That seemed to him to be putting one of those marks of inferiority on Scotland which were elsewhere to be found in the Bill. He was certain that, so far as Scotland was concerned, that could not be considered a lasting settlement.

MR. CRUM said, that after the expression of opinion from both Front Benches, and the speech of the hon. Member for North Lanarkshire, it was unnecessary for him to detain the Committee at so late an hour by any further argument against the Amendment. He need only say that the position taken by the President of the Local Government Board, which showed that the Government would adhere to the recommendation of the Boundary Commissioners in regard to the County of Renfrew, would be entirely satisfactory to his constituents, both burghal and rural.

MR. ORR-EWING said, he hoped the Government would see their way to granting the inquiry. There seemed to be some doubt in the minds of some hon. Members who were not familiar with the circumstances of the case. He was not present at the Commission during the time it sat; but from what he knew of the feelings of the inhabitants he thought the Amendment of his hon. Friend (Dr. Cameron) would enable them to carry out their wishes. The proposed inquiry was only for the purposes of Parliamentary elections. The hon. Member for North Lanarkshire (Sir Edward Colebrooke) had persistently and consistently opposed the junction of the populous places around Glasgow with the Municipality of Glasgow. But this Amendment did not touch the municipality question at all. In fact, the municipal boundaries could not be altered without the assent of the inhabitants of these burghs. But perhaps the hon. Baronet (Sir Edward Colebrooke) was not familiar with the fact that there had been meetings in almost all the burghs around Glasgow, expressing a wish to be united to Glasgow for Parliamentary purposes. The hon. Baronet said that since 1868 there had been no attempt to combine those burghs with the Municipality of Glasgow. If he was not mistaken, the Police Bill introduced by the Lord Advocate in 1883 provided for the amalgamation of these burghs with the City of Glasgow; but he was sorry to say that Bill did not pass. The contiguity to Glasgow was an advantage to the burghs of Govan and Partick, and why should they be exempt from municipal taxation? However, that question was not before the Committee that night. The question now was the extension of Glasgow by the combination of those burghs for Parliamentary purposes. It was obvious that in a few years they would be joined and form a portion of the city. Yet Glasgow would then have only seven Members, when she would be entitled to ten. It was a great pity that Glasgow, which was generally acknowledged to be the second city of the Empire, should by this legislation be put down in the eyes of the world to be

only the fifth or sixth city of the Empire. All he wished was that the Government should do what he thought they seemed inclined to do—namely, to send down a Commission to make a thorough inquiry as to the necessity and fairness of the proposed extension.

MR. TENNANT regretted very much that the President of the Local Government Board had not conceded the inquiry, especially as he believed that the materials for that inquiry would be brought before him without loss of time. Both parties were prepared to state a case, and he thought they ought to have something in the shape of an investigation before the House did what he believed would be a permanent wrong to the City of Glasgow. They were all pretty well agreed that those outlying burghs were really the overflow of Glasgow. Their interests were purely urban; they had no interests connected with the county. Their prosperity and progress depended on the prosperity and progress of the City of Glasgow; and when they were in distress—as lately they all knew they had been unfortunately—they did not go to the landed proprietors and farmers of Lanarkshire and Renfrewshire, but appealed to their own brethren in the City of Glasgow, and he was glad to say they rarely asked in vain. Therefore, on the ground of their urban character, the inhabitants of those burghs were entitled to be citizens of Glasgow. If the granting of this Commission, and the extension of the boundaries of Glasgow for Parliamentary purposes, should be necessarily followed by an extension of the municipal boundaries, he was prepared to argue that on both grounds it would be an advantage. What was the condition of Glasgow in a municipal point of view? There were more employers of labour and heads of mercantile firms living without the boundary than within the Municipality. Of the 118,000 houses in the City of Glasgow, only 6,000 were rated above £5; the remaining 112,000 were below; thus leaving the responsibility of municipal government, not on the wealthy merchants and employers of labour, but on the artizans and poorer classes. If the present arrangement were continued, the whole burden of the City of Glasgow would be thrown on the poor, who were rated at £1, £2, £3, and £4; because the number of houses rated at £5 and upwards was gradually diminishing, while the number of smaller houses was proportionately increasing. At the present moment, about 70,000 people in Glasgow were living in single rooms. That was an exceedingly regrettable state of things, and ought to be remedied. This was not at all a political question. It was a question of what was just and safe for the city, and he thought they were doing a great injustice by continuing the municipal boundaries of Glasgow as they were. The fact was that the boundaries of Glasgow to-day were as they were in 1832. They were slightly increased in 1868; but, for all practical purposes, they were the same as in 1832. And what took place then? There were four burghs—Gorbals, Anderton, Bridgeton, and Calton—which were in exactly the same position as the burghs with regard to which reference had been made that night. They were included within Glasgow for Parliamentary purposes; but for municipal purposes they were not included till 1846—14 years afterwards. It did not at all follow, therefore, that if they now extended the Parliamentary boundaries, the municipal boundaries must be at once similarly extended. For those reasons, he thought it would be a wise thing for the Government to grant the inquiry, and so prevent a great injustice being done to the second city of the Empire.

MR. J. A. CAMPBELL said, he thought the question was not why the districts immediately surrounding Glasgow should be included within the Parliamentary boundaries of that city, but why they should not. If the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would grant the inquiry, which he expressed himself as in some measure willing to do, it would be a great satisfaction both to the City of Glasgow and the suburban districts, and he should be surprised if the Commissioners did not recommend the extension now asked for.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 110; Noes 35: Majority 75.—(Div. List, No. 76.)

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would now move that the Chairman be directed to report Progress, for though the Government would have been very glad indeed to have finished this Schedule that night, it was understood that

considerable importance was attached to the next point which would be raised upon it. He hoped, however, that the remainder of the Schedule would not occupy much time to-morrow night.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE (ADVANCE) BILL.—[Bill 101.]

(*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Hibbert.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. HIBBERT: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the second reading of this Bill, it is only right that I should offer a few words of explanation as to its object; and I think I can say that that object is quite as much, or perhaps more, political than financial, though, of course, it is true that the financial arrangements of the Bill are made upon satisfactory terms and upon satisfactory security. The Bill is for the purpose of enabling the Government to make a loan to the Cape Colony for the purpose of continuing the railway from Hope Town, on the Orange River, to Kimberley—a distance of 74 miles. Great inconvenience is felt at the present time in regard to matters of transport between those places, and even civilians experience the greatest difficulty in arranging for such transport. Indeed, we are informed that so great is the pressure for transport upon that distance between Hope Town and Kimberley that, although 6*s.* per 100 lbs. used to be the rate for the conveyance of goods, it is now the case, owing to the extraordinary difficulties of transport, that that sum of 6*s.* has actually risen to 15*s.* Of course, that makes the Cape Government very anxious, if possible, to complete the railway. It may be asked, why do not the Cape Government find money in the Colony for the purpose; but I am sorry to say that in the Cape, as well as in this country, there is depression of trade, and the Cape Government have found it very difficult to raise money either there or here for such an object; and as they were authorized in the year 1883 to raise £1,000,000 for public purposes, and as they still have unexhausted powers to borrow £400,000, they have applied to Her Majesty's Government to assist them in this emergency. Now, the question is, why should Her Majesty's Government, not having for some years past made any loans to any Colonial Government, or guaranteed any of their railways—why should Her Majesty's Government help the Cape Colony at the present time in the manner proposed? It is because this line, when constructed, will be of great assistance to the Military Expedition which is now in Bechuanaland; and it is calculated that if the railway were made, it would, so long as the Expedition lasts, lead to a saving of something over £2,000 per month—I believe the calculation is £2,250 per month. Her Majesty's Government therefore think that this is a matter which is deserving of consideration, and I may say at once that that is the main thing which has induced the Government to enter into this undertaking. Then there is the question, what is the security which is to be given for the loan? In the first place, the Cape Government transfer to the Treasury a sufficient number of 5 per cent debentures to the amount of £400,000, with a margin of £25,000 over the £400,000—that is to say, they transfer as security for the repayment of this loan debentures to the value of £425,000. They also undertake to complete the railway within eight months; and if it is not completed in that time, then, instead of paying 3½ per cent interest for the loan, they will have to pay 5 per cent. I therefore think it may be said that the arrangement is not an unsatisfactory one for England, and it is certainly a satisfactory one for the Cape. Under these circumstances, I think we may fairly ask the House to give a second reading to this Bill. No doubt the policy embodied in it differs to some extent from the principle in which we have acted of late years; but I think there are strong reasons for the proposals for carrying out this particular undertaking, and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Hibbert.*)

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I do not wish to discuss the financial details of this proposal, because I am quite pre-

pared to admit that, so far as I can understand them, if the principle of this Bill be sanctioned there can be no objection to its details. But the hon. Gentleman has very properly stated that this is a measure of a very exceptional character, and contrary to the policy adopted by this House for many years past in dealing with the Colonies. It is a guarantee of money to a Colony possessing a responsible Government to construct a railway, the principal object of which is to develop the trade of that Colony with the interior. That is not a principle which would bear a wide interpretation or frequent application. The question is whether this particular case is so exceptional as to warrant the Bill which has been presented to us. The hon. Gentleman, looking to the nature of the undertaking, said that if it were merely considered as a commercial undertaking, it might be expected that the Cape Colony would themselves supply the money to carry it out. He went on to refer to the depression of trade in the Colony and the difficulty which the Colony had in raising money for any purpose. No doubt there has been a very great depression for the last year or two in the Cape Colony; but, without wishing to go at any length into this question, I may say that those who are most intimately concerned in the affairs of the Colony would almost unanimously admit that the present financial condition of the Colony is mainly due to that uncertainty as to its future which has resulted from the policy of Her Majesty's present Advisers. But the whole of the hon. Gentleman's argument in favour of this Bill was of a temporary character. He referred to the Imperial advantages which might be derived from this railway, if it should be at once constructed, by the Expedition which is now under the command of Sir Charles Warren in Bechuanaland. Well, no doubt that is a matter which deserves very serious consideration; and as it is put forward as an argument—and I admit a very important argument—in favour of the Bill, I hope we may have some statement from the Government as to the present position of that Expedition—that we may be told what Sir Charles Warren has done and what he is going to do. We have all seen telegrams from South Africa on this subject of a more or less conflicting character, as those telegrams always are. Speaking in the absence of any official information, it seems to me that Sir Charles Warren is performing his task with great firmness and courage, and that he decidedly deserves, not only the support, but the complete confidence, of Her Majesty's Government. But I should like very much to hear something more definite than we know at present as to the condition and progress of that Expedition. I will only express a hope that Her Majesty's Government will take care that Sir Charles Warren's proceedings are not brought to an end until he has completely carried out the whole object of his Expedition to Bechuanaland, and that there will be no undue haste in attempting to carry out the desire which has been expressed by the Cape Government for the annexation of that territory to the Cape Colony. I think, as was pointed out by Sir Charles Warren himself in his comments on the instructions which were delivered to him, that that is an essential element in the success of his undertaking. I do not want at this late hour to detain the House; but there can be no doubt, not only of the temporary, but of the permanent importance of this railway which the Bill is intended to develop.

MR. MONK wished to point out to the House that this was the first proposal which had been made since the present Government came into Office for a Colonial loan. He believed the last proposal was made in the year 1879, when the late Government were in Office, under the West India Loans Act. It really was a very serious thing, when a Government had been in Office for five years, that they should come forward and propose that this country should guarantee another Colonial loan, especially after the numerous speeches which had been made by the present Prime Minister against Colonial loans. He (Mr. Monk) recollected that so long ago as the year 1869 he acted with his right hon. Friend now President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) in moving the rejection of one of these Loan Bills; and though there was a strong feeling shown in favour of that measure, it was only carried on a division by a narrow majority of 10. At that time the present Prime Minister said

that before 1865 the practice had been slowly growing up of giving these guarantees, and the right hon. Gentleman contended that such guarantees ought not to be given except for objects of broad Imperial policy. He (Mr. Monk) was not satisfied, from the explanations given by the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hibbert), that this railway would be of any great use for Imperial purposes. To begin with, it was proposed that the railway should be completed in eight months; but he very much doubted whether it was possible for it to be finished in that time, or for it to be of any use for their troops. What the House was asked to do was to recur to a most objectionable system—a system which had been condemned, he thought, by almost every Gentleman now sitting on the Treasury Bench. Unless some stronger reasons could be given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in favour of departing from the rule observed by Parliament during the existence of the present Government, he hoped the House would not agree to this Bill. He moved that it be read a second time on that day six months.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(*Mr. Monk.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

SIR HENRY HOLLAND said, that he rose to support this Bill, and he desired, in the first place, to point out to the House that the hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Monk) had misunderstood the character of the Bill. He had treated it as a case of a guarantee, which it was not, and therefore his objections to it failed. It was an advance to the Cape Government. He agreed, however, that such advances should not be made except in special cases, and he did not desire that this Bill should be treated as a precedent for making advances except in such cases. He thought this was an exceptional case, looking to the state of things in South Africa; and he understood that the right hon. Baronet (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) took the same view, though he regretted—and in this regret he (Sir Henry Holland) shared—that the Government had given the House so little information as to the exact state of affairs in that country. He believed, however, that this railway, when completed, would prove of great and immediate service to the Cape Government, and he thought it might also prove of use to this country in the future, unless peace was restored in Bechuanaland. He wished to be satisfied upon one part of the financial arrangement provided by this Bill, which was not in the usual form. He observed that advances might be made by the Home Government before the Colonial Legislature had passed any law providing, to the satisfaction of the Treasury, for the repayment of the advances and interest thereon. That this was the case would be seen by a reference to Sub-section 3 of Clause 3 of the Bill, by which it was provided that if the Legislature of the Colony did not pass such a law within a reasonable time, &c., the Treasury might refuse "to make any further advance;" and the Colonial Government were, in such case, to pay interest at the rate of 5 per cent, instead of 3½, on the advances already made. Now, if the present Colonial Government, or their successors—and changes of Government were tolerably frequent at the Cape—declined to introduce such a law, or if the Colonial Legislature declined to pass it, it was clear that the Home Government could not enforce the return of any advances, nor the payment of increased interest. He presumed that in such case, though not a very probable one, the Home Government would recoup themselves out of the debentures to be deposited with them by the Government of the Colony under Clause 3, Sub-section 1. He wished to know whether he was right in that assumption?

MR. COURTNEY said, he did not propose at that late hour (1 o'clock) to enter into the question of the policy of this particular advance. He was content to rely on what had been the long accepted principle of all Governments formed from the Liberal side of the House—that it was very injudicious to enter upon these advances to Colonial Governments. He thought the burden of proving the case rested entirely upon Her Majesty's Government, and he did not think the case had been satisfactorily made out by the Secretary to the Treasury. He wished to point out one very extraordinary portion of the agreement, so far as it appeared in the Bill, which was his first acquaintance with it.

It had already been referred to by the hon. Baronet the Member for Midhurst (Sir Henry Holland). The Agreement was one apparently entered into between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of the Cape Colony; but it seemed to have been rather forgotten how very insecure in its position a Government at the Cape usually was, and how much it depended on a Parliamentary majority, which was very easily turned from one side to the other. It was an Agreement with the Government of the Cape, and had not been submitted to the Legislature of the Cape. If they were going to safeguard the financial interests of this country, they ought at least to secure that no advance should be made under the Agreement until the Legislature of the Cape had entered into an equal obligation with the Legislature of this country which we had entered into towards them. This was the first time he had ever seen in a Bill such an entity referred to as "the Government of the Colony," and he did not know what was the legal acceptation of the phrase. It might be, as the hon. Member for Midhurst had pointed out, that the Cape Legislature might fail to pass a law upon the subject. In what position would they be then as to the amount which, up to that time, might have been advanced? He thought it was clear that they would then be unable—because the Bill did not contemplate such a contingency—to exact 5 instead of 3½ per cent. If the Legislature of the Cape refused to ratify such legislation, how could they obtain from the Revenue of the Cape that extra charge which was to be the penalty for non-fulfilment of the contract? They could not propose, by any Agreement with the Cape Government, to impose a penalty upon the Cape Legislature. His hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury relied upon the debentures. He (Mr. Courtney) did not know whether there was any lawyer upon the Treasury Bench who could give them any light upon the subject; but he had very great doubt himself as to whether the deposit of those debentures could, under the circumstances he was suggesting, be made use of. He was supposing the case of the Legislature of the Cape proving hostile to the carrying out of this Agreement. He knew the Act of the Cape Legislature to which his hon. Friend had referred. It enabled the Colonial Government to raise money upon debentures which should be issued at par at rates to be settled by the Government from time to time. He was not quite sure, but he rather thought there was an actual legal decision under which, though a Colonial Government might have power to raise money upon debentures to be issued at par, it had no power to pawn the debentures—it was not thereby enabled to carry the debentures off to some other part of the world and raise money upon them by pawning them. Yet that was the proposal made here. A certain number of the debentures in excess of the amount of the loan were to be pawned. That was not issuing them at par, but at a discount, in direct violation of the requirements of the Act itself. The whole transaction amounted to this—that if the Legislature viewed the Agreement with hostile eyes and did not carry it out, they would have advanced money and they would be unable to realize the security. They would have advanced money upon an illegal security. Under those circumstances, and quite apart from the political objections to the transaction which were exceeding grave, the financial aspect required a good deal of explanation, and he hoped that some further information would be given to the House before the next stage of the Bill was taken.

MR. PULESTON said, he had no interest in the Bill, but he had had some opportunity since he first saw it of conversing with some people from the Cape who were sufficiently authorized to go into the facts of the case. He had ascertained in a way which satisfied his own mind that this proposal met with the approval of almost everybody in the Cape, and it was inconceivable that the Cape Legislature would refuse to ratify it, because they got, on very easy terms and in a very easy way, money to construct a work of great national importance to them. Therefore, although he agreed with some portion of the remarks of the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, he thought they must take something for granted in discussing this question, and certainly they might feel perfectly secure that no Legislature at the Cape would venture to refuse to pass a law ratifying this Agreement, in view of its terms and of what it was designed to carry out. He wished to correct one

statement made by the hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Monk), who had called this arrangement a guarantee. It was not a guarantee, it was an absolute loan, and it was made in the interests of this country as well as in the interests of the Cape.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): As the financial question has been raised, I may be allowed to correct what appears to me to be a misapprehension on the subject at the present moment, and to explain what the financial grounds for this proposal really are. The question is a very simple one. We were urged by the Military Department to assist the Cape Government in more rapidly constructing this railway in consequence of the advantage that would accrue to Her Majesty's Government in connection with the Bechuanaland Expedition, and because of the extremely onerous and expensive method of conveyance from the Orange River to Kimberley. There was no prospect of the railway being made during the course of the Bechuanaland Expedition unless Her Majesty's Government came to the rescue, and the Military Department would be saddled with a large expenditure for transport which would be necessary during the course of next year if there were no railway. That was the inducement for the Bill. I entirely concur on general principles in all that has fallen from the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach). Nothing would induce me to be a party to such a Bill if it were merely to lend money to a Colony for railways for the ordinary purposes of transit or commerce. But this is really in the nature of a military work, and is an exception to the general rule, which I accept quite as strongly as my hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney). Then what was the arrangement which we had to make? My hon. Friend has asked—"Why did you not require an Act to be passed by the Cape Parliament in the first instance?" [Mr. COURTNEY: Oh, no.] I mean before an advance was made. Well, Sir, the whole reason was this. The Legislature of the Cape is not in Session, and it would be utterly unreasonable to require that Legislature to meet simply for the purpose of ratifying the arrangement under this Bill, if we had what we considered sufficient security without it. We, therefore, took this precaution, stated very plainly in the 3rd section of the Bill, that there should be deposited with us a sufficient amount of debentures, with a margin beyond the amount of the loan; and we conceived that there could not be any more proper security than the deposit of such debentures that we could possibly ask for. So far, therefore, from the debentures which we are to receive being foreign to the object of the Bill, as my hon. Friend appears to think, they are distinctly germane to its object, because they are debentures on which the Cape would raise money for the very purpose of constructing this railway. We are satisfied with the inquiries we have made. We think the Cape Government are perfectly competent to deposit these debentures with us, and that if the Cape Legislature does not pass the Act completing our security, these debentures will be available, and could be disposed of by us in this country in respect of the first instalment which is not met. The security of the Treasury is, therefore, complete. The whole case is this—that, finding that the Cape Government have power to construct this railway, we have agreed, for military purposes, to lend them the money on the security of debentures. If, after making the first advance, the Colony does not go on with the undertaking, Her Majesty's Government, under the 1st clause of the Bill, have power to say they will make no further advance. I think that I have now answered conclusively the point raised by my hon. Friend.

MR. R. N. FOWLER said, that having travelled over the country in question, he would like to make one or two inquiries of the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies. He believed that it would be an easy thing to construct this railway from the Orange River to Kimberley, because he apprehended that no engineering difficulties were involved; but he would be glad to know what it was proposed to do with regard to crossing the Orange River. There could be no doubt that when it was called into existence, it would be a most important line. The House was aware that the Diamond Fields at the Cape were of great importance to this country, and he might say to the world, and it was a great

object to the Cape Government to extend the system to the Diamond Fields. It was obvious also that the military operations in Bechuanaland would be greatly promoted by the construction of the railway. He would be glad if the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies would say whether it was intended to make a bridge across the Orange River?

MR. FRANCIS BUXTON said, his hon. Friend the Member for Devonport (Mr. Puleston) had treated it as a matter of course that the Government of Cape Colony would be ready to make this railway. The object of the Bill, as had been pointed out, was to advance a large sum of money to the Cape Government, who would be responsible for the construction of the railway, the avowed object of which was to assist Sir Charles Warren and his Forces in Bechuanaland. It appeared to him that the Cape Government were far from friendly to this Mission, and, indeed, almost hostile to any military measures being taken at all. Under the circumstances, he asked whether the Government had taken due security and guarantee from the Cape Government that this railway should be pushed on with the utmost possible celerity, so that it might be used by Sir Charles Warren's Forces in returning from Bechuanaland?

MR. CROPPER said, he looked with satisfaction on this railway, which would open up Bechuanaland. When he considered the fact that there was a Colony of 50,000 people at Kimberley, and that it would be on the line of the direct route into Africa, he could not help thinking that the railway itself would very soon reward the Colonists. He was of opinion that so far as the line itself was for a definite object the Colonists at the Cape would always regard it with satisfaction. The hon. Gentleman who introduced the Bill had brought forward, one very marked fact—namely, that the present rate for goods carried into the interior was 15*s.* per 100 lbs. weight. That alone was sufficient to show the need of better means of transport than the miserable waggon road which was at present the sole route by which goods could be carried into the interior.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I can assure the hon. Member for Andover (Mr. Francis Buxton), that if he will examine the Bill closely, he will see that security has been taken that the railway will be pushed on with all possible speed. It is to be completed within eight months, and in the event of that condition not being complied with, it will be a question with the Imperial Government whether to make any further advance or not. With regard to what has been stated by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), the Government admit that this is an operation of an entirely exceptional character, which cannot be more strongly marked than by the fact that the proposals to the Treasury were made, in the first instance, not by the Colonial Department, but by the War Department. Representation was made by the Cape Colony that they were not in a position to proceed with it financially immediately, and they represented to us that, in view of the military operations in Bechuanaland, it might be an object of very great importance in prosecuting the war there. The question was considered by the War Department, and we were convinced that if those operations which are now proceeding under Sir Charles Warren, in Bechuanaland, were to be continued for any length of time, they would, by means of this railway, be greatly facilitated, and that if, unfortunately, operations more active than those now in operation were necessary, it would be of great advantage to have this railway—an advantage which could hardly be measured by any pecuniary cost. We thought this a question which might very properly be brought before the Colonial Office and the Treasury—that an advance might be made from the National Exchequer under the exceptional circumstances of the case. We believe that this would be a very proper use of the public money, and although the matter has passed out of our hands, I believe security has been obtained which will protect the Exchequer against any loss. The right hon. Gentleman has asked whether any information had been received with respect to Sir Charles Warren's Force, and the operations which have taken place. I am very sorry to say that the Government have very little detailed information as to the movements of Sir Charles Warren's Force, although I am expecting to receive fuller information every day. All we know is, that Sir Charles Warren

has moved the Force under his command with great rapidity, with great energy, and apparently so far with success. He has, I believe, provisionally settled the affairs of Stellaland; he is now in Goshen, and, so far as we know, entire success has attended all the operations which he has undertaken; he has not only not met with any opposition, but I believe he has been cordially received by a very large proportion of the population, and apparently he is making very fair progress with the Mission intrusted to him. As soon as we are in a position to make a fuller statement to the House, we shall take an opportunity of doing so; but the information we have received is so very slight that it is impossible at the present time to make any detailed statement. In reply to another question of the right hon. Gentleman, I can assure him that there will be no undue haste on the part of Sir Charles Warren's Force to leave the territory; but until we have fuller accounts than we now possess from Sir Charles Warren as to the whole position of the situation, it will be impossible to state what will be done. Certainly, after the exertions we have made, and after the success which has attended so far upon Sir Charles Warren's Expedition, I may assure the House that the Government will do nothing which would tend to undo the work which Sir Charles Warren has accomplished, and that we shall do all in our power to give fuller information on the subject.

MR. R. N. FOWLER said, he should like to know what arrangement had been made with regard to the bridge across the Orange River?

MR. HIBBERT said, that a contract for the bridge had been taken.

MR. COURTNEY said, he wished to point out to the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he had not touched his point at all. He was afraid he had not made it clear. The point he had endeavoured to make, and which he wished his right hon. Friend to take up and look into before the next stage of the Bill, was that these debentures could not be used in the way proposed under this Bill. The debentures were issued under an Act of the Cape Legislature which gave power to issue debentures to meet its occasional wants. The words of that Act were not being carried out in the present case, and therefore it would appear that the security proposed under this arrangement was no security under the Act. His right hon. Friend would doubtless see whether there was anything in the point he had raised by consulting with the Law Officers of the Crown and the Treasury. The simple fact was, as it appeared to him, that the debentures supposed to be available as security could not be used for the purpose of a loan.

MR. HIBBERT said, perhaps his hon. Friend was not aware that an Act had been passed by the Cape Legislature in 1884, which authorized the construction of the railway and the use of the money available under the former Act for the purpose of making the railway? The Government were satisfied that those two Acts, taken together, formed a perfect security.

MR. PULESTON asked if power was vested in the Cape Government to borrow money in this way?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, that the Government were satisfied, from inquiries made, that the Cape Government could deposit the debentures for the purpose of the railway, and that there would be no question as to the security. He was quite willing, however, to look into the matter again before the Bill went into Committee.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (RETURNING OFFICERS) BILL.

(*Mr. Attorney General, Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

[BILL 99.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

COLONEL MAKINS said, he hoped the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill would give some explanation with regard to it.

MR. H. H. FOWLER said, the Bill related to uncontested elections. Under the existing Act, where there was no contest, the Returning Officer was en-

titled to demand that one-fifth of the amount of his expenses should be deposited as security. If they amounted, for instance, to £300, he was entitled to a deposit of £60. It had been pointed out that this was an excessive amount, and when the subject was brought forward the Attorney General said he would propose that the amount should be reduced. The present Bill proposed that the amount of the deposit of one-fifth should be reduced by half. He (Mr. Fowler) believed that those who had had experience would agree that the ordinary expenses of an uncontested election would be amply secured by this amount.

COLONEL MAKINS said, he thought it would have been well to have included in the Bill some provision for the exceptional circumstances which would arise under the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill. The number of Returning Officers required to be appointed would be far in excess of the present number; and it was a matter of extreme importance to ascertain whether there existed any local power for the appointment of a sufficient number of Returning Officers to discharge the necessary duties in connection with Parliamentary elections. It was obvious that those duties would be very different in the future from what they had been in the past. There would be in some cases six divisions, and in others as many as 20; and special provisions would have to be made to meet such cases. He doubted whether any authority existed at present to enable or compel the High Sheriff to appoint a sufficient number of Returning Officers, so as to insure those duties being performed. As far as he could judge, the Authorities were not at all satisfied that there was any power which enabled them to appoint those Officers, or compelled them to do so. This matter came within the scope of the Bill as it now stood, and the object of the Bill would seem thoroughly to justify the insertion of a clause which would remove the disability which he believed now existed. Without detaining the House any further, he would simply observe that he had felt it his duty on that occasion to draw attention to this matter on the Motion for the second reading of the Bill, which seemed to afford an opportunity of making a necessary reform in order to meet the altered circumstances that would arise in connection with Parliamentary elections.

MR. WARTON said, he had no wish to speak on the Bill in the absence of the Attorney General; but he was compelled to do so on this Motion. It would be in the recollection of the House that he had received from the Attorney General, whose absence he regretted, a kind of promise that he would afford him an opportunity on this Bill of raising a question of practical importance to all candidates at the next General Election. He had taken the opportunity of pointing out, either on the Report or the Committee stage of the Elections in Counties (Hours of Polling) Bill, he did not remember which, that in the Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt Practices) Act there was an inconsistency between two of the Schedules of that Bill with regard to the Returning Officer's charges. The Attorney General said that he should have an opportunity of raising the point upon the present Bill, and, therefore, he would be glad to know whether it was the intention of the Government to remove the inconsistency?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir FARRER HERSCHELL) said, the hon. and learned Member for Bridport had correctly stated that when the Attorney General announced his intention of introducing this Bill, he said that although it was intended for a particular purpose, he would take care that the title was wide enough to take in the question raised by the hon. and learned Member. His hon. and learned Friend, however, had not pledged himself to introduce in the Bill any provision of the kind referred to; but he had undertaken to introduce a Bill with such a title as would enable any hon. Member to raise the question which the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Warton) had raised. With regard to the other matter, to which the hon. Member for Mid Somersetshire (Mr. R. H. Paget) had called attention, it had frequently been referred to, and it seemed to him that it would be more properly dealt with in the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill, which had reference to the Returning Officers. [Mr. R. H. PAGET: Only in boroughs.] Yes; but any alteration with regard to the counties would more properly come within that Bill than the one it was now proposed to read a second time, for the

Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill dealt with the question of who were to be the Returning Officers. He quite admitted that the subject was well worthy of attention.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he was glad to hear from the hon. and learned Gentleman that the Bill had been enlarged in its title. The pledge which had been made had, he thought, gone a little farther than the hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) had said, for the Attorney General had not confined himself entirely to uncontested elections, but had, he thought, also said something about contested elections. He hoped such clauses would be introduced into the Bill as would tend to economy in the way of reducing the expenses of elections. He was sorry the Government were not going to take the initiative themselves, because he thought that such action on their part would meet with general consent. He did not think there was now a person in the House who wished to pay a farthing more than they could possibly help in connection with Returning Officers; and unless those items were effectually kept down, the Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Act would fail in its purpose of making Parliamentary elections inexpensive and open to larger classes of the community.

MR. STAVELEY HILL wished to point out that, although the title of the Bill was wide enough, the scope of the measure was limited by the Preamble. He would call attention to that more especially with regard to the remarks which had fallen from the hon. Member for Mid Somersetshire. He would ask the Government whether they would be willing to introduce new clauses dealing with this subject into the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill on Report? They had passed through all the clauses of that Bill in the Committee stage, and it would not, therefore, be possible now to introduce new clauses until they came to the Report stage. It would be difficult for a private Member to carry such clauses as those he suggested, unless he were promised by the Government that they would accept his proposals. Would the Government give such a pledge?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir FARRER HERSCHELL) said, that a Committee was to sit, for the first time, tomorrow, to go into the question of registration, and they might be able to afford some assistance in the matter; but, however that might be, he should recommend the county Members who took an interest in the subject to recommend their views to the right hon. Baronet who had charge of the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke). If they would let the right hon. Baronet know what they wished to be done, and would show him the necessity of it, no doubt he would endeavour to meet them.

MR. SEXTON said, he had stated, last year, that the effect of the new franchise would be to greatly increase the number of working-men candidates, but that the present scale of charges made by the Returning Officers would be prohibitory to this class of candidates. He had understood the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister to assent to that view; and he had gathered from what fell from the right hon. Gentleman that the Bill to be introduced would not only affect the expenses to be paid at uncontested elections, but also at contested elections. The question that really affected the constitution of the House was not what a man should pay in the event of there being no contest, but what he should pay if the contest took place. If the Bill was to meet the necessities of the case, it would have to deal with the question of the scale of expenses in the case of contested elections, and would have to face the question of working men's expenses.

MR. R. H. PAGET said, that, with the permission of the House, he would ask the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General to consider this question. The hon. and learned Gentleman had suggested that probably the Amendment he (Mr. Paget) desired could be introduced in the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill. He himself thought the Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers) Bill was the right place for it; and the hon. and learned Gentleman had made another suggestion — namely, that probably it would be as well to leave the matter to the consideration of the Registration Committee. Between these three stools it was not unlikely that they might fall to the ground; and he would, therefore, ask the hon. and learned Gentleman

whether they should press an Amendment, wait for the Report of the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill, or go to the Committee on Registration?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir Farrer Herschell): I would recommend the hon. Gentleman to take the course he desires in relation to the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill, as I think the subject is more directly relevant to that measure.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday.*

COUNTY OFFICERS AND COURTS (IRELAND) [PENSIONS].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of special pensions to Clerks of the Crown and Clerks of the Peace in Ireland, under certain circumstances."—(*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Mr. SEXTON: I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said, that before that Motion was put the hon. Member should understand what was the character of the Bill which would be founded upon this Resolution. The Bill would relate to the Treasury, and would authorize the pay and pensions of certain officials in Ireland. The offices of Clerks of the Peace and Clerks of the Crown in Ireland were, under a certain Act passed in 1877, to be amalgamated. Cases, however, occurred where when one office became vacant it was not desirable to propose the holder of the other office to fill it, and where, consequently, a temporary appointment was desirable. In these cases there would be a pension and a temporary salary running at the same time, and the Local Authorities would have to bear the burden of a double payment. A case of this kind had recently arisen in Dublin; and what the Government were now seeking to do was to enable the Treasury to undertake the payment of the pensions so long as temporary salaries were paid for these duties. The present was merely a formal stage of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did I understand the hon. Member (Mr. Sexton) to move the adjournment of the debate?

Mr. SEXTON: No; I did not, Sir.

Mr. BIGGAR said, that, no doubt, Clerks of the Crown and Clerks of the Peace in Ireland were scandalously overpaid; and he would suggest to the right hon. Gentlemen that while he was on the subject he should make inquiries to ascertain what was reasonable compensation to these gentlemen for the amount of service they performed. In many cases they were practising attorneys, who were in receipt of good private incomes, and, whilst receiving official salaries of £1,200 a-year, paid a small amount to clerks who did the bulk of their work for them. Every case of that kind he looked upon as a scandalous job. The Act had been passed at the instigation of Members who wished to make provision for their election agents. It had been pushed through, and the ratepayers had been saddled with payments for a long period in a most scandalous manner. The matter deserved to be looked into, and, if possible, these payments should be curtailed. If Her Majesty's Government could succeed in curtailing the salaries of the men in possession, the money so saved would make provision for their successors.

Resolution *agreed to;* to be reported *To-morrow.*

ARMY (ANNUAL) BILL.—[Bill 104.]

(*The Marquess of Hartington, The Judge Advocate, Sir Thomas Brassey.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Marquess of Hartington.*)

Mr. SEXTON: I object. The Motion is only on the Paper for the first time to-day, and consequently Members have not had an opportunity of putting down a Notice of opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is an Order of the Day, and the fact of the hon. Gentleman's objecting does not prevent it from coming on.

Mr. SEXTON: I thought that when such a Motion appeared on the Paper for the first time objection could be taken.

MR. SPEAKER: That applies only to a Notice of Motion.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, that before the Bill was read a second time he should like to ask whether the Government were in a position to state how the Volunteers from the Colonies would be circumstanced in regard to military law when they were serving with the British or Indian troops? A similar question had been put the other day; but he believed that no clear or definite answer had been returned.

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN) said, he would answer the question as far as he could. The question involved the consideration of a great many Acts of Parliament which were not at present before him. He might say—to speak generally—that all the Volunteer Forces raised in any of the Colonies—with the single exception of the Cape Mounted Rifles, who were under a discipline of their own—were, when on military service, placed by the Colonial Legislatures under our military law. There were some modifications in the application of that law, however, so far as such Forces were concerned, the most important of which was that they were not liable to corporal punishment. Again, some of the Colonial Forces could only be tried by courts martial consisting of their own officers. Looking to those discrepancies, and to the importance of placing all men serving under the same flag under the same discipline, he had advised—and he thought the arrangement would be carried out—that the Colonial Forces serving with the British Forces should be put unconditionally under Imperial military law; but that could only be done with the sanction of the Colonies themselves. The hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Sexton) had spoken of the Bill having only been circulated that morning——

MR. SEXTON: No; I said this stage had only appeared on the Paper this morning.

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN): I think it was put on the Paper on Saturday.

MR. SEXTON: Yes; but this is the first Sitting of the House since it was put down.

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN) said, that, at any rate, the Bill was a simple one. It was merely a renewal of the old Army Act, with only four Amendments in it, all of which were very simple. He should not have asked the House to read it a second time that night if it had proposed any serious change in the law. If the second reading were now agreed to, he should not propose to take the Committee stage until Thursday.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked, whether the right hon. and learned Gentleman was of opinion that the law observed in the Colonies as to Colonial Volunteers would have effect when the Volunteers were serving beyond the jurisdiction of the Colonies?

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN) said, he could explain that matter. Under the 177th section of our Army Act, Colonial Forces serving with our Forces were placed under our military law, except so far as the law of the Colonies was inconsistent with that law. Of course, if the Colonies made their law consistent with ours, the Colonial troops would be under our military law altogether.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, his hon. Friend the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) had not taken exception to the second reading of the Bill on trivial grounds, or merely for the purpose of causing inconvenience or annoyance to Her Majesty's Government or to the House; but he had had a very distinct and definite object. No one was better aware than the right hon. and learned Gentleman in charge of the Bill that the hon. Member had brought before the House very often a special grievance as to the Regulations of the Army. At present, the Army Regulations were such that the wives of soldiers when deserted were practically left unprotected. The hon. Member, in bringing the matter before the notice of the House, had acted from time to time not merely in obedience to his own feelings, but in consequence of representations which had been made to him and to several other Members of the House by persons interested in removing the grievance. The amendment the hon. Gentleman wished to bring about in the law was to compel soldiers to maintain their wives when removed to a distance from them. At present, it was optional with the Commanding Officer to compel the soldiers to maintain their wives; but

the hon. Member desired to remove that option.

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN) said, that he had two years ago consented to make a promise which was then optional compulsory. It was compulsory now.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, that his hon. Friend had watched the case much more closely than he had; and he (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) should be very much surprised if his hon. Friend were wrong. It was for the reason he had mentioned that the hon. Member had objected to the second reading. He would point out that hon. Members had been taken at a considerable disadvantage by the Government in regard to this Bill. If a Member of the Government were to be allowed to give Notice of the second reading of a Bill for the following Sitting at the very moment the House was rising, then all opportunity of blocking such Bill was taken away, and, consequently, all opportunity of securing that it should be taken at a proper hour of the night.

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN): I think I am right in what I said. In the Army Act were the words, "The Secretary of State *may* order," &c.; but in consequence of the action of the hon. Member, those words were changed to, "The Secretary of State *shall* order a sum not exceeding," &c.

MR. SEXTON said, the Act said "not exceeding," so that the Secretary of State might do what he liked.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said, he thought it extremely unfair that this Bill should be read a second time at that hour of the night. There were a large number of Members who were extremely interested in all affairs relating to the Army; and he had no doubt—and he was sure the right hon. and learned Gentleman who was now seeking for the second reading of the Bill also had very little doubt—that if proper Notice had been given by the Government of their intention to move the second reading that night, many Members would have been in their places who were now absent—who were absent simply because they were under the impression that the Government would not attempt to go on with the Bill at that hour of the morning. However, he merely wished to enter this protest. With regard to the question raised by the hon. Member for Queen's County (Mr. A. O'Connor), he should be very glad if he could elicit a little information from the right hon. and learned Gentleman in charge of the Bill. The right hon. and learned Gentleman had said, in reply to the hon. Gentleman the Member for Queen's County, that the Volunteers and Colonial Forces serving with the British Army were under British military law. He (Mr. W. Redmond) wished to have an emphatic assurance on that point. Were these soldiers who were serving with the British Army at their own expense under British military law? That was a question which had been raised before, and in which he knew a great many people to be interested. If those men were not amenable to British law, were they amenable to Australian law; and, if not, then to what law?

MR. KENNY said, he thought the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) was quite correct in the point he had raised; for though the word "shall" had been substituted for "may," the obligation was still practically optional, inasmuch as the Commanding Officer could order the soldier's wife to receive "any sum not exceeding," &c. He could order a very small sum to be paid. The condition of the law was very unsatisfactory, the obligation being really a nullity. He thought the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Judge Advocate General ought to accede to an adjournment of the debate. A quarter past 2 in the morning was an extremely unreasonable hour for such a discussion as that. The question involved was very complicated and very interesting; and looking at those facts, and at the unusual hour at which the Bill had been brought on, he begged to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Kenny.*)

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I really hope the House will accede to the second reading of this Bill to-night. It will, I think, be seen that the point referred to by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) and the hon. Gentleman who spoke last, is one which, if raised at all, should be raised in Committee. My right hon. and learned Friend does not intend to bring

on the Committee stage until Thursday, which will give ample time for hon. Members to bring forward any Amendments they think it right to bring forward. Under the circumstances, I trust the House will not think it desirable to agree to the Motion for Adjournment.

MR. SEXTON said, he thought that it would perhaps be as well for them to accept the suggestion of the noble Marquess, and put down Amendments for Thursday; but, with all respect to Mr. Speaker's ruling, he was still in great perplexity as to why the Standing Order embodying the Half-past 12 o'clock Rule did not apply in this case, when a Member objected to the Order being proceeded with.

MR. SPEAKER: The ruling I have given has been given more than once from the Chair, and there can be no doubt about it.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday.*

EAST INDIA (LOAN) BILL.

Resolution [March 19] *reported*, and *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Sir ARTHUR OTWAY, Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, and Mr. KYNASTON CROSS.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 109.]

MOTIONS.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (POOR LAW) (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL, Bill to confirm certain Orders of the Local Government Board under the provisions of "The Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876," as amended and extended by "The Poor Law Act, 1879," relating to the Parishes of Aller, Barrington, Berecrocombe, Camerton, Curry Mallet, Curry Rivall, Drayton, Dunkerton, Earnshill, Fivehead, High Ham, Huish Episcopi, Isle Abbots, Isle Brewers, Kingsbury Episcopi, Kingsdon, Long Sutton, North and Mid Littleton, Pitney, Puckington, Somerton, South Littleton, and Swell, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL and Sir CHARLES DILKE.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 107.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (POOR LAW) (NO. 3) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL, Bill to confirm certain Orders of the Local Government Board under the provisions of "The Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876," as amended and extended by "The Poor Law Act, 1879," relating to the Parishes of Ashcot, Bridgewater, Cannington, Chedzoy, Chilton Trinity, Durleigh Etchingham (two), Fiddington, Goathurst, Grointon, Hawkhurst (two), Huntspill, Lyng, Middlezoy, Mountfield, Nether Stowey, North Petherton, Othery, Otterhampton, Overstowey, Sandhurst, Shapwick, Stockland Bristol, Wembdon, Weston Zoyland, and Wollavington; and to the Hamlet of Edstock and Beer, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL and Sir CHARLES DILKE.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 108.]

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Registration of Parliamentary Voters in Ireland; and for other purposes connected therewith, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN and Mr. SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 110.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 24th March, 1885.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—*Third Report*—Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod.

PUBLIC BILL — *First Reading* — County Justices * (*55*).

FRANCE AND CHINA—HOSTILITIES—INTERNATIONAL LAW—RIGHT OF SEARCH.—QUESTION.

EARL DE LA WARR asked, Whether there was any truth in the statement that there was a difference in the treatment by France of England and Germany as neutrals?

EARL GRANVILLE: In answer to the Question of the noble Earl, I have to state that yesterday I was informed by the French Ambassador that, noticing that a similar Question had been put in the House of Commons, he had immediately telegraphed to his Government, and the French Government authorized him, in the most formal manner, to assure me that the treatment of neutrals would be exactly the same in all cases, whatever the nationality might be.

METROPOLITAN IMPROVEMENTS—PARLIAMENT STREET, &c.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

LORD LAMINGTON, in rising to call attention to a Bill entitled—

"An Act to authorise the widening of Parliament Street, Charles Street, and Delahay Street, and the making of a new street in the parish of St. Margaret, Westminster, and for other purposes,"

said, that he wished to explain the extraordinary nature of the Bill, although it was not before the House, and he could not, therefore, properly discuss it on the present occasion. The Bill really transferred the whole responsibility of the Government as regarded most important public buildings to a private Company. Nothing could be more unsatisfactory than for the Government to hand over its duties to an irresponsible body. A similar Bill was introduced last year for the construction of a railway from the Marble Arch to Westminster, and the inducement held out to the Government was that the Company would carry out all those improvements in Parliament Street which, he maintained, ought to have been made many years ago by the Government themselves. The Bill of last year was very properly thrown out. The approaches to the Houses of Parliament were a perfect disgrace to the nation. The first thing that the Government ought to have done was to take down the remainder of Parliament Street and to build thereon a new War Office, making proper approaches to the two Houses of Parliament. But nothing whatever had been done by the Government, and the blame did not rest with the present Government alone. Notwithstanding all this, large plots of ground purchased by the Government had been kept for years without any buildings, and meanwhile the property that would have to be taken ultimately was greatly increasing in value. This extraordinary Bill proposed that a Company should be formed with a capital of £300,000, held in £20 shares. There were to be five Directors, whose qualification was to be £500 each. Three were to be a quorum, and two had already elected themselves.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY rose to Order. The Bill the noble Lord opposite (Lord Lamington) was discussing was not before the House at all. Although the Rules of the House were sufficiently elastic, he was convinced that none of their Lordships would consider that the noble Lord was in Order in discussing such a Bill.

LORD LAMINGTON said, he wished to point out that he had admitted that he was not strictly within the Rules when he began. If the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Rosebery) objected, of course, Notice could be given when the Bill came on in the usual course.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, that, though the Bill was before the other branch of the Legislature, his noble Friend (Lord Lamington) was not restricted from discussing the subject.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY said, that would be a dangerous precedent to introduce into that House. What he objected to was not so much the noble Lord's discussing the Bill as to himself (the Earl of Rosebery) having to discuss it in answer to the noble Lord. The Bill would come before the House on a future occasion, and then they could proceed regularly.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, if the noble Earl really thought there was a danger of the discussions of the House of Lords getting too lengthy upon the matter, that altered the case; but that danger was hardly to be apprehended.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY said, that he would not further contest the point with the noble Marquess.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that the noble Lord opposite (Lord Lamington) might, of course, go into the general subject after proper Notice of Motion without any impropriety at all, and the mere fact of a Bill being pending in "another place" would not preclude his doing so. If his ears did not deceive him, however, the noble Lord was going into particular details of a Bill now pending "elsewhere," which he (the Lord Chancellor) ventured to think did not belong to the general subject. Such observations ought to be reserved until the Bill came before the House.

LORD LAMINGTON said, that he would not go into the details of the Bill; but its principle had been objected to by many public bodies, and, in particular, by the Westminster Board of Works. He would point out what the noble Earl (the Earl of Rose-

bery), having been so recently appointed to his present Office, might not be aware of, that we were actually paying no less than £35,000 or £40,000 a-year for the hire of Public Offices scattered all over London. Even if the new War Office were built, there would still remain £25,000 a-year, which represented a capital sum of about £900,000; yet only £300,000 was wanted for the purposes of this Company, which was to have seven years allowed for effecting these improvements. As he could not refer to the Bill, he would conclude by moving for Papers.

Moved, "That there be laid before this House, papers relating to the widening of Parliament Street, Charles Street, &c."—(*The Lord Lamington.*)

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY said, that so far from objecting to the general sense of what the noble Lord had said, he thought the House was indebted to him for bringing the question forward. Since entering on the Office which he (the Earl of Rosebery) now held, he had investigated the subject; and, although formerly he had been of opinion that a Private Bill for the purpose was not one that it was necessary to interfere with, he now agreed with his noble Friend that it was highly objectionable that this great site and the improvements to be made on it should be left to private enterprize. Since his former answer to the noble Lord, other circumstances had come to his knowledge of which he was not then cognizant. He found that it might be necessary to find room for the Admiralty officials, who might be turned out before the end of the year to make way for the new buildings designed for the Public Offices. He might say generally that there was another objection, which was that the Bill gave a private Company large powers to deal with a particular site for a considerable time without putting upon them any compulsion to use those powers. A third objection was, that a site of so much importance and so closely connected with the Government ought not to be handed over to a private Company. The noble Lord was Chairman of a Committee under the late Government, which Committee reported on three different schemes, each costing at least £2,250,000. Even under that Government the noble Lord was quite unable to obtain the slightest attention to his urgent request for money to carry out the scheme. It must be obvious that, at this moment, when our financial position could not be considered to be as satisfactory as it was upon that occasion, the Government could not be expected to find funds for dealing with this site in what his noble Friend called an Imperial spirit. He was afraid, therefore, that he could not hold out any hope of the Government doing anything at present. As to the particular measure to which the noble Lord had hypothetically alluded, the most careful and serious attention of his Office should be given to it at once.

LORD NORTON inquired, whether the sham buttresses outside Westminster Hall were intended to afford the only means by which the judgment of this House was to be appealed to as to the design for that part of the building? He wished to know whether any designs would be laid before that House, or exhibited in any room there?

VISCOUNT BURY said, he wished to remind the noble Earl that he had given no answer respecting the production of the Papers for which his noble Friend (Lord Lamington) had moved.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY said, he had to ask that Notice might be given of the Question concerning Westminster Hall. With regard to the point about the Papers, he did not think there were any Papers relating to the matter, and certainly there were none which could be produced before their Lordships.

Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

NAVY—TORPEDO BOATS—THE CONTROLLER OF THE NAVY.

QUESTIONS.

VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether the Board of Admiralty have sent a naval officer to the United States for the purpose of inspecting a newly invented torpedo boat recently purchased by the American Government for purposes of harbour defence; and whether the report of that officer can be laid on the Table for the information of Parliament? Also, Whether the copy of an Order in Council procured by the Right Honourable Hugh Childers, the purport of which was to render the Controller of the Navy responsible to the First Lord

as distinguished from the other members of the Board of Admiralty, can be laid on the Table?

THE EARL OF NORTHBROOK, in reply, said, that a naval officer had been instructed to inquire into the matter on the spot and to inspect the vessel; but it would not be desirable to give the Report to the public. In answer to the second Question, he had to say that the Order in Council had been already laid upon the Table of that House. Moreover, a Select Committee of their Lordships' House was appointed to inquire into all the circumstances of the case, and the Order in question would be found in the Appendix to the Report of that Select Committee in the year 1871.

COUNTY JUSTICES BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to amend the law relating to Justices of the Peace — Was *presented* by The Earl BEAUCHAMP; read 1ª. (No. 55.)

House adjourned at Five o'clock, to Thursday next, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 24th March, 1885.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE — School Board Elections (Voting), *appointed.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolution* [March 23] *reported* — *Ordered*—*First Reading* — County Officers and Courts (Ireland) [Pensions] * [112].

Motion for Leave—Telegraph Acts Amendment, *debate adjourned.*

Ordered — First Reading—National Education (Ireland) [111]; Police * [113].

Committee—Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) (*re-comm*) [49]—R.P. [*Ninth Night*].

Committee—Report—Cape of Good Hope (Advance) * [101]; Consolidated Fund (No. 2).*

QUESTIONS.

—o—

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS—BRITISH BARLEY.

MR. HICKS asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether he can state the number of quarters of British barley returned as having been sold in the week ending March 1st 1884 at and below 32*s.* a quarter, the number of quarters returned as having been sold above 32*s.* a quarter and not exceeding 40*s.* and the number of quarters returned as having been sold at a price exceeding 40*s.* a quarter; and, whether he can state the lowest and the highest price per quarter of British barley returned in the week ending March 1st 1884?

MR. J. HOLMS: In order to obtain the information asked for by the hon. Member, the Board of Trade would have to communicate with their officers at the 187 towns at which the prices of corn are collected, and some of these officers would have to examine a large number of Returns. The process will be laborious and costly, and ought not, I think, to be undertaken unless there is some important public object to serve. Perhaps, therefore, the hon. Member would be good enough to call at the Office of the Board of Trade, when it may be found possible to supply the information he desires in some other form.

LOCAL TAXATION AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT—LEGISLATION.

MR. DUCKHAM asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he can state when it is purposed to introduce the measure for dealing with the whole question of Local Taxation and of Local Government, as declared to be most urgently required in the Amendment accepted by the Government and carried by this House upon the Debate on Local Taxation on the 17th April 1883?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: The subject of the reform of local government in the Metropolis and in the whole of the Three Kingdoms is much in the mind of Her Majesty's Government. Large measures on the subject are ready; but the question as to which of them can be carried in the present Session is hardly ripe for decision until we see our way to the completion of the Committee and Report of the Amendments on the Seats Bill.

THE BOUNDARY COMMISSION (SCOTLAND)—INSTRUCTIONS TO THE COMMISSIONERS.

MR. JOHN HAMILTON asked the Lord Advocate, Why the instructions to the Boundary Commissioners for Scotland, as printed in their Report, contain a third paragraph instructing them to take into consideration the pursuits of

the population in counties, which was not in the instructions laid before the House of Commons, and issued to the public at the time the Commissioners held their meetings in Scotland; and, why no public mention was then made of amended instructions having been issued?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (MR. J. B. BALFOUR): It is true that in the Correspondence with the Secretary of State as to the appointment of Commissioners, which was laid on the Table of the House, and which contained a statement of the duties of the Commissioners, there was no Instruction to take into consideration the pursuits of the people in counties. But in the Instructions actually issued to the Commissioners for England and Wales, and also for Scotland, this defect was supplied, and the Commissioners were especially directed that in dealing both with county and burgh divisions special regard should be had to the pursuits of the population. The Instructions to the Commissioners for Scotland were not signed until after the close of the Autumn Session, and consequently could not be presented to Parliament, or published as a Parliamentary Paper, till Parliament reassembled. The Instruction in question is, I venture to think, even more required in the case of counties than of burghs.

AFRICA—WEST AFRICAN SETTLEMENT—SIR SAMUEL ROWE.

SIR WILLIAM M'ARTHUR asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether it is true that Sir Samuel Rowe, Governor of the West African Settlements, has organised an expedition into the interior for the purpose of extending commercial intercourse with the Native tribes; and, if so, whether Her Majesty's Government will lay upon the Table any correspondence on the subject which they have received from His Excellency?

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY: We have as yet received no information from Sir Samuel Rowe of any intended expedition; but he went out with general instructions to endeavour by peaceful means to restore quiet and order in the countries adjacent to Sierra Leone and British Sherbro, with a view to the revival of trade. A great number of merchants interested in the district asked for this special mission, because they thought Sir Samuel Rowe was the most likely man to be able to effect the purpose.

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—NON-VESTED NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

MR. KENNY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the Commissioners of National Education will be requested to reconsider the prevailing system of refusing grants for the repair, &c. of "non-vested" National schools, while the Commissioners keep the schools vested in themselves in repair at the public expense; and, if steps will accordingly be taken to relieve local trustees from the burden placed upon them by the present incomplete system?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I see no reason to depart from the principle I announced on the 1st of December last, that the owners of the school fabrics are the proper persons to keep them in repair.

ISLANDS OF THE WESTERN PACIFIC—LABUAN.

MR. GORST asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether Labuan still remains a possession of the British Crown, or has been ceded to the North Borneo Company; whether the governor of that Company's territories has been recently appointed Governor of Labuan, and whether he holds the office of Her Majesty's Consul General at Brunei; in which capacity has he negotiated the late cession by the Sultan of Brunei of a large part of the West Coast of Borneo, and to whose sovereignty is it ceded; whether the expedition which annexed this territory proceeded from Labuan; and, what measures are taken to enable the Sultan of Brunei and others to distinguish between the sovereignty of Great Britain and that of the North Borneo Company?

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY: Labuan has not been ceded to the North Borneo Company. The Governor of the Company's territories is also an officer of the Colonial Service, who administered Labuan from 1877 to 1880, when he was permitted to leave the Colonial Service to hold the appointment of first Governor of the Company's territories. He has

lately been granted an extension of leave of absence. He is now acting also as Administrator of Labuan and Consul General during the absence on leave of the Administrator, Dr. Leys. It was in the capacity of Governor of the Company that he negotiated the late cession. The Sovereignty is that of the Company under its Royal Charter. I know of no expedition which proceeded from Labuan; but I believe that Mr. Treacher was conveyed across as a passenger by Her Majesty's ship *Pegasus*. The Sultan of Brunei is fully aware of the constitution of the North Borneo Company, whose Charter provides for the acquisition of territory, subject to the approval of Her Majesty's Government. I may add that Sarawak is interested in similar cessions, and Her Majesty's Government think that the Rajah's position should also be considered.

NAVY—H.M.S. "GARNET."

MR. GORST asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether H.M.S. *Garnet* is now undergoing extensive repairs at Bermuda; what is the nature and estimated cost of those repairs; whether the *Garnet* was fitted out for service in the West Indies at the end of 1882, at a cost of £15,000; and, whether the efficiency of ships of the *Garnet* type is such as to render the expenditure of such sums upon their maintenance advisable?

MR. CAINE: Her Majesty's ship *Garnet* is not undergoing extensive repairs at Bermuda. The only repairs which have been authorized are estimated to cost £127. The *Garnet* was fitted out for service in 1882 at a cost of £15,000. Ships of the *Garnet* type are efficient, and such as to justify the expenditure incurred for their maintenance.

LAW AND JUSTICE—SENTENCE ON HENRY WILLIAMS AT WINCHESTER ASSIZES.

MR. W. FOWLER asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the sentence passed on Henry Williams, at Winchester, in November last; whether he has received a Memorial from Poole, numerously signed, and including several magistrates amongst the signatures, protesting against the conviction and sentence; and, whether he will order an inquiry into the case?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I have gone into the case more than once, and have come to the conclusion that there is no reason to interfere.

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—PENJDEH.

MR. M'COAN asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether there is any, and, if so, what, truth in the following paragraph in *The Daily Telegraph* of yesterday:—

"*The Central News* is enabled to state that Her Majesty's Government have received information that the Russians have endeavoured to create an outbreak in Penjdeh, the assumption being that Russia would immediately use this pretext for interfering and seizing the place. The British authorities have certain knowledge of a letter sent by the Russian Officer Alikhanoff, instigating the Sarikhs of Penjdeh to rise. It is not known whether the Government of St. Petersburg has disavowed this act on the part of its officer, but, as the English Government were aware of this Russian intrigue previously to Mr. Gladstone making his recent reassuring announcement in the House of Commons, it is believed that M. de Giers has made such a disavowal?"

MR. ONSLOW asked, Whether it was not within the knowledge of Her Majesty's Government that General Alikhanoff had on the occasion of the late advance attempted to get into Penjdeh by a *coup de main*, but that the Afghans turned out in considerable force, and the Russians retired?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: In reply to the Question of the hon. Member for Wicklow (Mr. M'Coan), that of the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Onslow), and that of which the hon. Member for Eye (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett) gave Notice yesterday, but has not put on the Paper, I can only repeat what I have stated more than once in this House—that in the present stage of the negotiations it would be inexpedient to reply to Questions of this nature, more especially when they are founded upon newspaper reports. I may add that I am not aware that *The Daily News*, as stated yesterday by the hon. Member for Eye, has published a report to the effect that Her Majesty's Government are prepared to assent to the Russian occupation of Penjdeh.

MR. ONSLOW: I beg to point out to the noble Lord that the Prime Minister asked us to put Questions with regard

to the matters of fact. The Question which I have put is no controversial matter, but is purely a matter of fact, and has reference to whether a certain fact is not within the knowledge of the Government. If the noble Lord cannot answer it now, I will put it down for next Thursday.

MR. M'COAN: I wish to ask whether information was not received by telegraph from Sir Peter Lumsden early this month, advising Her Majesty's Government of Russian intrigues going on in Penjdeh; if so, whether that communication will be laid upon the Table of the House?

[No reply.]

EGYPT (FINANCE &c.)—REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, as Sir E. Baring, in his Despatch of the 3rd November 1884, stated that a Return of the Revenue and Expenditure of Egypt would always be available ten days after the close of each month, he would lay upon the Table such a Return for the year 1884?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): No, Sir; we have a provisional account, but the Annual Return has not yet arrived in a complete state. I have asked Earl Granville to telegraph for it, and as soon as it arrives, and I have had time to examine it, I hope to arrange that it be laid on the Table.

TURKEY—THE FRANCO-ENGLISH LOAN OF 1855—THE CONVENTION.

MR. GIBSON asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Would he reprint and cause to be circulated the Convention relating to the Franco-English loan to Turkey in 1855, in order to enable the House to realise the significance (if any) of its being referred to in recent negotiations relative to the Egyptian financial proposals? He also wished to know whether the Convention contained any clause or term expressly dealing with the subject of international interference? [*Parl. Papers*, c. 4342, 4343.]

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Yes, Sir; orders have been given for the Declaration and Convention relating to the loan in question to be reprinted without delay, and I have this afternoon laid them upon the Table.

MR. GIBSON: Can the noble Lord say whether the Convention itself contains any term expressly dealing with international interference?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The right hon. and learned Gentleman will perhaps be content to wait until he sees the Papers, which will be in his hands at once.

SUEZ CANAL—THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION.

MR. GIBSON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Are the instructions to the British representatives on the proposed Commission to draw up the Agreement relative to the Suez Canal yet prepared; when will those instructions be laid before Parliament; how soon will the Commission begin its work; and, will the Report of the Commission be directly or indirectly communicated to Parliament before a final decision is arrived at upon it by the Government?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: It would be unusual and inconvenient to publish the instructions to our representatives before the meeting of the Commission; but I may mention that, as stated in the despatch of February 3, 1885, from Lord Granville to Lord Lyons, which is included in the Papers I laid on the Table yesterday (Egypt, No. 7), all that is required is to draw up a formal Article for the purpose of carrying into effect the principles set forth in the Circular of two years ago with the addition of a provision regarding the equipment of ships of war in the Canal. This is stated at page 9 of the Papers presented last night, in the section marked B. The Commission will meet on March 30. In reply to the last part of the right hon. and learned Member's Question, it is not intended to depart from the usual practice, which, in these matters, places the responsibility of negotiation on the Executive Government.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Will the noble Lord have any objection to reprint the extract from Lord Granville's despatch of January, 1883, in regard to the Suez Canal? Such a course would be very convenient.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I shall be very glad to mention the matter to the Secretary of State. I may, however, remind the right hon.

Baronet that the Blue Book containing the despatch is a very recent one; it is the last Blue Book of 1882, although the despatch is dated 3rd January, 1883.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: If the decision of the Commission affects the value of the Suez Canal shares, and if that decision is not submitted to Parliament before the Government act upon it, what remedy will Parliament have against the Government for deteriorating the value of public property?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The hon. Gentleman the Member for Portsmouth will hardly expect me to answer a Question of that kind without Notice.

EGYPT (FINANCE, &c.)—RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he could state the exact amount by which the payments out of the Egyptian Exchequer will exceed the receipts and balances during the month of April; and also specify the nature of such payments?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): The noble Lord will, perhaps, on reconsideration, see that one expression in his Question is a little unreasonable. Even in this country I could not state the exact amount by which the payments out of the Exchequer will exceed or fall short of the Revenue in a particular month to come, and I certainly cannot give such an exact statement with regard to Egypt. But, after the Question which the noble Lord put to me yesterday, I asked Lord Granville to telegraph to Sir Evelyn Baring for the probable financial position of the Egyptian Treasury in April; and I find that the deficit, after exhausting the balance in hand on March 31, will be about £310,000. The chief items are the payment on account of deficiency on the Domain Loan, the payment of the tribute to Turkey, and the salaries of the Administration. Both of the former payments are obligatory under the laws now in force. These sums do not include the payment of certain advances made to the Egyptian Treasury under Article 37 of the Law of Liquidation of 1880. Some of these will fall due on the 1st of April.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: There is a matter of great importance in the papers published to-day. There is a statement made that, as regards the Commissioners of Public Debt, they are in possession of a sum exceeding by £200,000 all demands to be made upon them for some time to come. It is also stated by Sir Evelyn Baring that after the month of April the receipts of the Egyptian Treasury will exceed the expenditure up to the month of September. That being so, there only remains this one sum of £100,000; and what I want to ask the Government is, whether, if these be facts, it is outside the financial capacity of Her Majesty's Government to make some arrangement to meet this paltry sum other than prematurely binding this House to a permanent loan of £9,000,000?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): The noble Lord has evidently not read the Papers. Had he done so he would have observed that the use of the money in the hands of the *Caisse* is what has been condemned by the unanimous voice of the Powers; and, after being parties to the Convention, we could not, without a violation of the public law, take any money out of the *Caisse* which is applicable to local purposes. As to the noble Lord's other suggestion, that we ourselves should lend money to Egypt, I am not aware that this House would be prepared to pass an Act for that purpose.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Is it true that the Government have promised to a Foreign Power that this question shall be settled before Easter by the House of Commons?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): The hon. Member had better place his Question on the Paper. I certainly have never heard of such a promise.

EGYPT (THE MILITARY EXPEDITION)—THE NAVAL BRIGADE.

MR. BRETT asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, From what ships the men composing the Naval Brigade now with Lord Wolseley were selected; and, whether their places on board these ships have since been filled up; and, if not, for what reason?

MR. CAINE: The men composing the Naval Brigade appear to have been taken from the *Alexandra*, *Inflexible*,

Superb, *Monarch*, *Invincible*, and *Téméraire*. The Commander-in-Chief selected them. Supernumeraries have been sent from home to fill the places of these men.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND) — THE GRAND JURY AND THE "FREE FORCE," CO. KILKENNY.

MR. MARUM asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been directed to a Petition to Parliament of the Grand Jury of the county of Kilkenny adopted last week, containing the following statement:—

"That whereas the justices of the county, acting upon the advice and recommendations of the local executive and Constabulary officials, have determined that the 'free' force of the Constabulary is insufficient efficiently to work the several police stations of the county without the addition of an extra force, which now involves an annual local charge of £1,700, we therefore submit that the 'free' force should be augmented to the full complement required to make up such proper normal standard;"

and, whether, in the promised Police Bill, provisions will be inserted so that wherever the "free" force shall be found insufficient for the proper working of Constabulary stations, it shall be augmented to a proper standard for such purpose, and that the measure shall not be restricted to a mere redistribution of the existing "free" force, even though such be deficient as aforesaid for ordinary service?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have not seen the Petition referred to in this Question. The views of the Government as to the "free" force have been embodied in a Bill which is in the hands of hon. Members.

LOCAL TAXATION AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT—LEGISLATION.

SIR BALDWYN LEIGHTON asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether it is the intention of the Government this Session to make any provision for the relief of local taxation, according to the Resolution of the House of Commons last Session; and, seeing that about nine-tenths of the local rates are now administered by popularly elected bodies, and most of the rest under the immediate direction of the Home Office, and seeing also that the London Government Bill of last year, stated to be the basis of a County Government Bill, contained no provision for such relief, whether it is still the determination of the Government to postpone all such relief until the passing of a County Government Bill?

MR. GLADSTONE, in reply, said, this Question was one of a family of Questions which had not unnaturally been put to him with regard to a variety of Bills as to which the Government had more or less pledged itself to bring before the House on the first opportunity. The time had not yet come when they could arrive at a decision on the question. The subject was one of great complication, and would require a good deal of time for its consideration. The Government were quite sensible of its urgency. He would make a statement whenever they saw what time would be at the disposal of the House; but to attempt to do so now would be premature.

EGYPT (FINANCE, &c.)—THE NEW LOAN, 1885.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether the undertaking of the Khedive to issue a Decree for a new Loan of £9,000,000 is subject to the obligation first to submit the matter for the opinion of the Egyptian General Assembly, in accordance with the 35th Article of the Organic Law of the 1st May 1883, as follows:—

"Art. 35. L'Assemblée Generale doît être consultée pour avis. 1 Sur tout Emprunt Public;"

and, if this is not to be done, then whether the Organic Law has been abrogated, or is it to be set at nought in this instance, with the consent and approval of the British Government?

MR. GLADSTONE: My hon. Friend asks me a Question with regard to which I cannot give particular details. The business of the Khedive, no doubt, if he thinks proper, is to take all the steps required by the law in force in Egypt to fulfil in a regular manner his part of the duties connected with this Convention. Application has been made to the Khedive upon the subject, and he has engaged to take all those steps. Therefore, my hon. Friend need not feel any alarm as to what has been done so far as Egypt is concerned.

CENTRAL ASIA — RUSSO-AFGHAN FRONTIER COMMISSION.

MR. E. STANHOPE asked the First Lord of the Treasury, If he can now hold out any hope of a day being fixed for the commencement of the work of the Afghan Frontier Commission, or if it is to be understood that, in accordance with the request of the Russian Government, the negotiations for the settlement of the Frontier are to take place in London?

MR. GLADSTONE: There are two Questions here, and I am not able to answer them at the present moment. I think I ought to say, however, in justice to the Russian Government, that we do not think the time has come when we can fairly make it a matter of complaint that there has not been received an answer to an important communication by Lord Granville, which was but recently made —on the 16th of March. That has been transmitted to St. Petersburg; but we could scarcely expect an answer to have reached us by this date. We do not believe that the answer will be long delayed. The effect of that answer will be to bring to an issue the question whether negotiations shall take place in London, or whether there is to be a preliminary inquiry on the spot, and consideration by a Commission, which we desire.

MR. E. STANHOPE: I will repeat the Question on Monday.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL: Perhaps the noble Lord the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs can answer this Question now; if not, I will put it on the Paper. I wish to ask, as a Question connected with this matter, are we to understand that the state of local tension on this question as to the disputed boundary will prevent our Commission from continuing and completing their survey so as to ascertain the physical facts, or, notwithstanding the occupation of those parts of the country in dispute, that our boundary officers are still at work completing the survey?

MR. ONSLOW: Was it not, as a matter of fact, arranged last Autumn between the Governments of England and Russia that the boundary should be fixed in Afghanistan and not in London?

MR. GLADSTONE: I must request the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) to put his Question on the Paper. With respect to the other Question, I do not think it would be convenient to enter into a discussion of the matter now. The Russian Government had made this proposal to us—a proposal which we were bound to consider, and we have not yet received a reply to our answer.

MR. ONSLOW: What proposal?

MR. GLADSTONE: I do not wish to go back to that—[*Opposition laughter*]—and I decline to go back, notwithstanding the method of receiving Ministerial answers in very grave circumstances, and which seems to be greatly gaining ground in this House—I decline to go back and give partial replies to partial questions on partial transactions, from which partial answers inferences may be drawn that may be injurious to the public welfare.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: Will Her Majesty's Government, before the House breaks up for the Easter holidays, be prepared to make a statement as to the state of the relations between this country and Russia?

MR. GLADSTONE: I may answer that Question by saying that I have not the least reason to suppose that it would be in the least degree advantageous to the Public Service that we should make any such statement at any time whatever.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: The right hon. Gentleman has referred to a proposal made by the Russian Government. Will he be so good as to say to what proposal he refers?

MR. GLADSTONE: The proposal to negotiate.

LUNACY LAWS—RECEPTION OF INSANE PERSONS INTO WORKHOUSES.

MR. W. H. SMITH (for Lord ALGERNON PERCY) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether the Guardians of the Westminster Union have called the attention of the Board to the recent decision of Mr. Justice Wills, in the proceedings lately taken against the Master of the Marylebone Workhouse, and other officials of that Union, with regard to the reception of insane persons into workhouses; whether it is proposed to issue any letter instructing masters of workhouses and relieving officers as to their duty in this matter; and, whether it is proposed to introduce any measure for the amendment of the Law relating to the reception of persons supposed to be insane into workhouses,

and for the protection of Poor Law officials from the responsibilities in which they may be involved by the strict application of Mr. Justice Wills's decision?

MR. GEORGE RUSSELL: The Guardians of the Westminster Union have called the attention of the Board to the decision of Mr. Justice Wills in the Marylebone case. It appears that in that case a woman who was not a pauper, and who was alleged not to be under proper care and control, was by stratagem removed to the workhouse, and was detained there against her will for a period of 14 days, and that the requirements of the Statute were altogether ignored. The publicity which has been given to the decision in this case will be a warning to the officers of other Unions if there should be any disposition to adopt a similar course. It does not at present appear to the Board to be necessary to issue a Circular letter on the subject, neither would they be prepared to propose legislation for legalizing action such as that in the case in question.

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—GENERAL GRAHAM'S FORCE—ACTIONS ON THE 20TH AND 22ND MARCH.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he had any further news from General Graham; whether he could give any more details with regard to the numbers killed in the action of the 22nd of this month; and, also, whether he could state the number of transport animals and camp followers killed on that occasion?

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked, Whether it was true that the English Forces were fighting against the women and children of the Soudan as well as the men?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I have received no communication from General Graham except some telegrams on Departmental business, and except the telegram received last night, which has been published in the papers.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR asked, Whether the noble Marquess would answer the Question put by his hon. Friend the Member for Queen's County (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) as to whether he had received any confirmation of the statement which had appeared in telegrams from the seat of action, that the bodies of some women and several boys were found around the zerebas; and, whether he would not think it necessary to communicate to the Military Authorities on the matter?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I answered the Question when I said that I had received no intelligence beyond the despatches published in the newspapers this morning.

EGYPT—THE SLAVE TRADE IN THE SOUDAN—PRISONERS OF THE MAHDI.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention has been called to a statement by *The Daily News* Correspondent at Korti, that—

> "There is an immense traffic in slaves around Khartoum. In consequence of the large number of prisoners, female slaves are selling at 48 reals to 92 reals a-piece;"

and to statements which appear in all the papers that female prisoners from Khartoum are being freely sold near Korti for £16 a-piece; and, whether Her Majesty's Government will authorize Lord Wolseley, by telegraph, to ransom these unfortunate victims, and also to ransom Slatin Bey and M. Cuzzi, now prisoners of the Mahdi?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I have seen the paragraph in *The Daily News* to which the hon. Member refers; but I am not aware whether the statements made in it are accurate or not. It appears to me to be extremely doubtful whether it would be desirable to direct or authorize Lord Wolseley, as the hon. Member suggests, to ransom those unfortunate victims, and it seems to be extremely probable that such a course might greatly tend to encourage the traffic that is said to be going on. With regard to Slatin Bey and M. Cuzzi, I can add nothing to what was stated the other day by my noble Friend the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs. The noble Lord said that Her Majesty's Government had taken no steps to ransom Slatin Bey or M. Cuzzi; but one of the main objects of Lord Wolseley's Expedition would be to secure the safety of those who remained loyal to the Egyptian Government, and that he would take every step that is likely to secure that object. He also said that Lord Wolseley had received full powers to take whatever steps he thought proper.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked whether the noble Marquess distinctly declined to advise Lord Wolseley by telegram that he was at liberty to ransom these unfortunate persons, and especially Slatin Bey and M. Cuzzi? He also asked the Prime Minister whether he still adhered to the opinion that the Slave Trade had received a decided check in the Soudan? ["Order, order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is asking the noble Lord to reply to a Question he has already replied to; and is, therefore, not in Order.

PROTECTION OF YOUNG GIRLS—LEGISLATION.

MR. CROPPER asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it was the intention of the Government to introduce any measure this Session for the better protection of young girls?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Yes, Sir. The Bill introduced last Session into the House of Lords will be re-introduced there almost immediately.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—RIOT AT NEWRY—TRIAL AND ACQUITTAL OF WILLIAM ORR.

MR. O'BRIEN: I would like to ask the Solicitor General for Ireland a Question which I think he will have no difficulty in answering without Notice—Whether he has learned that William Orr, charged with discharging a revolver from the Orange Hall at Newry on a Nationalist procession, was acquitted to-day by a Belfast jury; whether it was sworn by the police that the prisoner threw the revolver out of the window when one of the barrels had been discharged; and whether the jury not only acquitted Orr, but expressed their disapproval of the Nationalist procession permitted by Lord Spencer; whether the further charge of riot against Orr will be proceeded with before a Belfast jury; and, whether the trials of the other Orangemen charged with firing at the Nationalist procession will be entrusted to juries which have made so gross a display of partizanship?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER) said, he could not answer the Question.

MR. O'BRIEN: Will the hon. and learned Gentleman answer whether it is intended to proceed with the cases against the Orangemen at the Belfast Assizes?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER) said, he would speak to the Attorney General on the subject.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

—o—

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (REDISTRIBUTION) (*re-committed*) BILL.—[BILL 49.]

(*Mr. Gladstone, The Marquess of Hartington, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Attorney General, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 23rd March.*]

[NINTH NIGHT.]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

THIRD SCHEDULE.

BOROUGHS TO HAVE ADDITIONAL MEMBERS.

MR. SEXTON moved, in page 15, column 2, line 41, after the word "Dublin," to leave out the word "four," and insert the word "five." The hon. Member said the object of the Amendment was, of course, obvious. It was to increase, by one Member, the representation which was allotted by the Bill to the City of Dublin. He thought he should easily be able to show that the City of Dublin had been treated exceptionally hardly in the Schedule; and if he established that contention he hoped to be able to lay before the Government, with great confidence, the Motion he had the honour to make. He was still further encouraged by the circumstance that the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had dealt very tenderly with the claims of the City of Westminster, the proposed representation of which he had agreed to increase from three Members to four, although the City of Westminster had a population of nearly 40,000 less than the City of Dublin, which had only four Members allotted to it, even with an extended boundary. The Motion which he desired to make was one which he thought would commend itself both to English and Scotch Members of the House. He did not propose to call in question the relative augmentation of

the representation allowed to the three countries under the Bill. He was satisfied that the gross representation of England, Ireland, and Scotland should remain as it was now proposed; and as the additional Member for the City of Dublin, if he were allowed, must be taken from some other constituency in Ireland, he conceived that the English and Scotch Members would be in a position to give a fair and impartial consideration to the case he proposed to make. It would also commend itself to men of all political Parties. The Motion was not made in the slightest degree in the interest of any political Party, and he candidly confessed that if it was adopted he was unable to see to what particular Party it would work with advantage. Indeed, he thought there were very few people in Dublin itself who could speak with confidence upon that point. The vital principle of the Bill was the principle of population. Whenever the Government had been attacked with reference to any of their proposals they had generally defended themselves by a reference to the principle of population; and when they were not prepared to agree to an Amendment that was proposed they usually referred to the population principle in order to justify their objection to such Amendment. But before he came to the question of the population of the City of Dublin, he wished to say, in the first place, that he pleaded for Dublin as the capital city of Ireland. If any deviation was to be made from the strict principle of the Bill in the case of a capital city it should be a deviation favourable, and not adverse. Dublin was a capital city in every respect, except that it was not the seat of the Legislature. It was formerly the seat of the Legislature, and he had no doubt whatever that it would very soon again occupy that position. But in the meantime, and until that result was secured, the special interests of Dublin were such as needed particular representation in that House. Questions relating to the municipal life of the city—to its rating, and to the collection of its rates, were constantly demanding attention; and, therefore, he maintained that Dublin was entitled to the full measure of representation which it ought to have according to the principles of the Bill. The position he laid down was this—that Dublin should no longer be cramped within artificial and restricted boundaries—that the boundaries ought to be so drawn as to include the whole City of Dublin, as it actually stood at the present moment; and that when the boundaries were so drawn the representation ought to be fixed according to the principles of the Bill to the full extent of the population. Speaking of Dublin as the capital of Ireland, he found it described by a standard authority as the centre of all the political, ecclesiastical, educational, fiscal, commercial, and military institutions of the country, and he might add that it was also the seat of judicature, and the centre, not only of literary and scientific research, but also of political Party organization. The right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board, in repulsing the case of Limerick last night, referred to the question of area. The right hon. Gentleman stated that the area of the borough of Limerick was exceptionally large. Now he ventured to assert that no such point could be made in reference to the borough of Dublin, because the present extent of the Parliamentary borough of Dublin was only 5,500 acres. The addition he proposed to make to that area was about 3,000 acres, so that the total area of the extended borough would only be between 8,000 and 9,000 acres, or less than one-third of the area of the present boundaries of the borough of Limerick. He found, by a Return issued in 1881, that the area of Sheffield in that year was 20,000 acres, or more than twice as much as he proposed to give to the borough of Dublin; the area of Leeds was 22,000 acres, or more than twice as much; and he thought he could point out upon the maps appended to the Report of the Scotch and English Boundary Commissioners at least half-a-dozen cases of boroughs where extensions had only been carried into effect under the fifth Schedule of the Bill, which covered an area more extensive than that which he proposed for Dublin—a borough much more considerable in point of population. He came now to the question of population, which was the vital point under the Bill. The unit of representation in the Irish boroughs was 47,000—that was to say, that for every Member allowed to an Irish borough there were 47,000 inhabitants in the borough. The unit for the Irish coun-

ties was 52,000 for each Member, and the average for all Irish Members, taking the counties and boroughs together, was a little over 51,000. Now the present population of Dublin was 273,000, which, with the four Members proposed to be given to the borough, allowed an average of 68,000 odd for each, or, in other words, the proportion of the population of Dublin was nearly one-half as much again as the proportion for the Irish boroughs in general. Moreover, the proportion for the borough of Dublin was one-third in excess of the general unit of population for the whole of Ireland. Perhaps the Committee would allow him to compare Dublin with the other Irish boroughs. Newry had one Member for 15,000 population, Kilkenny one for 15,000, Galway one for 19,000, Londonderry one for 29,000, Waterford one for 29,000, Limerick one for 48,000, Cork one for 52,000, Belfast one for 55,000, and Dublin one for 68,000. If the representation of Dublin were calculated upon the basis of the average population of the Irish boroughs, the result would be as follows:—The population of Dublin was 273,000, and four Members for the borough upon the general average of 47,000 would give 188,000, leaving Dublin a surplus population of 85,000 unrepresented. He would compare Dublin with the only other strictly parallel case of a borough that occurred in Ireland; he referred, of course, to the borough of Belfast. Dublin got four Members, with a population of 273,000, but Belfast got four with a population of 221,000; so that Dublin, with an excess over Belfast of 51,000, got only the same representation, although the average of population for a borough Member was as low as 47,000, or 4,000 less than the excess of Dublin over Belfast. If he were fortunate enough to obtain an additional seat for the City of Dublin he presumed that the seat would have to be taken from some Irish county; but he did not shrink for a moment from that test. He had been obliged, in previous debates, to agree with the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) that there was no tenable claim in the case of Drogheda or Limerick for the transfer of a Member from any Irish county, because if such a transfer were made the Member would have to be taken from a place representing a larger number of people and given to a place representing a smaller. Therefore, he had found it impossible to maintain that position, having regard to the fact that the principle of population was the vital principle of the Bill; but he was prepared to say that Dublin was entitled to have another Member, even although that Member had to be taken from some Irish county. He had pointed out already that the county average for Ireland was 52,000 for each Member, whereas the average in Dublin City was 68,000, or one-third in excess of the general county average in Ireland. The county average in Ireland varied from 30,000 at Longford up to 70,000 in Clare; and out of the 32 counties in Ireland there were no fewer than 30 in which the average of population for each Member was less than the unit proposed for the City of Dublin. He, therefore, contended that he was entitled to press upon the Government—and he believed they had no reply to his contention—that he was strictly adhering to their own principle of population when he claimed that Dublin was entitled to take a Member from any one of those 30 counties. The right hon. Baronet had told them that the county of Tyrone was to have four Members for a population of 197,000, or one for every 49,000. The county of Tyrone, therefore, was the first of the Irish counties from which a Member might be taken.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE remarked, that Tipperary had a population of 2,000 less.

MR. SEXTON said, the right hon. Baronet had distinctly referred to Tyrone. He had asked which of the Irish counties came first, and the right hon. Gentleman said Tyrone.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE remarked, that if he had said so he had made a mistake. As a matter of fact the population of the two counties was almost the same; but that of Tipperary was 2,000 less than that of Tyrone.

MR. SEXTON said, that was not so according to the Census Returns.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE stated that on referring to the Census Returns he found that the hon. Member was right. The population of Tipperary was 199,000, while that of Tyrone was 197,000, or 2,000 less.

MR. SEXTON said, that in order that there should be no dispute he would

quote the actual figures. The population of the county of Tyrone was 197,233, which gave an average of 49,308; and the population of Tipperary was 199,612, which gave an average of 49,903, so that the difference of 2,000 was in favour of Tipperary. Therefore, if an additional Member was to be given to the City of Dublin it would have to come from the county of Tyrone. He would not, however, press that matter further than to say that each Member for Tyrone would only represent 49,000 persons, while the average in Dublin was 68,000. If they took away one Member from Tyrone the average for each of the three remaining Members would be 65,000, while the average for five Members in the City of Dublin with an extended boundary would be one for every 63,000; so that after taking away a Member from Tyrone and giving him to Dublin the principle of population would still remain unviolated, seeing that the city and county average would still be practically the same. A very curious collateral result had followed from the abstention of the Boundary Commissioners from recommending the extension of the boundaries of the City of Dublin. The population of the county of Dublin, under the Bill, was 145,000. His proposition was that 40,000 should be taken out of the county and put into the city, which would leave 105,000 in the county, and would still supply an average for each of the two Members above the county average for the rest of Ireland. But if the county was to be divided, as it now stood, its average would be 72,000 for each Member—that was to say, that while they cramped the representation of the city, and starved the representation of the borough, they placed in the county the highest average of any county in Ireland—namely, 72,000. He had stated that the Boundary Commissioners declined to commit themselves to the recommendation of any extension of the boundaries of Dublin. What were the Instructions to the Commissioners? They were instructed, no doubt, that the boundaries should be in conformity with Schedule 5 of the Bill; but he found that their Instructions contained these words—

"Where it appears to the Commissioners from information obtained in the course of their inquiry that an alteration of the existing borough boundaries is desirable, a description of the alteration shall be embodied in their Report. Should there be any such case the Commissioners will, before making any recommendation, take the necessary steps for satisfying themselves whether or not there is any number of houses beyond the boundaries, but contiguous thereto, the occupiers of which, either by community of interests with the borough, or from any other circumstance, form part of the county population proper."

He would turn now to the plea of the Commissioners for declining to enter into that question in the case of Dublin. They said—

"The Corporation of Dublin pressed upon us the propriety of incorporating with the City some of the external townships constituted under various Acts of Parliament, but with separate rating powers; but as it was evident that the proposed extensions were of such magnitude as to affect the representation of both county and borough, we pointed out that it was beyond our discretion to enter into the consideration of the question."

He contended that it was not beyond their discretion, because the words of their Instructions which he had just read enabled them and entitled them, if they thought it desirable, to inquire into the question of the extension of the boundaries of the borough without regard to Schedule 5 of the Bill. Schedule 5 governed the boundaries they were to make on the maps; but it was within their Instructions to inquire into the extension of boundaries. They stated that the proposed extensions were of such magnitude as to affect the apportioned representation of both county and borough; but he maintained that that assertion was untrue. It was absolutely and obviously untrue both as regarded the county and also as regarded the borough. The population of the county was 145,000. It was sought to take away 40,000 from it, leaving 105,000, and giving an average of 52,000 for each Member. That average was quite up to, if not beyond, the general average for a county constituency; and how could the Commissioners, with decency, contend that the extension of the borough boundaries would affect or alter the apportioned representation of both county and borough? It did nothing to affect the apportioned representation of the city and borough. He had pointed out that the average of the borough representation in Ireland was one Member for every 47,000 people, and he had shown that the representation proposed to be given to Dublin was

one Member for every 68,000. The average of Dublin therefore, under the Bill, was 21,000 over the average required for the representation of all the other boroughs in Ireland; and when the Government had already, by the Schedule, violated every principle of representation by population in regard to the City of Dublin, it was superfluous and absurd for the Commissioners to refuse to inquire into the extension of the boundaries of Dublin on the ground that it would do that which had already been done. The Commissioners seemed to think that the reason they assigned would not bear the test of inquiry, because they proceeded to add another reason for not inquiring into the extension of Dublin City. They said that although the case of Dublin had been made the subject of a previous inquiry by a Municipal Commission in 1881, no legislative action had been taken to give effect to the recommendations of the Commission. But no legislative action was taken in the case of Belfast. Nevertheless an inquiry was held in Belfast, and 13,000 people were added, in order to eke out the necessary population and give the borough a presentable margin above the average. Although in Dublin legislative action was considered to be a necessity, in the Northern city no such object was held to be a vital one. A good many years had been spent and wasted in the efforts to extend the municipal boundaries of Dublin. A Select Committee of the House of Commons reported upon that question in 1878, and upon the recommendations of that Committee the Conservative Government of that day appointed a Commission of Inquiry. The Duke of Marlborough was Viceroy at the time, and in appointing the Commission language of an imperative character was employed directing the Commissioners to report by a certain date in the following year. If the Conservative Government of seven years ago thought the question of the extension of the boundaries of Dublin an urgent and pressing matter then, although the Liberal Government of the present day professed to be more concerned about the principle of municipal government than their Conservative Predecessors, they had, nevertheless, been content to give all the recommendations which resulted from that inquiry the go-by. In 1881 the Municipal Commission reported, and at the end of that year the Government, with the Report of that Commission before them, recommending the extension of Dublin, excused themselves from carrying out the recommendation, on the ground that they were very busy with the Land Act. In 1882 they further excused themselves, on the ground that arrangements for the working of the Land Act were still occupying their attention. In 1883 Earl Spencer made a further excuse to the Corporation of Dublin for not carrying out the recommendations of the Commissioners, on the ground that the rating of Dublin required a revision, and that the Government had a measure in contemplation, which, however, had never come to light, for the amendment of the law relating to the local government of cities in Ireland. Last year Earl Spencer again excused himself to the Corporation, upon the still more vague and impalpable plea that he had other matters to engage his attention. They all knew that matters of an extremely unpleasant kind did occupy the attention of the Irish Government during a great part of last year; but from one excuse or another the Irish Government, for the last four years, had staved off this question of the extension of the municipal boundaries of Dublin. It was well known, however, that the authorities at Dublin Castle were never at a loss for excellent excuses for doing nothing. What were the recommendations of the Boundary Commissioners in 1881? What the Irish Members were now urging was an extension of Parliamentary boundaries, and not a municipal extension, although both were based on the same principle. His contention was that Dublin and the townships converging upon Dublin formed one body of people—one indivisible city, with a common ground of enterprize, law, trade, and industry, and a common fund for income and profits. In the map appended to the Report of the Municipal Commission of 1881 the part coloured blue represented the present borough of Dublin. The five other districts represented the five townships abutting on the city; and here he would direct the attention of the right hon. Baronet and the Committee to a very curious fact. One of the five townships—the township of Pembroke—already formed part of the Parliamentary borough of Dublin;

[*Ninth Night.*]

and side by side with it, lying alongside the present boundary of the city, alike in position, with a similar area, and differing from it in no one quality that could be discerned, was the township of Rathmines. He would defy any human intelligence to point out any reason why the township of Pembroke should be included in the Parliamentary borough of Dublin and the township of Rathmines left out. Two of these five townships were situated on the Southern side of the city, and two of them on the Northern. They were not distinguishable to the eye from the city itself; and, as an illustration of the close and definite character of the tie which bound them to the city, he might point out that there were four lines of tram-cars running from the centre of the city to the outer extremity of these four townships, and the bulk of the people dwelling in the four townships earned their income as merchants' clerks or artizans in the City of Dublin. They went into Dublin by the tram-car lines in the morning, and returned in the same way to their homes in the evening. Many of those persons had shops in Dublin, where they realized their incomes, but lived with their families in one or other of those four townships. No test could be applied by which it could not be proved that those four townships were one in unity of position, in unity of interest, and in everything that could constitute a unity or give a claim to one common government with the City of Dublin. He failed to see how the claim he made for the unification of these townships with the City of Dublin was to be contested. He believed he might say that Dublin was the only instance in the Three Kingdoms where the Government had refused to extend the boundaries of the city. He did not know any other case contained in the Report of the Commissioners.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE remarked, that a similar extension had not been acceded to in the case of Drogheda.

MR. SEXTON said, he was speaking now of the Report of the Commissioners. In every case where the Commissioners had recommended an extension of boundaries their recommendation had been adopted, and in most cases the Parliamentary boundaries had been made coincident with the municipal borough. He would invite the Committee to consider for a moment the remarkable contrast in the treatment of the Irish and the treatment of the English and Scotch constituencies in a similar position. Take the case of Birmingham. In the case of Birmingham, the Boundary Commissioners had added four areas—three of them, judging from the groves and hills and dales they contained, being practically rural, and all of them outside the municipal boundary. Was he right in saying that that was the case? [SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: No!] He (Mr. Sexton) had carefully examined the map, and he was of opinion that the areas proposed to be included within the Parliamentary borough were outside the municipal borough of Birmingham. Birmingham already contained 436,000 people; they proposed to add 36,000 more to it under the Bill, and to give seven Members to it; but if Birmingham were treated as Dublin was treated, it would only be entitled to six. In the borough of Bradford, with a population of 180,000, they had extended the Parliamentary boundaries, so as to make them coincident with those of the municipality. By those means they had added 4,000, making the population 184,000, and they proposed to give to Bradford three Members. If they had treated Bradford in the same way as Dublin, that town would only be entitled to two. Then, again, there was the case of Bristol, with a population of 206,000. He asked the right hon. Baronet's attention to this case. The right hon. Gentleman appeared to doubt whether the Parliamentary borough of Birmingham had extended beyond the municipality.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, it had not; the hon. Member was labouring under a misapprehension. There was a population of 36,000 outside the municipal boundary.

MR. SEXTON said, he was glad of that admission; 36,000 people outside the municipal borough had been added to the Parliamentary borough of Birmingham, in order to entitle it to seven Members, and they had been added to a borough that already had a population of 400,000 within its boundaries, and a borough which had a co-extensive boundary for municipal and Parliamentary purposes. In that case the Government proposed to go outside the municipality and to add 36,000 more, in order

o entitle Birmingham to seven Members. In Ireland they altogether disregarded the recommendations of a Commission to extend the municipal boundaries, although in England, where a municipality was already extended as far as it could be, they went outside and took in an additional area. All he would say was that the additional areas added to Birmingham were in no respect urban. His point, however, was that the same treatment was not extended to Ireland, and that in Dublin the Government refused even to extend the municipal boundary to its natural limits; whereas in England they first extended the municipal boundary as far as it could go, and then carried the Parliamentary boundary beyond it. He would now take the case of Bristol. The Commissioners reported that in Bristol, before they set to work upon it, the boundaries of the borough and of the municipality were the same. Then, what had they done to it? The Parliamentary boundary of the borough was already extended as far as the municipality; but they had now actually added to Bristol three Local Government districts and part of a parish—having added to the borough a district as large as the old municipality itself. They had doubled, under the Bill, the size of the Parliamentary borough of Bristol, and they had added to it a population of 47,000. In the case of Dublin he only asked them to add 40,000, and they refused. By the addition to Bristol they were enabled to give to that city four Representatives, but if they had treated Bristol as they had treated Dublin it would only have been entitled to three. And now he would turn to the case of Liverpool. In Liverpool, before the Bill was drafted, the borough and the municipality had the same boundaries. They contained 550,000 people. What did the Government do under their Bill? Although they had already extended the borough to the utmost verge of the municipality, they actually added to Liverpool by the Bill so much of two great and populous parishes as was not already included within the boundary. To the population of 550,000 they added 48,000 more, and they gave to that 600,000 nine Representatives; whereas, if Liverpool had been treated in the same way as Dublin, it would only have been entitled to eight. The Parliamentary borough of Manchester had already, before the introduction of this Bill, had its borough boundaries extended beyond the municipality. What did the present Bill do? It added to the city two Local Government Board districts containing a population of 30,000, and to the borough thus created they proposed to give six Members; whereas, if they had treated it as they had treated Dublin, it would only have been entitled to five. The course pursued in regard to Edinburgh and Glasgow was precisely similar. In each case large additions had been made to the Parliamentary boundaries, in order to make them coincident with the municipal boundaries. The Government added 20,000 people to Glasgow, which would entitle it to seven Members instead of six, and they had in the same way increased the boundaries of Edinburgh, in order to entitle that city to additional representation. Then, he maintained that, on every ground of comparison, whether they contrasted Dublin with the other boroughs in Ireland, or with the Irish counties, or with the great boroughs of England and Scotland, the City of Dublin was clearly entitled to another Member, and it was entitled, if its boundaries were properly extended, not only to five, but to six Representatives. He was, however, content to rest his demand upon five. He felt that that claim was supported by the vital principle of the Bill; and he believed that, in moving that the representation of Dublin be increased from four Members to five, he was making a demand which could not be refused except by a gross and palpable violation, in the case of Ireland, of the principle which had been freely applied to every other great city of the Three Kingdoms, and of the principle which the Government professed to rely on as the fundamental principle of the Bill. He therefore submitted the Amendment with the utmost confidence to the Committee.

Amendment proposed,

In page 15, column 2, line 41, after the word "Dublin," to leave out the word "four," and insert the word "five,"—(*Mr. Sexton,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'four' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had no fault to find on that occasion with the speech of the hon. Member,

because the hon. Member had frankly met and faced the difficulties of the situation, instead, as he and others had done in former instances, of dealing only with general statements. On this occasion the hon. Member had fairly stated from what quarter he sought to take the seat which the acceptance of his Amendment would cost, and he had put before the Committee the claims of the City of Dublin as against those of the county of Tyrone. The hon. Member must excuse him if he reminded him once more of a remark which he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had made once or twice before—namely, that the Irish Members generally were treading on dangerous ground when they proposed to treat the Irish constituencies in any degree exceptionally, because the retention of 103 Members for Ireland had been defended by the Government, and had been accepted by the House generally in the earlier stages of the Bill, on account of the desirability of having an even scale as between the three countries. The hon. Member had spoken of the Irish borough scale and Irish borough averages as if they were standing by themselves; but they were not. They were an essential portion of a scale which applied to the whole of the Three Kingdoms. The hon. Member had proposed to the Committee to extend the boundaries of Dublin by adding, so far as he could make out from the Amendment which the hon. Member had placed on the Paper, a population of about 44,000 people. The hon. Member said the area he proposed to add was 4,000 acres. He (Sir Charles W. Dilke) made it very much more than that.

MR. SEXTON: How much more?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he made it nearly 8,000 acres; but he would not quarrel with the hon. Member on that score.

MR. SEXTON said, the total area of Dublin and of the county which he proposed to include within the boundaries of the borough was between 8,000 and 9,000 acres.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that was a point upon which he could not agree with the hon. Member; but it was not a point that was of particular importance in the matter. The only difference would be that the proportion which now existed in the borough and county area would be altered.

MR. SEXTON remarked, that, of course, if 4,000 acres were added to the boundaries of the city the area of the county would be so much less.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the hon. Member seemed to think that Dublin was treated in some way exceptionally; but he could not admit, in the least, that that was the case. Dublin stood, in the scale of representation, in the place in which its population would entitle it to stand. Islington, for instance, was much larger than Dublin, and it had allotted to it, by the Bill, the same number of Members. Dublin, he admitted, was a little high up in the scale; but, of course, if they had a scale with averages, they must have some places above the average, and some places below. Ireland had many seats which were below the average of the towns to which the hon. Member had alluded. If they took the cases much above, and compared them with those that were much below, they might make out instances of apparent hardship; but such instances were inseparable from any proposal to deal with the constituencies as a whole. In proposing to extend the boundaries of Dublin, the hon. Member proposed to make a boundary which, in his (Sir Charles W. Dilke's) opinion, would be of a somewhat irregular and objectionable shape, especially in regard to the inclusion of Kilmainham. He, however, did not propose to argue the question on that ground. The hon. Member had gone through a number of English and Scotch cases, and had contrasted the refusal of the Commissioners to extend the Dublin boundaries with the readiness with which the extension of boundaries had been granted in various English and Scotch constituencies, and in the case of Belfast. He (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had, on several former occasions, told the Committee that the Government had not proceeded upon any uniform plan in regard to the extension of borough boundaries. Each case had been considered separately, and on its merits. For instance, in the case of Glasgow the extension was small, and was only intended to bring the Parliamentary boundary up to the municipal limits. That extension was not made for the purpose of giving additional representation to Glasgow, because Glasgow was rather short of the average number of Mem-

ers. The hon. Member for Glasgow, nd the people of Glasgow, were de- irous of a large extension of the bo- ough boundaries, so that a much arger population might be included han had been included.

MR. SEXTON remarked, that such n arrangement would have disturbed he representation, so far as population was concerned, of two counties ad- oining.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, hat, no doubt, that would have been he case. The Government, however, would not have resisted the proposal on he ground of disturbance between county and borough. But when they came to examine it on its own merits, they ar- rived at the conclusion that the argu- ments in favour of an extension were not tenable. There was a great objec- tion altogether apart from that of in- cluding people outside in the towns. When such an inclusion was made, it was simply for Parliamentary reasons; but in this case it was proposed to be done for municipal purposes. The hon. Member had said nothing about the wishes of the population of the county of Dublin outside the present Parlia- mentary borough; but he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) fancied, from letters he had received, that there was considerable objection on the part of the people out- side to being included within the limits of the City of Dublin. But, no doubt, the feeling in regard to the municipal extension and municipal rates had some- thing to do with that opposition. He assumed that the Corporation of Dublin, as was the case with the Corporation of Glasgow, would be quite willing to say that the enlargement of the Parliamen- tary borough should be without pre- judice to the question of municipal boundaries; but still the people of the suburbs, he fancied, had a great dislike to any proposal for including them in the city. In many of these cases the people living outside disliked, and would greatly resent, the idea of being included within the limits of a city; and that feel- ing strongly existed, he believed, in the suburbs of the City of Dublin. That was an argument which, in several other cases, had been used before the Com- mittee. There were many cases where they could extend, and bring into the town everything that properly belonged to the town. Such, judging from the maps, and from what he had heard, was the case in Belfast. They could easily extend the limits so as to include every- thing that properly belonged to Belfast; but it was not so in the case of Dublin. The extensions proposed by the hon. Member would not include within Dublin everything closely connected with and commercially forming part of it. It ap- peared to him that in Dublin they had to face the same difficulty as that with which they had to deal in Glasgow, in London, and on Tyneside — namely, that they could never get quite to the end—that they could never, by any such extension of boundaries as the Commit- tee was likely to sanction, include the whole urban population, having more or less to do with the life of the town. They had had, in the case of Tyneside, a pro- posal for the extension of the borough of Newcastle, so as to include the whole urban district; but it had been thought better to deal with the matter by the formation of single-Member county di- visions. They had dealt both with Glasgow and Tyneside upon that prin- ciple, and he thought not unfairly. With respect to Birmingham, on the extension of the boundaries of which the hon. Gentleman had dwelt, that case would have to be considered under the next Schedule, and the Amendments which had been placed upon the Paper; but when the hon. Member, in a facetious way, spoke of the additions made to Birmingham, being rural, because of the "groves," "dales," "hills," and other romantic names borne by some of those places, he was taking a very falla- cious test as to the true character of par- ticular neighbourhoods, as anyone fami- liar with the Metropolis itself could easily show. In his own constituency (Chelsea) there were several "hills," and "dales," and "groves;" but it could not be argued, from that fact, that the popula- tion was rural. The hon. Member had severely criticized a remark of the Boundary Commissioners that the ex- tension of Dublin, and an addition to its number of Members, would affect the representation of the county and of the borough as regarded numbers. The hon. Member said that that was untrue; but he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would be disposed to say it was perfectly true. He fancied the hon. Member must have

[*Ninth Night.*]

misunderstood the sense in which the Commissioners used the phrase. What they meant was that the proposal for the extension of the City of Dublin was made with the view of gaining an additional Member for the city, and that that was shown by the nature of the proposals of the hon. Member himself.

MR. SEXTON remarked, that Dublin was to have an additional Member already.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: But not according to the scale.

MR. SEXTON: What scale?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he referred to the scale of population which prevailed throughout the United Kingdom. Dublin did not stand in the highest place upon the scale; but was below certain other boroughs. There was, at least, one borough with a larger population than Dublin, to which it was only proposed, by the Bill, to give four Members. He, therefore, maintained that Dublin was fairly treated according to the scale in the Bill. If the hon. Member could show that the Bill proposed to give five Members to any borough smaller than Dublin, it would be a strong argument in favour of his Amendment, and he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would be satisfied that a mistake had been made. So far, however, was that from being the case, that there was no instance of a borough with a less population than Dublin having over four Members allotted to it.

MR. SEXTON wished to remind the right hon. Baronet that it was intended to give five Members to Leeds, which had a less population than Dublin would have with its extended boundaries.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: The hon. Member said "with its extended boundaries;" but the Government went on the boundaries as defined by the Bill. It was impossible to contend that, as the Bill stood, Dublin was unfairly treated. He would admit at once that if they added 42,000 to the population of Dublin, as the hon. Member proposed, that city would be entitled to a fifth Member. That was exactly what the Boundary Commissioners meant when they said that the proposed extension of boundaries would affect the representation of counties and boroughs. The hon. Member proposed that Dublin should have an additional Member, because of the addition of 42,000 population.

MR. SEXTON said, that what he had stated at the beginning of his speech was that he did not intend to raise the question of the relative representation of the Three Kingdoms. He had said that Dublin must be treated on its own merits.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that in that case, if the hon. Member desired to separate Ireland from England, he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) must point out again that it was a dangerous thing for the Irish Members to raise the question of the equality of representation between the Three Kingdoms, or to attempt to upset the arrangement by which the Government considered they were justified in retaining 103 seats for Ireland. If they were to upset the even scale, and were to hold that Dublin ought to be represented by a larger number, they would lose all the ground on which they now took their stand for keeping the representation as it was. The hon. Member wanted both to eat his cake and have it. He wanted to keep 103 Members, and yet desired to cut the feet of the Government from under them by establishing an Irish scale which would remove the justification for retaining 103 Members. On all the grounds he had stated, he must ask the Committee to reject the Amendment of the hon. Member, although on this occasion the hon. Member had acted fairly by the Committee in placing before it an alternative.

DR. LYONS said, that no one felt more constrained than himself, from the circumstances of the case, to vote for the Amendment. He thought there was every justification for it; and it could not be contended that Dublin was not perfectly entitled to five Members. An inquiry had already taken place by a Select Committee into the propriety of extending the boundaries of the City of Dublin. The Commissioners took considerable pains to inquire into the whole subject. In addition to that Committee, there had been a Royal Commission upon the same question, upon which several able and distinguished persons were appointed to inquire into the whole circumstances of the case. One of the Commissioners was Mr. Exham, a gentleman now deceased, but of high character and great ability, and well known to many Members of the House. Another Commissioner was Mr. O'Brien,

who filled a distinguished position in Ireland in connection with a most important public Department — namely, the Prisons Board—and whose position pointed him out as a gentleman in whom the public could repose complete confidence. The Commissioners applied themselves, with the greatest possible diligence, to the examination of the subject intrusted to them, and presented a Report. He could not see how the conclusions they arrived at could be successfully contested. They stated that, in their opinion, the extension of the City of Dublin had been too long neglected, and that it ought to be undertaken immediately. That was, no doubt, in the contemplation of the Government of which right hon. Gentlemen opposite were Members, because there were circumstances which showed that the late Government had intended to extend the boundaries. He had spent the greater part of his life in the City of Dublin, and he knew there was nothing more artificial or unsustainable than to attempt to draw a distinction between the City of Dublin and its suburbs. The functions of one were identical with those of the other. There was a continuous line of streets, bearing the same names, running through the Parliamentary borough into the surrounding districts; and the suburbs were, to all intents and purposes, part of the city, and undistinguishable from the Parliamentary borough. There might have been distinctions in former days; but they ought no longer to be tolerated. The identity of the population was the same; persons occupying businesses in the city had their private residences in those outlying townships; and in every respect, so far as the suburban property was concerned, it belonged to what was practically and popularly known as the City of Dublin. He, therefore, contended that the artificial distinction which now existed ought no longer to be maintained; and the day must come, before very long, when it would be universally recognized that such a distinction was altogether untenable. His own opinion was that that day had come. The right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill had stated what amounted in substance to this—that the case of the townships outside the Parliamentary borough of Dublin, although in direct contact with it, had been fully inquired into by the Boundary Commissioners. That was not the case. What had really occurred was this—when the Commissioners found that the population of Dublin, within its present boundaries, was exhausted by the four Members awarded to it by the Bill, they proceeded no further with an inquiry which he (Dr. Lyons) maintained they were in a legal sense bound to make—namely, what should really be the proper limits and requirements of the city. He was forced to the conclusion that an artificial limit was laid down in the first instance, and that the Instructions given to the Commissioners had been something to this effect—"You are to give four Members to the City of Dublin; but when you have got a proper number of population for four Members, according to the scale laid down, then you are to go no further with your investigation." An arbitrary line was drawn at that point, and the inquiry was not allowed to proceed further. He believed that such a principle constituted a blot upon the Bill, and that there had been a failure to do justice to the City of Dublin such as to necessitate a re-examination of the whole case. The restriction of four Members placed upon Dublin by no means did justice to the city, according to the scale which the Government had themselves laid down. Why should the City of Dublin be deprived of its fair share of representation? Why should Dublin have four Members only in the face of nine Members for Liverpool, and seven for Glasgow? He certainly hoped that the question would be reconsidered upon the Report. The Committee had already departed from the hard-and-fast line laid down in the Bill in the case of Westminster, the representation of which had been raised from three to four; but, as far as he remembered the figures, the population of Westminster was not nearly as great as the present population of Dublin. Having transgressed the rule in the case of Westminster, and shown that the Government were not adopting a hard-and-fast line, he thought they would act not only unfairly, but illogically, if they continued to apply a hard-and-fast line to Dublin. He trusted that the case of Dublin would be treated as one of the reserved cases for ulterior consideration. The right hon. Baronet who had charge of the Bill a few nights ago said that as far as possible the policy

of the measure was to retain the natural boundaries for boroughs; but that contention failed altogether in the case of Dublin, because in that case some most unnatural and artificial boundaries had been created. The Government only proposed to give four Members to Dublin, and had drawn an arbitrary line and prevented further investigation. He contended that the Government ought to re-open the investigation into the boundaries of Dublin for Parliamentary purposes. In the future, Dublin would have to fight many contests in that House; but where would she be with only four Members?

MR. MACMAHON said, he had listened with attention to the speech of the President of the Local Government Board; but he failed to ascertain how he accounted for the fact that 118,000 of the population of the City and County of Dublin were unrepresented. The City of Dublin contained a population of 273,000, and the county 145,000, making a total population for the city and county of 418,000. The initial average number for one Member was 52,000, which would entitle the county and city to eight Members. The hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton), however, only asked for seven—two for the county, and five for the city. The city, according to its population, was entitled to five seats. The population was 273,000, and five Members would give an average of 55,000 for each seat; and if hon. Members would look over the printed list, they would find that there were numerous seats provided for a less population than 55,000. He hoped the right hon. Baronet would reconsider the matter, and give five Members to the City of Dublin, as proposed by the Amendment. Great discontent existed in the city in regard to the manner in which it had been treated.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR desired to call attention to the extraordinary manner in which the debate had been conducted by the Government. In the first place, the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board had been sitting upon the Treasury Bench absolutely alone during the discussion of this important matter. The Committee were discussing the representation of the chief city of Ireland—its Metropolis; and surely in the discussion of that question they were at least entitled to have Her Majesty's Government represented by more than a single Member. At the end of one of the speeches they had, indeed, been left without a Representative of the Government at all, because the right hon. Gentleman disappeared; and at a breakneck pace, panting and puffing, they saw the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) coming in to take part in a discussion not one word of which he had heard. He (Mr. O'Connor) ventured to say that such a proceeding was neither decorous nor respectful towards the Irish Members. He did not think it was difficult to answer the arguments of the President of the Local Government Board. He had no wish to be personally disrespectful to the right hon. Gentleman; but he could not help describing the speech of the right hon. Gentleman as eel-like, because no sooner had the right hon. Gentleman been answered in one argument than he immediately, with pantomimic velocity, put forward another, leaving the Committee in some bewilderment as to the real ground of his opposition. His hon. Friend the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) had pointed out that if Dublin were treated as Leeds was in the Bill it would be entitled to additional representation. "Oh dear no," said the right hon. Gentleman, "that is not so." His hon. Friend immediately pointed out that it would be so if the boundaries of Dublin were increased. Whereupon the right hon. Gentleman said that he was not talking about any increase of boundaries, although that was the whole *gravamen* of the arguments of the hon. Member for Sligo. He (Mr. O'Connor) wished to call the attention of the Committee to the different manner in which London and the Irish constituencies were treated. Last night they were discussing the representation of Westminster, and the right hon. Gentleman swallowed the proposals of his own Bill, and stated that he was going to give another Member to Westminster. The result of adding one Member would be that Westminster would have a Representative for every 59,000 inhabitants; while Dublin, according to the present proposal, would only have one for every 68,000, and one for every 79,000 if the boundaries were extended. He maintained that that was the very reverse of the principle which was supposed to

regulate the Bill, and the reverse of the principle on which the attention of the House of Commons was drawn to the Bill when it was first mentioned by the Prime Minister. He referred to the remark of the Prime Minister when the right hon. Gentleman was not speaking upon the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill, but upon the Representation of the People Bill, and when he found occasion to give a historic and prospective view of what the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill would do. In the sketch which the right hon. Gentleman then gave he said that one of the things to which great attention would have to be paid was the distance of constituencies from the seat of power. The right hon. Gentleman was very much ridiculed for laying down that principle; but it required no argument to show that a constituency which was distant from the political centre of the country fairly demanded larger representation than constituencies which were situated at the centre of political power. Everyone knew that a London constituency, from the nature of things, would be able to bring greater pressure to bear upon the political and Parliamentary decision of the country than a constituency at a remote distance from the political centre. In point of fact, the great complaint which was made in every part of the country with regard to the Metropolis was that the Metropolis exercised an undue influence and pressure upon the Legislature of the country. That was an argument used by the Prime Minister over and over again when fighting his Russo-Turkish Campaign against the late Conservative Government. His argument was that London was "Jingo," and that the country was pacific; but owing to the fact that London was the centre of political gravity, those who were in favour of a "Jingo" policy were able to overthrow the pacific policy of the rest of the country. But, notwithstanding the attitude in this respect which had been assumed by the Prime Minister, they found the opposite principle laid down by the Government now. Westminster—the very constituency in which the Houses of Parliament were situated—was to have one Representative for every 59,000; while Dublin, which was removed physically by 60 miles of sea from Great Britain, and morally and politically by countless millions of miles from the centre of political gravity, was only to have one Representative for every 68,000 population. He maintained that that was a monstrous contradiction of the principles laid down by the Government themselves. What was the answer of the President of the Local Government Board to the arguments of the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton)? His hon. Friend laid down the principle that if Dublin were treated like the English constituencies, it would be entitled to at least one, and probably to two additional Members. To show that that was so, he would take one or two cases. Leeds, according to the present arrangement, with a population of 309,000, would return one Member for every 61,000 population, and would have five Members in all. Sheffield would have five Members for 284,000, which gave the proportion of one Member for every 56,000 population. Thus Leeds would have one for 61,000, Sheffield one for 56,000, while Dublin was only to have one for 68,000. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board had restated one argument which he (Mr. O'Connor) confessed that he was unable to understand. He stated that it was very dangerous to raise the question of the scale of borough representation. Why was it dangerous? The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that if that argument were raised the result would be to show that Ireland was not entitled to retain its present number of 103 seats. The Irish Members were not at all afraid of that argument, and he did not see why they ought to be, when it was clearly shown that Leeds was to have one Member for every 61,000 population, Sheffield one for every 56,000, and Dublin only one for every 68,000. Under such circumstances, the right hon. Gentleman said the Irish Members ought to be afraid of raising the question of the proportion of population to the representation. If Dublin were treated in the same way as Leeds and Sheffield, upon its present population, without any extension of boundaries, it would be clearly entitled to five Members. With the extension of the boundaries which his hon. Friend proposed to carry out, Dublin would be represented by one Member for every 79,000 population, whereas Leeds

would have one for every 61,000, and Sheffield one for every 56,000. Nevertheless, the right hon. Gentleman warned them, in the most solemn and portentious manner, that if they raised any objection to the proportion of population to the representation they would be treading very dangerous ground. As to the question of boundaries, why should they not be increased? The right hon. Gentleman suggested that if the boundaries were increased, it might be held by some of the townships that the question whether they were to be included within the municipality or not was prejudged; but it would be very easy for the Corporation of Dublin to give a guarantee that nothing in the Parliamentary boundary should affect the question of municipality. There was one fact to which he wished to call the attention of the Committee, and it was this—that wherever the townships outside a constituency objected to be included in the Parliamentary boundaries in England or Scotland, on the ground that it would prejudice the return afterwards, their representations were thrown over and disregarded. Then why should not these townships be included in the case of Dublin? He would tell the Committee why. Their exclusion from Dublin was intended for the purpose of creating a constituency in the county of Dublin, which was supposed to be hostile to the National Party. It was intended, in reality, to make a certain portion of the county of Dublin a Tory preserve. He had not the slightest objection to the Irish Tories being adequately and properly represented in that House. He would be quite willing that the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Dublin University should have all the 33 Members the right hon. and learned Gentleman said the so-called Loyal minority in Ireland was entitled to, provided the National Party were to get as many Irish Members in England and Scotland as they would be entitled to have on the same scale. He did not, however, see the least chance of that. On the contrary, it was all the other way. The President of the Local Government Board and the Boundary Commissioners, acting on the Instructions of the Government, had taken care to reduce to a minimum the representation of the Irish Nationalists, whether situated in England or in Scotland. The Government refused now to give this additional Member for Dublin, although he quite agreed with the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) that the political complexion of the Member who would be returned was altogether problematical, and could be foretold by nobody. The right hon. Gentleman refused because it would interfere with the arrangement of the Bill, and yet he consented to give an additional Member for Westminster, which would certainly interfere just as much with the arrangement of the Bill. In fact, from beginning to end, by every quibble and caprice of jerry-mandering, the framers of the Bill had sought to deprive the Irish Nationalists of adequate representation in that House. He, therefore, felt bound to join his hon. Friend in offering to the proposal of the President of the Local Government Board the most strenuous opposition in his power, so that, even although they were unable to succeed in the object they had in view, they would make their protest so emphatic as to convince the Government that the rights of the Irish people were not to be interfered with with impunity.

Mr. MELDON said, the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) had brought forward the Amendment with so much force and argument that he had left very little, if anything, for his Friends to say in support of it. He (Mr. Meldon) had listened with attention to the objections which had been urged by the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill, and he must say that, with one exception, the speech of the hon. Member for Sligo had been left entirely unanswered. The only exception was, that on the scale fixing the number of population for a borough in the United Kingdom, and giving 103 Members to be divided upon that scale for Ireland, it was impossible to give a fifth Member to Dublin. That was the only argument adduced by the right hon, Baronet in justification of keeping the Bill as it stood. But the Government had failed to adduce, either now or at any other time, any reason whatever why any weight should be attached to this argument. If the Irish seats were now proposed to be fixed at 103, and it could be urged that that was a larger proportion than Ireland was entitled to, the argument of the right hon. Baronet might have some force in

upport of a proposal for a reduction of
e number; but when once it was con-
ded that Ireland was to have 103
embers, no force whatever was left
that argument. Therefore, the one
ason which had been adduced why
ere ought not to be 103 Members, dis-
ibuted according to the principles on
hich Members were allocated in Eng-
nd and Scotland, altogether failed;
nd if there were to be 103 Members, it
as clearly demonstrated, and no at-
mpt had been made to establish the
ntrary, that in Ireland, if the prin-
ple of population were to be adopted,
ublin, with its present boundaries, was
ntitled to an additional Member. Even
rowing that argument altogether aside,
nd adopting the population principle
hich was followed in fixing the number
f Members for the United Kingdom, it
as plain that Dublin did not, under
e present Bill, receive her fair share
f representation. It would be found
at in England, when it was sought to
ive an additional Member to a bo-
ugh, this principle was invariably
ted upon—that an extended boundary
as provided which was made to include
sufficient additional population to jus-
fy the concession of an additional
Iember. According to the statement of
e right hon. Baronet, the only result
f extending the boundaries of the City
f Dublin would have been to take away
portion of the county population and
ive the city the right to another Mem-
er. No reason whatever existed why
e Boundary Commissioners should not
ave further extended the boundaries
f Dublin, unless it was for the purpose
f depriving Dublin of an additional
Iember. The argument was that the
oundaries of Dublin ought not to be
xtended, and that, in accordance with
e scale, it already had its full number
f Members. But, unfortunately for
at argument, the boundaries had been
xtended, although only to such an ex-
nt as could be done without increasing
e number of Members to which the
ty was entitled according to the scale
f the Bill. The Commissioners took in
ne township, but left out two others.
f they had taken in another township
e population would have been so in-
reased that an additional Member could
ot have been refused. Therefore, to
is mind, it was perfectly clear that the
nly object the Boundary Commissioners had in extending the boundaries by taking in the Pembroke district and omitting the Rathmines and the Kilmainham districts, was to add to the city without making it necessary to increase the number of Members to five instead of four. What was the reason alleged for not further extending the boundaries of Dublin? It was that the population, living outside the boundaries, had no desire to be taken in. Now, he certainly had not heard any such reason assigned, and he did not believe there was any considerable number of persons in Dublin, or in the suburbs, who desired to leave the boundaries as they were. The right hon. Baronet said he had received letters from certain persons who said they objected to any proposal for extending the boundaries; but, notwithstanding such an objection, the boundaries had been extended so as to include the township of Pembroke, which, as compared with Rathmines, was certainly by far the most rural district of the two. The district taken in by the Commissioners was a district composed of villa residences, and was far more rural than the districts which had been excluded. There was not a single part of it which could be properly designated as a street. But what was the case in regard to Rathmines? There, they had a continuous row of streets—one called Upper, and the other Lower—and disconnected simply by a bridge. There was a large number of continuous shops; and so far as its urban character was concerned, of all the townships it was possible to include the one selected was the one which, upon every ground, ought to have been left out. He failed to see, however, what use there was in arguing the matter when the Government distinctly told the Committee that they would make no alteration. There was practical unanimity among the Irish Members upon the question. He knew that in Dublin the people were entirely unanimous, and it was unintelligible to them why on earth the township of Pembroke should have been included and the other townships left out. To his mind it was as clear as the sun at noonday that the Commissioners had instructions, for some reason or other, to extend the boundaries of Dublin so as to limit the number of Members to four, and not to justify an increase to five. That was the only intelligible way of explaining

what had been done, and the refusal, now, of the Government to make any alteration in their proposals, although none of them knew anything about the locality or the wishes of the people of Dublin, proved that they had arrived at a foregone conclusion, and that it was only wasting time to expend further argument upon the subject.

MR. PLUNKET said, he was not going to follow the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board into the arguments he had presented to the Committee in opposition to the Amendment. Those arguments were founded upon certain ascertained figures; and he (Mr. Plunket) thought that the right hon. Gentleman had shown that, according to the general scheme and plan of the Bill, Dublin, in regard to its representation, had been dealt with on sound principles. He was not going to express any opinion himself as to how many Members he should like his native city to return, if he could depend upon returning what Members he liked. That was not the question he desired to discuss; but he had risen to order to correct an impression which had been left by the hon. Member who had just sat down in that part of his speech in which he challenged the statement of the President of the Local Government Board that the opinion in favour of including the outlying townships was not universal. The right hon. Gentleman stated that he had received representations to the effect that the proposal to extend the boundaries did not secure the universal assent which it was supposed to have secured. Now, he (Mr. Plunket), speaking from his own knowledge, was bound to say that not only did that proposal not receive the universal assent of, but that almost the universal opinion in the townships affected was that they ought not to be included in the Parliamentary boundaries of the City of Dublin. He would cite one strong argument in support of that view—namely, that when the matter was being considered by the Boundary Commissioners in Dublin, and a scheme as nearly as possible similar to that which was now proposed was put forward in reference to the township of Rathmines, which was by far the most important of those townships, the township itself thought it worth while to employ the most eminent counsel at the Irish Bar to resist it on their behalf. It was only right that the Committee should be acquainted with that fact, and should know that the almost universal feeling of the townships was opposed to the Amendment, and to the proposal for including them within the Parliamentary boundaries of the City of Dublin.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA said, he knew the City of Dublin perhaps better than he knew the parish of Paddington, in which he resided at the present moment. He, therefore, thought that he was entitled to address the Committee upon the statement which had been made by the right hon. and learned Gentleman who had just addressed the Committee, that the inhabitants of the township of Rathmines objected to be included in the Parliamentary boundary of the City of Dublin. If that were so, it arose from the simple reason that the local taxation of the City of Dublin amounted to something like 10*s.* in the pound on the valuation, and the inhabitants of the outlying townships were simply afraid that one of the consequences of being included within the Parliamentary limits of the city would be that hereafter they would be compelled to contribute in a similar proportion to the local taxation. He thought the Committee was bound to throw that consideration on one side, and unless the townships were able to bring forward some reason quite apart from a sentiment based on their own self-interest—some reason that would commend itself to the common sense of the Committee—this objection, even if it prevailed, should not be accepted for one moment. The hon. and learned Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon) stated that the township of Pembroke was, comparatively speaking, a rural township. It was a rural township, divided by a canal from the City of Dublin, and divided in the same way that Rathmines was divided from Dublin—by a bridge; but while the one consisted of villa residences, the other was the continuation of a line of streets from Dublin extending over a distance of more than a mile, with houses as close together as in any part of London. Yet this district was absolutely shut out, while the township of Pembroke was included. He hoped that the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill, whose conduct of it had won the admiration

and approval of hon. Members on both sides of the House, would take this question seriously into consideration before the Report. He was sure that if there was any reason why the township of Rathmines would object to be included within the City of Dublin, it was only the reason which would be obvious to everyone—that they did not want to pay an additional tax of 4*s.* in the pound for local rates for the mere privilege of being included within the Parliamentary area. That objection, however, ought only to apply to an extension of the municipality, and not to the extension of the boundaries for Parliamentary purposes. No other intelligible reason could be brought forward to justify the distinction between those townships and the city proper which now existed.

MR. O'BRIEN said, he was not at all surprised to find that the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Plunket) agreed with the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) that Dublin had been treated on sound principles. The right hon. and learned Gentleman himself represented a constituency which had been treated so tenderly by the right hon. Baronet that 70,000 persons outside Trinity College had only the same political weight as 2,000 within its walls. He was not at all surprised, therefore, at the view which the right hon. and learned Gentleman had taken of the right hon. Baronet's objection. He had listened to the right hon. Baronet with a good deal of attention, and it seemed to him that the right hon. Baronet had really left unsaid the only effective thing that could be alleged against the proposal now made—namely, that the mischief was done, and that the whole matter was concluded by an arrangement between the Heads of the Whig and Tory Parties—an arrangement made without the slightest reference to the Representatives of Ireland. For good or evil the Ministry had bound themselves by law that 103 Members was the proper proportion of Members for Ireland, and the only question, therefore, to be settled now was whether those 103 Members had been fairly and equitably distributed. Could anything be more utterly indefensible than the contrast between the measures meted out to Dublin and Belfast? Supposing that Belfast were the capital of Ireland, and supposing that it contained, like Dublin, 273,000 inhabitants, and that with an extension of boundaries it would contain 317,000, as Dublin would have if the recommendations of Exham's Commission were carried out, did anyone mean to suggest that those 317,000 so-called "Loyalists" in Belfast would have been dismissed with four Members? He ventured to say that the Government proposal under such circumstances would not have stopped short at the modest figure of five. The present population of Belfast, even with the addition made to it by the Boundary Commissioners, would only be 221,000. If the rate of increase which had been going on in Belfast for 10 years before the Census were maintained—and it was perfectly notorious that the population as well as the prosperity of Belfast had been declining instead of growing—but even admitting that it would increase at the rate of 1,300 a-year, it would be a quarter of a century before its population reached the population of even the present restricted borough of Dublin; and half-a-century, if Rathmines and the other townships were thrown in with Dublin, in the same way as the townland of Holywood and the straggling districts around Belfast had been included in the boundaries of that borough. Had the right hon. Baronet given any sort of satisfactory reason why Dublin, as the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) had pointed out, should be cramped and mutilated within an unnatural boundary line, while Belfast received its full and natural development? He believed that the only reason that would for a moment hold water was that the population of the suburbs of Belfast was of the same politics as the dominant Party of Belfast, while the population of Rathmines was notoriously a nest of Tories; and it was supposed that there would be more likelihood of securing a Tory seat by leaving them out, and keeping them as a carefully arranged Tory preserve where they were, rather than adding them to the population of the city. As had been pointed out by several hon. Members, Rathmines was really a continuation of the streets of Dublin. The line of demarcation between Rathmines and Dublin was simply artificial, and not half as wide as the division between the two banks of the pond in St. James's Park, nor half the width of the Chamber

in which they were then assembled. Although the long and straggling suburbs of Belfast were taken in order to make a fourth seat for the borough, this compact portion of the City of Dublin was cut off in order to preserve a Tory seat for the county. The matter was one which, in his opinion, would not bear a moment's argument. Even with the population which was now proposed to be added to Belfast, the population of that town would still be 50,000 under that of the present borough of Dublin; and what the Committee were really asked by the right hon. Baronet to do was to say that 55,000 persons in Belfast, because they were Orangemen, and had certain political views, were entitled to equal electoral power with 68,000 Nationalists in the capital of the country. He confessed that he looked in vain for any sort of explanation of that most galling and unfair contrast which had been drawn between Belfast and the capital of the country. If Belfast excelled Dublin in commercial greatness, or if it could be pointed to as a great centre of enlightenment and of intelligence, he could understand the favour shown to it. But he did not think its warmest advocate in that House would point to Belfast as a place to which such a distinction should be applied. It was a place which had never to this day admitted a Roman Catholic into its Corporation, and only recently it had exhibited its liberality by rioting and breaking convent windows. His hon. Friend the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) had dealt with the question of where they were to find the additional Member; and he confessed that Trinity College was as much over-represented as the City of Dublin was under-represented by the Bill. But Trinity College was defended upon the same principle which had been put forward in defence of the extension of the boundaries of Belfast, and the refusal to extend those to Dublin — namely, the principle of keeping up and maintaining the contrast which was observed in the treatment of the so-called Loyalists and the Nationalists of Ireland. One of the secrets of the failure to govern Ireland had been that Her Majesty's Government never gave a thing without crooking it. They could not make the concession of the new franchise to Ireland without making it as ungraciously and grudgingly as was possible. He would not go into the question of the interesting tricks the Boundary Commissioners had applied, even with regard to the four seats given to Dublin. The Committee would have an opportunity of discussing that question hereafter; but even if the Government should succeed, by their present daring course of procedure, in depriving the Irish Party of full representation in Dublin, and in cutting the representation down even from five to three, he thought that, from their own point of view, they would find the achievement dearly purchased by leaving in the minds of the people of Dublin and of Ireland a feeling of soreness and injustice.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that several Members, and especially the last speaker, had referred to a contrast between the treatment accorded to Belfast and to the City of Dublin under the present Bill. He, therefore, thought it would be as well to give the Committee some facts, in order to show that there were many large boroughs where the averages were higher than in Dublin, and which, according to the arguments of hon. Members, must be even worse treated. There were the cases of Battersea and Islington.

MR. SEXTON asked the right hon. Gentleman to cite the case of some four-Member constituency.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had already given several four-Member boroughs. The hon. Member spoke of the unfairness of giving Dublin one Member for every 68,000 population.

MR. O'BRIEN: As contrasted with one Member for every 55,000 in the borough of Belfast.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that was picking out the lowest places that were in the scale, and, as he had already pointed out, every scale must have its high and low places. He had already mentioned Newcastle-on-Tyne, the great city of Manchester, Kensington, Marylebone, Oldham, and several of the Metropolitan Divisions.

MR. SEXTON asked how many Members it was proposed to give to those boroughs?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the number varied. Some had two, some three, and others four; but they were all in the scale. All he wished to show was that there were worse cases than

that of Dublin. Taking his own constituency—the parish of Kensington—which was increasing far more rapidly than the City of Dublin, according to the Census of 1881 it had a population of between 81,000 and 82,000, and it was only to have one Member. The hon. and learned Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon) was altogether wrong in saying that the Commissioners had extended the boundaries of Dublin so as to include the township of Pembroke. That was not so. Pembroke was already within the Parliamentary borough of Dublin. The hon. Member for Mallow (Mr. O'Brien) said the secret of the matter, and the real objection of the Government to this proposal, was that the arrangement with the Opposition precluded it; but he might say that the question of the extension of the boundaries of Dublin formed no part whatever of any arrangement.

MR. MAYNE said, that as the right hon. Baronet had given examples favourable to his own side, he (Mr. Mayne) would mention cases that went the other way. Take the case of Bristol. Bristol, with a population of 206,503, was to have four Members, or one to each 51,625. Then, again, there was the case of Kingston-upon-Hull. Hull had a population of 161,519, and the average there was only 40,379. Nottingham was a stronger case still. The population was 111,631, which for three Members gave an average of 37,210 for each Member.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the hon. Member was quite mistaken. The hon. Member was taking the Census Returns of the population of the Parliamentary borough; but Nottingham had been enormously extended.

MR. MAYNE continued: It was said that there was an objection on the part of Rathmines to be incorporated with the City of Dublin for Parliamentary purposes. No hon. Member who had spoken had given the Committee the real reason why the inhabitants of the township of Rathmines objected to row in the same boat with Dublin for Parliamentary purposes. The right hon. Baronet had assigned no reason whatever, because, probably, he was not aware of any; but he (Mr. Mayne) was pretty sure that the right hon. Gentleman's correspondents from Rathmines to whom he had alluded had carefully kept the real reason why that township objected away from him. It was certainly no part of the policy of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Plunket), although he knew the reason very well, to allow the Committee to become acquainted with it. The reason was this—it had nothing to do with taxes or anything of that kind, but, as the Committee had already heard from more than one hon. Member, Rathmines was virtually part of the City of Dublin. The division between them was merely an artificial one, consisting of a narrow canal; and in regard to some of the streets, the upper portion was in Dublin and the lower part in Rathmines, just outside the municipal boundary. All the inhabitants of Rathmines were entitled to the Parliamentary franchise; but the position they occupied enabled them to enjoy practically a double voting power, and that was the secret of the opposition of the inhabitants of Rathmines to the proposal to transfer them to the City of Dublin. Nearly 90 per cent of the male adult population of Rathmines and of the surrounding neighbourhood were citizens of Dublin—that was to say, that they had warehouses in the city where they carried on their business in the daytime, being rated for those places and entitled to vote in the borough elections, while they resided in Rathmines or the neighbourhood, and, being rated for their residences there, enjoyed a second vote for the county. Now, if Rathmines were added to Dublin, even if Dublin were to get a fifth Member in consequence of the extension of the boundaries, these gentlemen would only be able to vote once—namely, for the city. That was the gravamen of the whole case. It was only natural and quite reasonable, from their point of view, that they should object to lose the privilege they now enjoyed—namely, that of a double voting power. Whenever a General Election occurred they were enabled to vote within the city as urban voters and without the city as rural voters. It was patent that a considerable number of gentlemen now voting outside the city, as rural voters, if transferred in future to the city would interfere materially with the voting power of the county of Dublin. Those gentlemen were perfectly acquainted with the favourable position in which they now

stood, and, indeed, they had made an extraordinary request to the Boundary Commissioners when they were sitting in Dublin. They claimed not only to be left as they were, as voters for the county, but they said—"We are an urban population, although outside the city, and we think that in addition to the votes we already possess within the city, as county voters in the county there ought to be another seat given to us as an urban district." When his hon. Friend the Member for Mallow (Mr. O'Brien) said that the bargain was made and sealed, and that no alteration would be permitted, the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) shook his head; but it seemed to him that he was justified in dissenting from the negative gesture which the right hon. Baronet made. If this question was still open, he said that some other and a much stronger case ought to be made out for the proposed representation of the City of Dublin than had been made out up to the present time. The right hon. Baronet had only given two reasons why the present state of things had been permitted to remain. One of them was the objection of the surrounding townships to being included in the Parliamentary borough; the other reason was indeed an extraordinary one, and if the right hon. Baronet had known Dublin half as well as hon. Members on those Benches, he believed he would not have made use of it. The right hon. Baronet said it would be introducing a most inconvenient precedent if the Parliamentary boundaries were extended in the manner recommended by the Royal Commission which sat to consider this subject; but let the right hon. Baronet look into the facts of the case. The present Parliamentary borough of the City of Dublin, for some extraordinary reason which he had never heard explained, went all the way down to the Cross of Black Rock and the sea coast. Indeed, the Cross of Black Rock was nearly two miles further than Rathmines, so that if in the past it had been thought proper to extend the boundaries to the centre of Black Rock township, it was a sufficient reason for including now the populations of Rathmines and Kilmainham. He regretted that there was no chance of a further opportunity presenting itself for the consideration of the question, because he felt sure that the right hon. Baronet, on further consideration, would see that the reasons which had been furnished by him in respect of the proposed boundaries, and which he invited the House of Commons to accept, were not such as the Committee ought to follow.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said, here was a case in which Irish Members were all practically agreed upon a certain question with reference to the City of Dublin, and, instead of taking into consideration the opinions of the majority of the Irish Members upon a purely Irish question, the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board got up and gave his decision without giving any heed to the expressions of opinion which he had received from Irish Members on both sides of the House. Throughout the discussions on this Bill the Government had treated Ireland unfairly, and in every place where it was possible they had so arranged the boundaries as to secure the greatest possible degree of representation for the miserable Orange hierarchy in Ireland which now, with the assistance of an Army, held Ireland for the British Crown. But looking at all that had taken place throughout these discussions, he did not think there had ever been a case of more clear injustice than the case with reference to the City of Dublin. Here were two suburban districts of Dublin excluded from the city boundaries for some unknown reason—Kilmainham and Rathmines—both of which, as had been abundantly pointed out, were practically part and parcel of the City of Dublin. And yet, in spite of the fact that a great majority of the citizens of Dublin were anxious to have their Parliamentary boundaries settled in a compact way which would embrace the whole city, in spite of the fact that the majority of the Irish Members of all shades of opinion in that House were in favour of the inclosure within the boundaries of those two districts, the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill would not accede to their demands. And why? Because it appeared that he had received certain letters from persons in Dublin saying that they would not like to have those two districts brought into the boundaries of the city. The hon. and learned Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon) said in

he course of his very able speech that he right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board had received letters from certain parties in Dublin deprecating the idea of including Rathmines and Kilmainham in the boundaries of the City of Dublin. Would the right hon. Baronet be kind enough to inform hon. Members from whom he received those letters, and would he say that the people who wrote them had influence sufficient to counterbalance the influence which was possessed by the majority of the Representatives of Ireland in that House? Certainly to Irish Members it must be considered a matter of extreme humiliation to find that the right hon. Baronet made his decision in accordance with the advice contained in letters from people whose names were unknown, and that he paid no attention whatever to the demands of the Representatives of Ireland in the House of Commons. He maintained that there was a very great deal of injustice in the conduct of the Government in refusing to pay some attention and consideration to the demand which Irish Members had put forward that day. Well, he was sorry that there was no prospect, as apparently there was none, of the Government giving way to the demand of giving to Dublin an extra Representative; that there was no probability that Dublin would get the five Members to which it was entitled. Still, from every other point of view he was glad that the Government had taken up their present position with regard to this question, because when the news reached Ireland to-morrow morning that Irish Members of all shades of opinion had proved that Dublin wanted and was entitled to have five Members, and that the right hon. Baronet and his Colleagues had paid no attention to the claims of the City of Dublin, the people of Ireland would regard the action of the Government as one further proof of the fact that they had very little to expect in the way of justice from the British Government. It had been pointed out that there would be some difficulties in including in the boundaries of Dublin the two districts of Rathmines and Kilmainham. No doubt there were difficulties, but they would not be insurmountable difficulties. If an exception could be made in any part of the Bill with regard to Ireland, that exception should be made in the case of the City of Dublin, which, as it had already been pointed out, was the centre of the social and political life of the country. He was perfectly sure that if it were a case of giving to London an extra Member to which it might be entitled, that some other part of England would be made to suffer or made to do without a due measure of representation, in order that the capital of the British Empire should be fully represented. Now, what London was to England, Dublin was to Ireland. London was the centre of the Empire and of Great Britain; Dublin was the centre of Ireland, and Irish Members asked that the capital of Ireland should have a fairer and fuller representation. They asked the Government to take from some other district, say, from the county of Tyrone, a Member, and give it to Dublin, in order that the City of Dublin, with its great interests, might have an adequate meed of representation. It was an extraordinary statement, as coming from the right hon. Baronet, that in fixing the boundaries of electoral districts in Ireland, care had been taken that those districts should be fixed on the principle of the arrangements made as to England and Scotland. Now, he contended that they were entitled to have the electoral districts in Ireland fixed with respect to Irish circumstances and requirements alone, and without any reference to the circumstances or requirements of England and Scotland at all. The Government might mix up England and Scotland as much as they pleased in this matter of boundaries; but in fixing the boundaries in Ireland, he repeated that regard ought not to be had to circumstances which might exist in England and Scotland. Unfortunately, the Government had not acted in this way, and accordingly Orange boundaries had been drawn in Ireland, and Members had been given to certain places on arrangements made in England and Scotland. Ireland was a separate country from Great Britain, and as a separate country, and inhabited by a population totally different from that of England and Scotland, he contended that it ought to have had a Redistribution Bill all to itself. But it was not to be wondered at that in this respect, as well as in other respects, the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill was unsatis-

factory to the people of Ireland. He understood that before the Bill was drawn up, Her Majesty's Government had given sufficient consideration to the interests of Scotland by inviting Scotch Members to meet them in conference and discuss the scheme of the Bill. He did not know whether that was the fact; but certainly, if it were, it was the most extraordinary thing, that in these matters relating to everything that concerned Ireland, neither Her Majesty's Government nor right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Opposition Bench had the common fairness, or the common politeness, to consult even one Member for Ireland in respect of the redistribution of seats. The Government were going to redistribute the electoral divisions in England and Scotland, and they very properly consulted the wishes of English and Scotch Members; but although they had done so, they had not acted in the same way with regard to the wishes of Irish Members. He supposed the Government regarded Irish Members as mere nonentities, or possibly irresponsible persons; at any rate, they did not extend to Irish Representatives that justice which they had extended to Scotch Members. Under these circumstances, he said that they had in Ireland, from the beginning to the end of the ParliamentaryElections (Redistribution) Bill, every cause for complaint. As he had said, justice was being done to the City of London; but Dublin was not to have adequate representation in that House. But although there was no possibility of getting this question settled in accordance with the wishes of Irish Representatives, he was glad, as he had stated before, that the Government was so stubborn, because their stubborness would prove to the people of Ireland that, whether in respect of redistribution or other legislation, they had nothing to expect in the shape of consideration from English Members in that House.

Mr. KENNY said, the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board had argued in this case that there were certain places in England, which he named, much more unfavourably treated than the City of Dublin, and he had pointed to two instances in which the boundaries had been extended and additional Members given. The Government had given two Members to the City of Dublin; but they refused to extend the boundaries, and therefore he said that the contrast made by the right hon. Gentleman was utterly unfair. Hon. Members on those Benches wanted the Government to extend exactly similar treatment to Dublin as they had done to other boroughs in the United Kingdom. They wished it to have its fair chance as compared with other places, and it had been pointed out that by extending the boundaries, and adding one more Member, a condition of things would be brought about which would leave Dublin fairly represented, as having one Member to every 63,000 of the population, and that would still leave it to compare most unfavourably with many English and Scotch constituencies. Now, in the case of the City of Edinburgh, the capital of Scotland, the position of which was almost perfectly analogous to the position of the City of Dublin, it would be found that it had had two Members added to its former representation, and that the population was only 236,000, or 40,000 less than the population of Dublin, which city was only to have the same number of Members. Now, if they added to that portion of the suburban district of Dublin the district which Irish Members asked should be added, and retained the present proportion of Members, they would have a representation in the proportion of 79,000 people to each Member, while, if they added one Member, they gave something like a fair proportion. As far as England was concerned, it was only the case of one or two Metropolitan boroughs which could be cited as an unfair and unjust arrangement. There was another point to which he desired to refer in connection with the refusal of the Government to listen to the request of Irish Members. Their proposal extended to, and would meet, an anomaly, and it would put an end to the inconsistency which had been occasioned by the Boundary Commissioners. The Instructions to the Boundary Commissioners were that, as far as possible, all suburban districts should be included in one constituency. Irish Members desired to add to the City of Dublin certain outlying suburban districts; but at the present time, under the provisions of the Bill as it stood, the Government divided those suburban districts into two separate divisions.

Another point which the right hon. Baronet put forward, and upon which the changes had been rung by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Plunket) was that the people of Rathmines objected to Parliamentary consolidation with the City of Dublin, and the right hon. Gentleman argued that they objected because there was such a great difference in the relative taxation as between the City of Dublin governed by the Corporation of Dublin and the outlying districts, and that an injustice would be inflicted on the outlying districts by their being incorporated with the City. But he would point out, what everyone knew, that the difference of taxation referred to was in all probability purely temporary in its character; and, further, that the real objection of some of the inhabitants of Rathmines to Parliamentary consolidation with the City of Dublin, was that they wished to preserve their present double system of voting. Another advantage to be gained by adding Rathmines to the City of Dublin was that the compactness of the constituency would be thereby greatly improved. At the present time the shape of the Parliamentary boundaries of the City of Dublin was something like that of a tennis bat; there was a thin narrow line running out from the City of Dublin which had no connection with it, and which was detached from its natural constituency, the Southern portion of the county of Dublin. If they added Rathmines and the other districts in the same direction with this line, they would add to the constituency a district which would greatly improve its formation. This consolidation and compactness of constituencies had been directly recommended to the Boundary Commissioners, and they had been instructed to effect it wherever it was possible. There was no case more convenient for, or which more clearly demanded the application of, that principle than the case of the City of Dublin; but in this respect the Boundary Commissioners had plainly disobeyed their Instructions. The right hon. Baronet could not defend the position he had taken up logically in any way; he seemed to argue that, as a line had been laid down, there must be no departure from it with regard to the City of Dublin. If the Government and the Opposition distinctly stated that they would not accept any Amendment which might be proposed in Committee on this Bill, he said the sooner the discussion on this stage of the proceedings terminated the better it would be. He thought it would be much more in accordance with strict justice and equity if the Government would accept, in matters of this kind, arguments which they could not logically meet, and thereby afford satisfaction and content to persons who were directly concerned. But if they continued to refuse that just proportion of representation which they laid claim to, it would lead to discontent, and leave this question a source of future agitation, no matter how final the Government might think the present measure would be.

MR. BIGGAR said, he had listened attentively to the speech of the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill, and although he believed that some of his arguments were entitled to a certain amount of consideration, he did not think that the right hon. Baronet had made out a very strong case. There were one or two points with regard to the representation of Ireland which he (Mr. Biggar) thought were entitled to a considerable amount of attention. One was the way in which the Boundary Commissioners were instructed and the way in which they had acted with respect to Dublin and Belfast. In the case of Belfast, they had introduced into the Parliamentary borough a very considerable area which, in fact, could not be fairly called an urban district at all. The place was studded, to a large extent, with detached villas, and had nothing about it which entitled it to be considered part of the town; but in Dublin they refused to admit into the Parliamentary borough districts which were clearly urban in their character. For those reasons he thought the contention of the right hon. Baronet was not sound, and that he ought to give way to the arguments of his hon. Friend the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton). Another contention of the right hon. Baronet was that there were certain anomalies with regard to the representation of the country as a whole. Of course, that was perfectly well known; but, on the other hand, he (Mr. Biggar) contended that it was the duty of the Committee, as far as possible, to make

the redistribution of political power as nearly equal as possible. It was very clear that Belfast had a greater representation than Dublin had; but Dublin was the capital of the country, the place where the chief professional men resided, and where the educational establishments of the country were situated to a larger extent than any other Provincial town, and therefore, from that point of view, Dublin, he said, was very much worse treated than it should have been. Seeing that Dublin was a place of much more real importance than any other part of Ireland, he contended that the Government ought to deal with it as they had just done with Westminster—that was to say, they should give it another Member at the expense of some over-represented constituency. They could take it away from the county, which was rather over-represented according to the present arrangement, the population being under 200,000. He thought the Government should give way, and agree to the Amendment.

MR. GRAY said, that most extreme discontent had been caused by the proposed arrangement with reference to the representation of the City of Dublin, and, as he did not understand from the speech of the right hon. Baronet who had charge of the Bill that this was a question upon which the Government were absolutely bound by their compact, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would take it into his serious consideration. Under the scheme, no doubt unauthenticated, but never repudiated by the Government, which was published in *The Standard* as the draft scheme, it was proposed not to give the same number of Members to Dublin and Belfast, but to give Dublin twice as many Members as Belfast; but after consideration, and probably consultation with the Representatives on the other side of the House, the Government, in their matured scheme, were found giving an equal number of Members to Belfast and Dublin. The discrepancy was so enormous that it was only by a device that it could be defended for one moment. The device was to extend the boundaries of Belfast, as recommended by the Exham Commission which sat a couple of years before, and to refuse to extend the boundaries of Dublin as recommended by the same Commission. The Boundary Commissioners in their Report gave as their reason for the repudiation of the recommended extension in the case of Dublin, that legislation had not followed that recommendation. But legislation had no more followed in the case of Belfast than in the case of Dublin, and the argument was, therefore, as good in the one case as it was in the other; and if legislation did not follow the recommendations of the Royal Commission, who, he would like to know, was to blame? The Government had been appealed to again and again to adopt the recommendations of their own Commission, and to act on them. Questions had been put in that House; Motions had been made, and deputations had waited on the Head of the Irish Government on the subject; but all of no avail. It was out of the power of the Local Authorities to carry out the recommendations of the Commission. All that the Commission did was to dislocate all local arrangements and induce Dublin to hang up its reform pending the adoption of the recommendations of the Commission—to leave Dublin to stew in its own gravy, waiting for the Government to carry out the recommendations of the Commission. And now they were told that because the Government did not do its duty in one respect it was a good excuse for not doing its duty in another. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman was well acquainted with Dublin; but anyone who had ever taken an active interest in this matter, and was fairly well acquainted with Dublin, would know that Rathmines was absolutely a continuous portion of the city—that a continuous street ran into it, and that there was no real distinction between Rathmines and the city proper. In Dublin they had this extraordinary state of things, that while the borough extended in one direction far away into the rural districts, in another its artificial boundary shut out a portion of the city. The only argument the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board had addressed to the Committee in favour of the retention of the present extraordinary boundaries was that certain persons in Rathmines had written to him objecting to the proposed absorption of the township. He (Mr. Gray) was not aware that in any other case the views of individual residents had guided the policy of the Go-

ernment. He had been under the impression that general principles had been laid down, and that the Government had made up their minds to follow them. No doubt, many private individuals had made representations to the Government in regard to their constituencies or other districts affected by the Bill; but he did not know that they had paid any particular attention to such representations. Now, if the present scheme, which was most imperfect and unfair, were adopted, Dublin would have no chance of fair representation for many years to come. He himself did not regard the matter from a political standpoint. He did not think it would affect the political Parties one way or the other. He did not think it would give a seat to the Home Rule Party or take one away from the opposite Party; but he knew that on the fortunes of the municipality and the general community in Dublin it would exercise a very great effect. They were now maintaining an artificial division between one portion of the city and another portion. That division would have effects more far-reaching than concerned Parliamentary representation—it would establish a distinction in municipal affairs and in social affairs, and would keep up a rivalry between persons whose interests ought to be identical, and who ought to work together. To say for a moment that because a certain number of persons in Rathmines who under the existing system enjoyed the unfair privilege of two votes—one for the city and one for the county—whilst some of them possessed old corrupt franchises such as the freeman franchise, and voted for parts of the county other than those in which their residences were situated—to say that because of this therefore these people should retain their qualifications in violation of all principles of common sense and of the principles of the Bill itself, was a most preposterous proposition. Dublin, as at present arranged, had, he believed, the largest numbers for each Representative. It was only beaten by Glasgow—which was a case rather to be avoided than followed. They had treated Glasgow as badly as they proposed to treat Dublin. He maintained that the proportion of inhabitants to each Member in Dublin would be still above the average of the United Kingdom, even if the boundary were properly adjusted. He did not wish to detain the Committee any longer. The right hon. Baronet was probably well aware of all the arguments which could be adduced on the question. He would merely add that he did not think they were informed, when the Commission was appointed, that it was to report in the bald fashion that it had done. Though the Commission had taken a great deal of evidence, and though everyone knowing the situation had been bound to acknowledge that the arguments in favour of extending the boundary were solid and irrefutable, the Commissioners had paid not the slightest heed to the circumstances brought before them; and the Committee, therefore, had no means of knowing whether what the Irish Members asked for was reasonable or unreasonable—that was to say, no means of knowing, of their own personal knowledge, of the facts. All that could be hoped for was that those whose business it was to investigate the matter and to know whether the contention of the Irish Members was a fair one or not would, if they were not bound hand and foot by the compact, give adequate consideration to that contention.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY said, the Committee would have liked to hear something from the Treasury Bench as to the position taken up by the Government. They had only had a few words from the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board in answer to the convincing speech of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton), who had made out a case so clear that it was impossible for the Government, with justice, to refuse to act on it. The argument, so far, had been altogether one-sided. All that the right hon. Baronet had said was that some other places had been treated as badly as Dublin; but he had failed to show that in those cases there was as easy a means of remedying the injustice as there was in Dublin. The Irish Members maintained that as a mere matter of justice—if there were no question as to the population and number of Representatives—the proper boundary for Dublin was only to be found by taking in the Rathmines district. If that Rathmines district—which most naturally and properly belonged to Dublin—were taken in, Dublin would then have an unquestionable claim to

an addition to her number of Representatives. He supposed the reason why the Committee had heard nothing more from the Government was tolerably plain—at least, he thought public opinion in Ireland would not find it difficult to discover the reason. It would be said that the Government were determined, by some process or other, to rescue a seat in the city or the county of Dublin from the growing opinion of the National side. He doubted whether the Government would find this operation attended with the desired effect. On the contrary, he believed that the course taken by the Government would only create a stronger feeling and provoke greater energy on behalf of the Nationalist candidates. He expected that the Nationalists would now secure all the Dublin seats.

MR. SEXTON agreed with the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down as to what would be the effect of the plot arranged between the two Front Benches with regard to Dublin. It would be such as the intriguers little expected. The right hon. Baronet had told them they should not compare Dublin with other parts of Ireland; but he (Mr. Sexton) contended that they had a right to make such a comparison, and that, having their 103 Members in Ireland, they were justified in asking for a fair apportionment. The right hon. Baronet, speaking of extended boundaries, had referred to letters he had received from anonymous writers; in fact, at one time he had considered one part of the case and at another time another, but he had refused at any one time to take into view the whole case. This was the unanimous feeling on the part of the Irish Members, and he (Mr. Sexton) could assure the right hon. Baronet that they condemned and resented the manner in which this question had been dealt with.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he also felt it necessary to protest against the course taken by the right hon. Baronet. He was sure that this debate and the whole discussion and proceedings on this Bill would be a further warning, if any further warning were wanted, as to what Ireland had to expect from the present Ministry and from any Ministry of the same kind. When the Government announced for the first time that Ireland was to retain 103 seats, Members on the Irish Benches and the Irish people generally thought that at last they had received from the present Ministry a boon which might be taken without suspicion or *arrière pensée*, and everyone believed that the just claims of Ireland were to receive full, frank, and honest acknowledgment from the Government. But what had occurred? Why the 103 Members, given to them with one hand, were taken from them as far as possible with the other. The concession to Ireland of 103 Members was a sham, a delusion, and a snare. The eyes of the Irish Members, if they had been closed for some time, were now open, and they could see what an utter sham was this concession on the part of the Government. By every trick, device, and juggle which could suggest itself to the ingenious mind of man, this so-called "concession" had been destroyed, by filching away from the Irish people their fair share of popular representation in England, Ireland, and Scotland. In Ireland they had a proverb which said that there were three things to be suspected and feared—the first was the stones in Dinan River, the second the dog that did not bark, and the third the smile of the Sassenach. He would venture to add a fourth—namely, an Irish reform from an English Liberal Government.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he thought the Irish Members had rather had "the smile of the Sassenach" in their favour in this Bill. He, certainly, as one person in the House, must thank the Government for having given Ireland the 103 Members to which the hon. Member (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) had alluded. He was not "speaking to the country." He was merely addressing to the Committee a few observations in reference to hon. Gentlemen opposite. The hon. Gentleman who had just spoken had a world-wide reputation. His words were winged, and went far beyond the House; therefore, it was easy to understand the wide range that his observations took. Without going into the general question of the franchise, he (Sir Patrick O'Brien) felt, probably more deeply than the hon. Member who had preceded him, how important this matter was to Dublin, and how strongly the Motion of the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) ought to commend itself to every man who

ad been long connected with that an-
ent city. In that sense he should cer-
inly be disposed to give the hon. Mem-
er his vote. It was too funny, if he
ight say so, when they had heard talk
Ireland getting 103 Members, and
hen they found it was more than talk,
find an hon. Gentleman get up here
nd—wanting a special grievance, with-
nt which he could not speak with that
atform smartness or command that at-
ntion which he could with a grievance
-try to manufacture a grievance out of
reland having 103 Members. He (Sir
atrick O'Brien) did not reply to obser-
ations which he knew were only made
r electioneering purposes. He had
sen to say that the interests of the
ity of Dublin commended themselves
the attention of all Irishmen, and
nat, in that sense, he should vote for
ne Amendment of the hon. Member for
ligo.

MR. LEWIS said, that any stranger
oming into the House that day for the
rst time, and listening to the speeches
f hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway,
ould believe that a conspiracy had
aken place between the two Front
enches in order to deprive Ireland of
s fair share of representation in the
Iouse. He (Mr. Lewis) would not fight
ver again battles already decided in
ne House during the progress of the
ill, or he might have occasion to say
omething about the manner in which
ertain portions of the community in
reland had been treated relatively to
he rest of the country. He should not
ave risen if it had not been to protest
gainst an observation of the hon. Mem-
er for Carlow (Mr. Gray) to the effect
hat Dublin City had been treated
orse than any other constituency in
he United Kingdom. That was not the
ase. Islington had one Member for
very 70,000 inhabitants; Kensington,
ne for every 81,000; Marylebone,
ne for every 77,000; whilst Dublin had
ne for every 68,300. If they went to
Manchester they would find that it had
ne for every 70,600. It must be re-
nembered that this Motion had come
rom the same hon. Members who had
upported the Amendment for retaining
Member for Drogheda and two for
Limerick. Unless one could follow the
ea under the thimble which was upon
he table, it was difficult to know how
some of the Irish Members would have
the seats bestowed. He believed that
nothing would satisfy those Gentlemen
but the distribution of the whole of the
representation of Ireland over certain
constituencies that they believed them-
selves able to control. Those who had
been favoured with a sight of *The United
Ireland* map of the future representation
of Ireland would come to the conclusion
not only that hon. Gentlemen below the
Gangway had nothing to complain of,
but that they had appropriated by anti-
cipation and with evident satisfaction
the enormous advantages they hoped to
secure from the Bill. Those hon. Gen-
tlemen used language in the House to
the effect that the Loyal minority in
Ireland were likely to have some 20 or
23 Members, and he hoped that predic-
tion was more likely to be realized than
the fearful estimate they circulated
amongst their friends, as showing how
very few out of the Nationalist Party
would be returned. The map to which
he referred had been prepared, of course,
to show how loyal those hon. Members
had been to their friends as against the
desperate Tories and Whigs to be found
in the North of Ireland; but when they
came to that House they said—"Do not
be guided by this map that we have
prepared, but by our professions here,
and we say the Loyal Party will be so
over-represented that this Bill is nothing
less than a farce—a delusion and a
fraud." He thought the Committee
was entitled to judge those Gentlemen
by their acts when they were at home—
when they circulated for their own glori-
fication a map—[Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR:
Who circulated?] He (Mr. Lewis)
thought *United Ireland* was a represen-
tative journal, and that at least one hon.
Gentleman below the Gangway knew
something about it. At any rate, it was
an organ which those hon. Gentlemen
were very much disposed to uphold and
stand by. He preferred to judge the
opinions of those Members by the repre-
sentations there made; and, in answer
to the wail they had heard from below
the Gangway to the effect that the
Nationalist Party had been defrauded
of their fair share of the 103 Members,
he submitted the estimate of *United Ire-
land*, and maintained that the Loyalists
ought to be the parties to complain
rather than the Nationalists.

[*Ninth Night.*]

MR. CALLAN said, the hon. Gentleman had spoken of *The United Ireland* map showing the gains to the Nationalist Party under the Bill; but the hon. Member had forgotten to mention that if the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill were not before the House at all, the Nationalist gain would be much larger. One advantage he (Mr. Callan) looked forward to was, that under the enlarged franchise, when Irish boroughs or counties wanted a Member, they would go to Irish gentlemen, and not to practitioners in the London Bankruptcy Court.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 76; Noes 32: Majority 44. — (Div. List, No. 77.)

Schedule *agreed to.*

FOURTH SCHEDULE.

NEW BOROUGHS.

MR. RAIKES said, that in accordance with the resolution at which the Committee arrived last night, he begged to move the omission of the words "Bermondsey | Surrey | One | Parish of Bermondsey." It would only be necessary, he thought, to explain to the Committee that those words were in the Bill as part of a scheme by which Bermondsey was to be made a separate borough. By the decision, however, at which the Committee unanimously arrived last night—namely, to restore the borough of Southwark to its ancient dimensions, those words would be out of place. In proposing this Amendment, he might perhaps be allowed to remove a misapprehension which possibly existed in the minds of some hon. Members. The result of the Amendment to which the Committee arrived last night would not be to create a borough of Southwark, returning three Members, as one constituency; but the borough of Southwark would be divided into three wards, each of which would return one Member. It would be possible to make a very much more reasonable division of the borough of Southwark, under the circumstances, than would have taken place under the scheme which was originally proposed by the Government. He begged to move the Amendment which stood in his name.

Amendment proposed,

In page 16, line 9, to leave out,—

"Bermondsey | Surrey | One | Parish of Bermondsey."

—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he did not think that the boundaries which were made in the old constituency of Southwark were everything that were desired. In many respects there was to be a change for the better; but he wished to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) to the fact that, as the boundaries were settled by the Commissioners, there was to be a constituency of Rotherhithe.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Not by itself; with St. Olave's.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR wished to be perfectly candid with the right hon. Gentleman in the matter. The population of Rotherhithe were under the impression that theirs was one of the very few constituencies in England in which the Irish minority would have some chance of returning someone to represent their views. Some time ago he asked the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) what provision was to be made in England and Scotland for the representation of the Irish minority. That minority counted altogether about 2,000,000 of the population of the two countries, or, in other words, about 1-20th of the entire population. As there were to be in the new Parliament 570 English and Scotch Members, a simple sum of division would show how many Representatives that minority could fairly claim. He made out the calculation, and put it in the shape of a Question to the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman declined to answer, and, no doubt, very fairly so, as the Question seemed to involve matter of argument. Any way, he (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) thought that the Irish minority in England and Scotland would be entitled to something like 18 or 20 Members if the representation were to be regulated by the proportions of the population. He did not wish to re-open the question of the representation of Ireland; but some days ago a very strong demand was made on

he part of the minority in that country o a fair proportion of the representation. Nobody contested the principle which he Representatives of the minority in reland made out. The lowest estimate f the number of Representatives which hat minority should have was 23 out of he 103 returned by the country. Now, hey who formed the Irish minority in England would be very well content vith a very slight approach indeed to he same amount of representation which he so-called Loyal minority in Ireland laimed. But those who had studied he question very closely understood hat the Irish minority in England and Scotland had scarcely a chance of having nore than two or three Representatives out of the 570 Members who were to be eturned by the two countries. Now, hat would be nothing like an approach o the fair representation they should ave. The case was stronger with regard to the Irish minority in England han with regard to the Loyal minority n Ireland. In Ireland it was quite possible to have a Protestant returned by Catholics. The hon. Gentleman he Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), the Leader of the Irish people, vas a Protestant, and his Predecessor, Mr. Isaac Butt, was also a Protestant. The Catholic majority had always been willing to select their Leaders altogether irrespective of creed; but to return a Catholic for an English constituency might be described as a practical impossibility. He did not wish to make this a matter of creed; but it was notorious that the vast majority of the 2,000,000 Irishmen in England and Scotland were Catholics. This Catholic minority had a right to have its interests fairly represented in the House of Commons; and it was for that reason he hoped that in the reconstruction of the borough of Southwark the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would have due regard to the question of nationality, which he thought fairly came under the principles of the Bill, as they had been laid down, and that he would not deprive the Irish portion of the population of a chance of having at least one out of the three Representatives of the borough.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he knew that, as a matter of fact, there was a large Irish population, not only in Rotherhithe, but also in Bermondsey. He doubted whether any change which might be made in the district of Rotherhithe would be likely to affect the Irish population. There were courses open—namely, to add St. Olave's to Rotherhithe, or to add a small piece of Bermondsey to Rotherhithe, or to leave Rotherhithe entirely by itself. He did not imagine that the adoption of either of those courses would be likely to influence the proportion of the Irish population. However that might be, the division would be a matter of local convenience. If any re-arrangement were proposed by Sir John Lambert a local inquiry would be held; and he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) promised to look into the matter before any proposition was laid before the House.

MR. SEXTON was bound to say that the course of affairs appeared to him and his hon. Friends to bear a suspicious character. Last night the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) very readily assented to the proposal to add another Member to the fashionable and aristocratic part of London at the expense of the representation of the East of London, which of any district in the Metropolis counted the largest Irish population. He (Mr. Sexton) would not be inclined to look too curiously into the particular manipulation of localities if the right hon. Gentleman had shown any reasonable disposition to meet the appeals which he (Mr. Sexton) and his hon. Colleagues had had to make to him with regard to an equitable redistribution of the representation of Ireland. As they had found that influences to prevent a fair representation of the people of Ireland were supreme in the minds of the Government, it would be necessary henceforth to give a closer, and perhaps a more critical, attention to the proposals concerning the constituencies of Great Britain. He quite agreed with his hon. Friend (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) that the number of Irish people in England and Scotland was large enough to entitle them to between 20 and 30 Members. It appeared to him they would not have that number, or any considerable part of it. It was questionable whether they could count on more than two or three constituencies in England in which Irishmen had a chance of re-

turning a Member. His countrymen in England were, as a rule, massed together; so that if the Government were to take any trouble in the matter, if they would take a tithe of the trouble they had taken in Ireland to give the imported element in that country an undue share of the representation, Irishmen here would get a material share of the representation. All the steps the Government had taken, so far, had, instead of being in the direction of giving Irishmen in England their proper share of representation, been in the direction of depriving Irishmen of the political power they ought to have. He was disposed, so far as he could understand the matter, to protest against the right-about-face of last night. He could see in the transfer of power from Rotherhithe to Westminster nothing but an effort to still further complete the process of intrigue by which the power of the Irish people was being minimized under this Bill. He thought his hon. Friend (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) had done good service in calling attention to this subject. The contrast between the treatment of Dublin and Westminster was most striking; so striking, indeed, that he (Mr. Sexton) and his hon. Friends would be obliged to give a most critical attention to the proposals in the Bill regarding England.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he was not at all satisfied with the answer of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke). The right hon. Gentleman had said nothing at all to meet the fair and reasonable claim he (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) put forward. The other day, in reply to a Question, the right hon. Gentleman said that the principles of the indirect representation of minorities were the same in the three countries. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman to be true to his own principles; he would ask him to put the treatment of England and Ireland side by side, and then see whether the same principle was carried out in both cases. Where was the uniformity of principle in the retention of two Members by 4,000 electors in Trinity College, Dublin, in order to secure a certain two Representatives of the Loyal minority in Ireland, and the practical cutting down to one or two seats the representation of the Irish minority in England and Scotland? Unfortunately, he was not in the House last night when the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board made his extraordinary change of front. Business took him elsewhere; but had he been present he should not have allowed the right hon. Gentleman to make the change without, on his part, a strong, though, no doubt, unavailing, protest. What had the right hon. Gentleman done? He had increased the representation of Westminster. Westminster had no right to increased representation, if such a city as Dublin had not. In fact, the case of Westminster was one of the very worst for anything like increased representation, for, as he pointed out on a previous Amendment, Westminster was the constituency in which the Houses of Parliament were situated, and, therefore, the constituency which had the largest indirect pressure upon the proceedings and policy of the Legislature. How did the right hon. Gentleman propose to get the additional Member for Westminster? By taking it from the East End of London; and that being the poorer part of the Metropolis, was the part in which the Irish chiefly congregated. Accordingly the increased representation of Westminster could only be purchased by the diminished chance of the representation of the Irish people in London. He would take the case of Southwark. In each of the three constituencies in which the borough was to be divided there was a very considerable Irish population; and he did not wish the right hon. Gentleman to misunderstand in the least the claim put forward on behalf of that Irish population. The claim was that as the local circumstances supplied the opportunity the right hon. Gentleman should give the large Irish population concentrated in certain portions of Southwark a chance of having that representation in the House of Commons which such a minority was entitled to have. He put the question to the right hon. Gentleman on the ground of fairness, though he might put it on the higher ground of policy. He assured the right hon. Gentleman that the more men of the Irish race in England, Ireland, and Scotland could be induced to take an interest and actually participate in political questions the better. The reason why so many Irishmen, at so many periods of Irish history,

had been driven into the dark recesses of conspiracy, and still darker recesses of crime, was that the Legislature of this country gave them no Constitutional method of carrying out their purpose, and gave them no Constitutional hope of gaining their ends. Did the right hon. Gentleman wish the 2,000,000 Irish people in England and Scotland to understand that by the deliberate action of the Government they were to be wholly deprived of any representation in the House, while, with a large, and lavish, and generous hand, the Government provided representation in the House for the English faction in Ireland? He (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) considered the contrast between the representation of the two minorities was most instructive and significant.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that the case of Westminster and that of the Tower Hamlets did not arise now, and could not arise until the alteration in the Bill which it was proposed last night to make was made. It was not yet known what the alteration would be. Report would be the proper time to raise the matter. No doubt it would be matter for discussion.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: I was perfectly in Order.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Well, Sir, that is a question for you, and not for me.

MR. SEXTON: It is a matter for the Committee.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I say that the cases of Westminster and the Tower Hamlets cannot arise on this occasion.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: If the right hon. Gentleman will allow me, I will tell him how the question arises. I was discussing the general policy of the representation of minorities; and I was perfectly right in bringing in, by way of illustration, what was done in regard to Westminster.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: This is a matter of convenience. What the hon. Gentleman has said with regard to Southwark is worthy of attention; but his general remarks with regard to the representation of the Irish minority in this country have no special point. I promise him to give a close examination of any proposal with respect to the borough of Southwark. I can do no more. The proposal with regard to Bermondsey is not one, I fancy, likely to diminish the Irish character of the constituency. I shall, of course, be glad to receive suggestions from any quarter of the House.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: I shall be very glad to give the right hon. Gentleman some details.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. J. G. HUBBARD proposed to leave out "Two," after "Bethnal Green, Middlesex," in page 16, line 10, and insert "One." He thought the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) in charge of the Bill would welcome his proposition, because, instead of adding to his difficulties and his liabilities as other Amendments had done, it would diminish them. He proposed to remove one from the present list of Members, in order to place it at the right hon. Gentleman's disposal for other claimants who had a stronger and a better qualified demand for increased representation. He ventured to justify his appeal to the right hon. Gentleman upon the grounds of the words which fell from himself (Sir Charles W. Dilke) earlier in the discussion that evening. The right hon. Gentleman, speaking of boroughs, had said they were not all to be dealt with by a rigid scale, but each upon its own merits. That was exactly the ground on which he (Mr. Hubbard) asked the right hon. Gentleman and the Committee to consider the question of the representation of Bethnal Green. Bethnal Green was one of the boroughs which had been placed in the Schedule simply upon the process of arithmetical computation with regard to the population now existing in the district. The population principle had been described as the basis of the Bill, and as the basis of the Bill he had no objection to it. Admitting population to be in the first instance the guiding principle, there were, in his opinion, certain considerations which proved conclusively that the borough of Bethnal Green was not entitled to more than one Member, and that one Member he did not grudge the borough. Bethnal Green was a very interesting *locale* of an exceedingly useful industry in days of yore—the silk-weaving industry, which he believed was still carried on, though not, perhaps, in the same prosperous form. The industry of Bethnal Green was essentially

uniform; there was no variety in it; the shuttle was the incidence of industry; and one Representative of the Bethnal Green weavers would be as effective as half-a-dozen. He (Mr. Hubbard) thought a great mistake had been made in the discussion of the question of re-distribution by conceding that in order to have a population of a borough or a county thoroughly well represented they must multiply the number of Representatives. The number of Representatives only required to be multiplied where the interests involved, concentrated in any particular places or towns, were vast, varied, and conflicting, in order that all the different interests might be properly represented. But where, as in the case of Bethnal Green, the interests were uniform and homogeneous, it was clear they did not need to multiply the representation—one Representative of the borough would be amply sufficient. He proposed now to consider how Bethnal Green stood with regard to other boroughs with reference to what ought also to be a matter for consideration—the wealth which they represented. He would not go into the question of taxation, because he had no precise data to go upon. He, however, held in his hand a Parliamentary Report which contained a statement as to the valuation of the borough of Bethnal Green. The population of Bethnal Green was 126,000, and the whole of the rateable value of the borough was stated to be £375,000. The Committee would see that that was an average of about £3 per head; £3 per head, therefore, represented the capitation wealth of Bethnal Green. What did that imply with regard to taxation? If there were five people in each house it meant that, on the average, each house would be rated at about £15 a-year. Now, £15 a-year did not bring a house under the operation of the Inhabited House Duty at all, so that, upon the average, it might be said that Bethnal Green was perfectly free from the charge under the Inhabited House Duty. Then, with regard to the Income Tax. If they assumed that rental represented one-tenth of the income, the average income of Bethnal Green would be £150 a-year; and that was exactly the point at which the operation of the Income Tax began. The Committee were now re-adjusting the seats of the House, and the Members who would be sent to fill those seats would have the regulation of the taxation of the whole country. What were they doing in this instance? They were multiplying the Representatives of a class who paid no taxation whatever. That class, through its Representatives, might insist upon a large portion of the income of the country being levied through the means of the most oppressive and iniquitous tax that ever existed, and from which they were practically exempted—the Income Tax. It was quite possible they would advocate the levying of the tax upon an aggravated ratio—perhaps in a graduated form, as advocated by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain). He thought the Committee ought to pause before they put into the hands of the weavers of Bethnal Green power to send two Members whose interest it might be to advocate the retention of the most injurious and mischievous system of taxation that ever existed. Compare, again, the wealth of Bethnal Green to that of other boroughs. The rateable value of Bethnal Green was £3 per head of the population, whereas in Islington it was £5 per head, in Hampstead and Kensington it was nearly £10, in Paddington nearly £12, and in St. George's, Hanover Square, which was, of course, a very opulent borough, the rateable value was nearly £18 per head of the population. Now, he did submit to the right hon. Gentleman in charge of this Bill and to the Committee that they could not treat boroughs where the rateable value was as low as £3 per head on the same footing as those where the rateable value was as high as £10 and £18 per head. That was the ground on which he contended that Bethnal Green had no right to more than one Member. They certainly ought to admit the principle that rateable value should be taken into consideration in dealing with this subject, and that the matter should not be dealt with solely in regard to the mere question of population. He begged to move the Amendment which stood in his name.

Amendment proposed,

In page 16, line 10, after the words "Bethnal Green, Middlesex," to leave out the word "Two," and insert the word "One."—(*Mr. J. G. Hubbard.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Two' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE regretted that the right hon. Gentleman should have brought a Motion of this sort before the House, which proposed that a borough with 127,000 people, an increasing population, and a rateable value of £375,000, should receive only one Member, when one Member was left to small places of 15,000 population, and when many places also with far fewer than 127,000 inhabitants and a lower rateable value would have two Members. The right hon. Gentleman would certainly not strengthen the feeling in the Committee on behalf of the City of London by attacking the representation which had been allotted to large constituencies like that of Bethnal Green. The rateable value of Bethnal Green was considerably above the average; and though, of course, it could not be compared with that of the City of London, yet it must be remembered that Bethnal Green had more than double the population of the City. The two divisions of Bethnal Green would contain 60,000 and 65,000 inhabitants respectively, and were increasing; but the right hon. Gentleman did not compare them with the City, which had a decreasing population of 50,000 for two Members, which had been given it out of consideration for its ancient position. No doubt, the silk-weaving industry in Bethnal Green was a declining one; but Bethnal Green was by no means a declining portion of the Metropolis, either as regarded population or rateable value; and, therefore, he did not think the right hon. Gentleman ought to try and reduce it to the position of a single-Member constituency.

Amendment *negatived.*

MR. GRANTHAM was very happy to say that the Amendment which stood next on the Paper in his name was not one which would necessitate him occupying the attention of the Committee for any considerable length of time. It seemed to him that the necessity for moving the Amendment at all was probably due to the mistake of the draftsman of the Bill, who did not know that the hamlet of Penge was situated in the county of Surrey, and not in the county of Kent. All parties in Penge were agreed that it was desirable that the change he proposed, which was to take the hamlet of Penge from the proposed borough of Lewisham and to add it to Camberwell, should be effected. Then came the question whether the change could take place, and how was it to be effected? Penge was situated in the county of Surrey, and though it was not part of the parish of Camberwell, yet he would point out that if it were added to the new borough of Camberwell, it would enable them to divide the parish of Camberwell in a much better manner, and make the districts much more homogeneous in their character, instead of being broken up as they were at present. It was contiguous to Camberwell, which it was not to Lewisham, and in every respect ought to be added to the nearest district in the county of Surrey. This was not a Party question, and he hoped the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill could see his way to give it his favourable consideration. He was quite sure his right hon. Friend the Leader of the Opposition would have supported him in this matter—in fact, he had the authority of the right hon. Gentleman for saying that if he had been back in his place in the House in time he would have supported the Amendment which he now had the honour to move.

Amendment proposed, in page 16, line 11, at end, to add the words, "and the Hamlet of Penge."—(*Mr. Grantham.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he was in some doubt in regard to this matter on first principles. He preferred the Bill as it stood, because the hamlet of Penge was in the Lewisham Board of Works District; but, although that was so, he did not attach very much importance to the matter, and if the feeling of the Committee was against him he would not press his objection to the Amendment, especially as the hon. and learned Member had stated that he had the support of the Leader of the Opposition, who had no doubt given much consideration to the matter. It was possible that if they made the change, however, they might see Members rise up to object. He should have preferred to have left the Bill as it stood. There was also this difficulty—that if they altered the Bill they would have to redivide the borough of Camberwell. It was hardly worth while dividing the Committee upon the matter, however;

and, therefore, he should yield to the hon. and learned Member.

MR. RAIKES said, that he had not heard of any opposition to this proposal.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that in the absence of any evidence on the other side he would consent to make the change. With regard to the hon. and learned Member's second or consequential Amendment, if he would agree not to move it he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would be happy, because he had rather a better form of words which he would move when the proper time came.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES said, he rose now to move the next Amendment in his name —namely, to leave out Clerkenwell. The object of this was to restore the borough of Finsbury as far as the three new boroughs of Clerkenwell, Holborn, and Finsbury were concerned. By a subsequent Amendment he proposed to remove the name of Holborn, and to add these two boroughs to Finsbury, so as to restore the existing borough to its present position, without altering its boundaries, and dividing it into three single-Member districts of the one borough. If the right hon. Gentleman preferred that this should be moved on Report he should be very happy to postpone it until that stage.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would accept the Amendment; but he should prefer to substitute another Amendment for the next one which stood in the right hon. Gentleman's name.

MR. W. M. TORRENS asked whether the constituency of Finsbury would still retain the three Members given it by the Bill? [SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Yes, Sir.] He (Mr. Torrens) had asked, because he understood from some of the papers that morning that it was intended to cut the representation of Finsbury down to two.

Amendment proposed,

In page 16, lines 13 and 14, to leave out—

"Clerkenwell	Middlesex	One	Parish of Saint James and Saint John Clerkenwell."

—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

On the Motion of SIR CHARLES W. DILKE consequential Amendments made,

that Holborn should be struck out of the Schedule, to assign three Members instead of one to the borough of Finsbury, and to constitute that borough as follows:—

"The parishes of St. James and St. John, Clerkenwell; the parish of St. Luke's, Middlesex; Holborn district; St. Giles' district; Gray's Inn; Charterhouse; Furnival's Inn; Staple Inn; Lincoln's Inn; and the Liberty of the Rolls."

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR supposed the object of these Amendments was simply to make the matter a little plainer.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that was so. It was proposed to make St. Luke's just a little larger by adding to it some small parishes south of Clerkenwell and thus reduce slightly the population of Holborn.

MR. WARTON asked how it was that the Liberty of the Rolls had been omitted in the Schedule up to the present?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the Liberty of the Rolls was under the Bill included in the Strand Borough as part of the Strand Board of Works District.

MR. WOODALL said, he proposed to commend to the attention of the Committee an Amendment standing in his name, which related to the town of Tunstall, one of the six towns which constituted the borough of Stoke-upon-Trent, the population of which fell just short of 165,000, the limit that would have entitled it to three Members. The population of Tunstall was approaching 15,000, and the proposal in the Bill was to detach it from the existing borough of which it was part, and annex it to Newcastle-under-Lyme. He was happy to say that no Party considerations were involved in his proposal, and to know that it had found favour with both political Parties. His chief reason for dissatisfaction with the proposal to annex it to Newcastle-under-Lyme was on the ground that the two towns had no kind of interest in common, and it would be found to be extremely inconvenient and difficult to get the two towns to act in concert. On the other hand, the town of Tunstall had, in common with the towns from which the Bill proposed to detach it, an identity of interest, social life, and political feeling, which made the severance extremely distasteful to the inhabitants. Tunstall shared with the other towns in the privilege of having a Stipendiary

court, was connected with them by tramways, and was an essential part of the Pottery District. The proposal in the Bill was extremely unpopular in the town of Tunstall. The population of Newcastle-under-Lyme was above the limit which would have brought it under disfranchisement. If his proposal were adopted, he pointed out that it would not affect the divisions of the county or district in any particular, or the general arrangements of the Bill. He knew it would have the effect of making one division of the Potteries—the new borough of Hanley—proportionately large, and increase the population from 75,000 to 90,000; but he was bound to say that that constituted no objection in the eyes of the people. In concluding, he said it was impossible for any hon. Member to follow this discussion without feeling the force of what had been said in last night's debates with regard to the re-adjustment of representation in the case of growing districts; and he believed that, at no distant date, the borough of which he was speaking would be entitled to that additional representation which its claims only just fell short of.

Amendment proposed,

In page 16, lines 45 to 47, leave out "and is not included in the Local Government District of Tunstall."—(*Mr. Woodall.*)

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he thought the only argument against the Amendment of the hon. Member (Mr. Woodall) was the extreme disparity which would result in respect of population. The hon. Member was, he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) believed, right in saying that, generally speaking, the change which he wished to make in the Bill was desired locally. But it seemed to him that the desire that was expressed had come from one side only, and it would be impossible for him to make any change until an expression of opinion on the other side had been received. He was bound to say that such expressions of opinion on this subject as he had received were all in favour of the proposal of the hon. Gentleman; but as it was just possible there might be some opinion the other way, he would suggest that the most convenient course would be to avoid dividing on the Amendment now, and that it should be agreed to on Report, unless there was any very strong opinion expressed against it.

MR. DAVENPORT said, the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) was probably right in supposing that the general feeling was in favour of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Stoke-upon-Trent (Mr. Woodall). He should not have ventured to intervene in the discussion but for the unfortunate circumstance that neither of the hon. Gentlemen who represented Newcastle-under-Lyme were in the House at the moment. Under the circumstances, he thought it perhaps right to express, on behalf of the inhabitants of Newcastle, their complete concurrence with the Amendment of the hon. Member for Stoke-upon-Trent. There would be no doubt, as had been stated, a great disparity of numbers between the two boroughs of Hanley and Newcastle-under-Lyme; but he was bound to point out that in the latter district there were large coal and iron industries, which, if trade revived, would lead to a great increase of population there. He did not speak on behalf of Newcastle-under-Lyme only, but generally on behalf of the district with which he had been long connected. He believed that the suggestion of the right hon. Baronet was one which the Committee could accept, because it would lead to a change being made which was generally desired. He presumed that the consequential Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for Stoke-upon-Trent would also be agreed to by the right hon. Baronet, who he did not think need fear any large increase of correspondence on the question.

MR. CRAIG said, after the remarks of his hon. Colleague who had just spoken (Mr. Davenport), there remained very little for him to say on the Amendment of the hon. Member for Stoke-upon-Trent (Mr. Woodall). He might, however, mention in regard to the disparity of population, that the districts of Chesterton and Silverdale, added to the borough of Newcastle-under-Lyme, were rapidly increasing in population. He knew that there were several large mining industries being started in the district, and that factories were springing up there, which rendered it possible that, in the next 10 years, the population would be nearly doubled. It was owing to this that he attached little importance to the disparity at the present moment. He was satisfied that the intimation of

the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) that he was willing to adopt this Amendment, subject to the reservation made, would be received in the district with general satisfaction, where it was a matter of surprise that the arrangement set out in the Bill should ever have been made.

MR. BROADHURST said, he also had to ask the Committee to accede to the proposal of his hon. Colleague (Mr. Woodall). The case of Tunstall was, perhaps, scarcely comparable with that of any other place in the country. Tunstall was one of a series of townships fully and closely allied in one general productive manufacture, and the proposal in the Bill was to take one of those towns and attach it to the town of Newcastle-under-Lyme, with which it had no sympathy, or anything whatever in common. To that annexation both the people of Tunstall and the people of Newcastle-under-Lyme objected. With regard to the suggestion of the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke), that the Amendment should be inserted on the Report, he (Mr. Broadhurst) would be personally willing to agree to any arrangement that secured the end in view; but he ventured to put it to the right hon. Baronet whether the suggestion, in the form in which it was made, did not rather tend to invite the raising of difficulties, and whether some cantankerous persons, supposing it were possible to find such persons in the Potteries, which he did not readily admit, might not construe the right hon. Baronet's suggestion as an invitation to commence operations at once? He thought it right to deal frankly with the Committee, and to say that at the commencement of the agitation with regard to this Bill there was not that perfect unanimity on this subject in the town of Tunstall which now existed. He trusted that the Committee would allow the alteration proposed by his hon. Colleague to be placed at once in the Bill.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, it seemed to him that although one difficulty had been pointed to in the course of the discussion, all who had had an opportunity of expressing their opinion were in favour of the proposal of the hon. Member for Stoke-upon-Trent (Mr. Woodall). He (Sir Stafford Northcote) thought that the course suggested by the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Charles W. Dilke), was perhaps the best to take. At the same time, it was quite possible that there might be others who might desire to see the decision of the Commissioners respected, and who might desire to be heard upon the arrangement before it was finally concluded. He would press upon the hon. Member for Stoke-upon-Trent the desirability of withdrawing his Amendment for the present, in order to enable the subject to be considered on Report. So far as he had been able to examine into the question, it appeared to him that the Amendment would be a good one, and that it was desirable that the change should be made.

MR. WOODALL said, he was in the hands of the Committee in the matter. He was bound to say, however, that it was not the Commissioners who had put Tunstall in. It was one of the proposals of the Bill as it stood on the Paper for second reading. He would also venture to remind the Committee that the Bill, as it stood for second reading, did give an extra Member; but that was merely an error of the draftsman. It had led to a great deal of complication, and had prevented them from arriving at a conclusion that, he believed, would otherwise have been arrived at with unanimity. He asked leave to withdraw the Amendment on the understanding that the subject of it would come up again on Report.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

MR. RAIKES: There is a consequential Amendment here. You must leave these places out.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: That is so.

Amendment proposed,

In page 16, lines 48 to 54, leave out,—

"Holborn	Middlesex	One	Holborn District.
			St. Giles' District.
			Gray's Inn.
			Charterhouse.
			Furnival's Inn.
			Staple Inn.
			Lincoln's Inn."

—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule," put, and *negatived*; words *struck out* accordingly.

Mr. Craig

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had an Amendment on the Paper to insert in page 16, line 58, column 2, after "Kent," the words "and Surrey." This was a verbal Amendment which had originally been necessary. It was not needed now, however, in consequence of what had been done in regard to Penge.

MR. RAIKES said, he begged to move the next Amendment, acting on the principle observed in other cases—that was to say, in order to give an opportunity for the reconsideration of the question affecting the Tower Hamlets.

Amendment proposed,

In page 16, line 59, leave out,—

Limehouse	Middlesex	One	Limehouse District."

—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had had an opportunity of consulting the Commissioners on this question, and they were of opinion that it should be left over to the Report, in order to give time for the consideration of the case of the Tower Hamlets. If the right hon. Gentleman would consent to that course, he would propose that this subject should be deferred.

MR. RAIKES said, he could not see any objection to that course; but he would put it to the right hon. Baronet whether it would not facilitate the labours of the Commissioners if the minor boroughs were struck out, leaving the larger area, which, by the direction of the Committee, they were to reconstitute?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he should not have proposed the course he had mentioned if he had thought any hon. Member objected. So far as he himself was concerned, he had no feeling in the matter one way or the other. The right hon. Gentleman did not propose to leave out "Poplar"?

MR. RAIKES: No.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: As the Amendment will not commit the House one way or the other, I accede to the Amendment.

MR. BRYCE said, he must enter a protest against the course being taken by the Committee, as it appeared to be prejudging the case of the Tower Hamlets. He certainly had not thought last night that the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had done more than promise to inquire. For his own part, he was ready to give the most strenuous opposition to the proposed scheme.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the question of the number of Members would not be prejudged. The Committee had adopted a course similar to that proposed in the case of Finsbury. He thought they had better leave the matter over to Report.

MR. RAIKES: I will not press the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. BRYCE said, he begged to move the next Amendment on the Paper, in line 59, after "Limehouse District," to insert "except the parish of Wapping." This change would affect the boundaries of the proposed boroughs of Limehouse and St. George's-in-the-East. The effect of the Amendment, with another consequential Amendment which he should move lower down, would be to take Wapping from the borough of Limehouse, and add it to the proposed borough of St. George's-in-the-East. The present Limehouse District, which it was proposed to make a borough, had a population of 58,000; and he desired to take from this the parish of Wapping, with a population of 2,225, and add it to St. George's-in-the-East, which had a population of 47,000, thus doing something to equalize the two boroughs. Wapping was a long narrow district, extending along the Northern bank of the Thames from the parish of Limehouse, to whose District Board of Works it belonged, although inconveniently outlying, and adjoining St. George's-in-the-East to the North. Geographically, it had a much closer connection with St. George's-in-the-East than it had with Limehouse; and, moreover, the change he proposed would give them an opportunity of altering the name of St. George's-in-the-East, which was unsuitable, inasmuch as it led to confusion with St. George's, Hanover Square, and which had somewhat unpleasing associations, recalling, as it did, to one's mind the disturbances which had occurred in connection with the services of the parish church a few years ago. The new borough could therefore

be called the borough of Wapping. That was a name of considerable interest. The Committee would remember that Macaulay, in his History, told the story of how Judge Jeffreys was discovered disguised as a coal-whipper in a small house in Wapping by a scrivener, whom he had once bullied in Court. Then they all remembered the pleasing ballad of "Wapping Old Stairs," which Colonel Newcome sang in the Cave of Harmony. Looking at the convenience of the alteration he proposed, and at the fact that they would get a better name for the borough, he would urge the Committee to assent to his Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

In page 16, line 59, after "Limehouse District," insert "except the parish of Wapping." —(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he thought that as the whole question of the Tower Hamlets was to be considered on Report, it would be undesirable to commence making small changes now. He would admit that the change proposed would, so far as it went, be an improvement; but the Committee had not all the facts fully before it now, and it would be well, therefore, to postpone the matter.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he wished to remind the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Bryce) that "Wapping Old Stairs" was mentioned in *Vanity Fair*, and not as having been sung by Colonel Newcome in "The Newcomes."

MR. BRYCE said, he consented to withdraw the Amendment; but, in doing so, he must take the liberty of correcting the hon. Member opposite (Mr. T. P. O'Connor). The song was sung by Colonel Newcome, as the hon. Member would find if he referred to the first chapter of the novel. And why should not a song that had been sung in *Vanity Fair* be sung again in "The Newcomes?"

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE regretted that they could not now have the song.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. RAIKES said, he would not move the next Amendment, relating to the hamlet of Mile End Old Town, as that also was connected with the Tower Hamlets. He would move, however, the Amendment in lines 9 and 10, to leave out St. George, Hanover Square, Middlesex, One, Parish of St. George, Hanover Square.

Amendment proposed,

In page 17, lines 9 and 10, leave out—

"Saint George, Hanover Square	Middlesex	One	Parish of Saint George, Hanover Square."

—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I agree to the Amendment.

Question put, and *negatived;* words *left out* accordingly.

MR. RAIKES said, he now had to propose an Amendment to substitute the historic name of Stratford for that of West Ham. He did not wish to change the framework of the Bill; but merely to bring about this alteration of name. He had no doubt the Local Government Board had considerable cognizance of the existence of West Ham, and so had its neighbours, although he very much doubted whether the district was generally identified by Her Majesty's subjects. He thought an hon. Gentleman rising in his place as the Member for West Ham would afford some doubt, as to the other 600 and odd Members in the House, where he came from. There was another West Ham in Sussex, and another in Hertfordshire, and they were both inconsiderable places. The place that gave its name to the Local Board of West Ham was also an inconsiderable place, It had a church, and there were a few houses in the neighbourhood; but the population of the district was, for the most part, congregated round the Town Hall of Stratford. Stratford had, for many years, been a growing town. It contained 30,000 or 40,000 inhabitants, at least, and for a long time it had contained the depôt of the Great Eastern Railway. There were several small places, such as Plaistow, in the proposed new district; but West Ham was really little more than a geographical expression. No doubt, the name might be useful if it could become known; but his contention was that it was not

own, and never would be, as the place is nothing but a sham. Stratford-le-Bowe was a place of historical interest, and a place of antiquity; and he could not help thinking that an hon. Gentleman returned to the House would rather be styled Member for Stratford than Member for West Ham. The question was one for the Committee to decide; his desire being merely to put before it what he believed to be a more convenient and euphonious nomenclature, and one that he thought they would be glad to welcome in the House.

Amendment proposed,

In Schedule 4, page 17, after line 16, insert—

Stratford	Essex	Two	The Local Government District of West Ham."

(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the argument in favour of retaining the name of West Ham was stronger than it would otherwise be, because they were creating, as a new borough, the Local Government district of West Ham—they were taking that exact district as it now stood. Surely it would be a very serious thing on the part of the Committee to take a complete Local Government district, which had been created with a certain name, and change that name for Parliamentary purposes. He was bound to say that the name of the district of West Ham was now generally accepted and recognized in the Metropolis. The name of Stratford was, no doubt, very ancient; but he was not at all sure whether the Stratford of the olden time was the place included within the district of West Ham. He found there were several Stratfords in that part of Essex. There was in the Metropolis Stratford-le-Bow and Stratford-atte-Bowe. The districts were somewhat obscure; but he had certainly discovered four of them—one being in Poplar, and another in Essex, outside the Metropolis. It would only be advising to accept the Amendment; and he therefore, thought it would be better to adhere to the nomenclature of the Bill.

MR. SAMPSON LLOYD said, the Committee must remember that they were going to make a district of Stratford-on-Avon, and that to have another hon. Member for Stratford in the House would lead to unnecessary confusion. It was desirable that there should be only one Parliamentary borough of Stratford.

MR. RAIKES: I am quite willing to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. RAIKES said, he should not move his Amendment to line 19 in regard to the Tower Hamlets, in view of the understanding which had been arrived at as to the consideration of that subject on Report; but it would be necessary for him to move his Amendment in lines 20 and 21.

Amendment proposed,

In page 17, lines 20 and 21, leave out—

"Westminster	Middlesex	One	Westminster District. Close of Collegiate Church of St. Peter."

—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule," put, and *negatived;* words *left out* accordingly.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, that, in the case of West Ham, he would make an earnest appeal to the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) to treat it as he had treated the Tower Hamlets and Southwark, and leave it over for further consideration on Report. This was one of the districts where, if properly divided, there might be some chance of the Irish in England securing the return of a Representative. He was glad to find that the right hon. Baronet had shown a somewhat conciliatory spirit in this matter. No doubt, it would be admitted, on all hands, that so considerable a section of the community as that to which he referred should be represented in the House; and he could not believe the right hon. Baronet would experience much difficulty through postponing the matter as he proposed. The division of the district, he was told, was, at the present moment, extremely clumsy. It seemed to be so arranged as to deprive the Irish of any chance. He understood that as West Ham was one of the divisions which had been fixed by the Boundary Commissioners, it would come under the compact to which the Leaders

on both sides of the House were pledged. He would, therefore, appeal to the right hon. Baronet the Leader of the Opposition (Sir Stafford Northcote), in case the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill consented to the plan he proposed, to allow the question to stand over. The right hon. Baronet was not in the House during the earlier portion of the evening, when they were discussing this question; but he (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) could inform him that it had been pretty generally conceded that, under the Bill as it at present stood, there would not be a fair opportunity for the large Irish minority in this country to get a Representative sent to Parliament to speak in their interest.

MR. RAIKES: If the hon. Member proposes to move an Amendment, he will see that the most convenient place to do it will be on page 38, when we come to the sub-division of the borough.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Yes; I was just about to point that out.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: I forgot that. I will not proceed with my Amendment.

MR. RAIKES: I do not propose to move my Amendment as to Woolwich.

GENERAL ALEXANDER said, that when he complained the other day that South Ayrshire, with a population of nearly 90,000, the population of the whole county being no less than 220,000, was only to be represented by one Member, the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Trevelyan) had endeavoured to console him by saying that the average population per Member in the Scotch counties did not exceed 52,000. Now, it was absurd, almost an absolute farce, to endeavour to console a Member the population of whose constituency exceeded the average by no less than 36,000 in this way. The Committee had no right to make these deductions or calculations based on large averages. They must take every case, and make every case a special one as it arose. The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster must know very well that the constituency that he (General Alexander) represented had not only the largest population in Scotland, but that it had the largest population in the United Kingdom. The population of South Ayrshire was larger than the population of any county constituency in Ireland, and larger than any county constituency in England. The largest in England was a division of North-East Lancashire; but that had some 20,000 inhabitants less than the population of South Ayrshire. He remembered that, on Friday last, the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke), when objecting to merge two boroughs in the county of Mid Lothian, said that it would raise the population of Mid Lothian to 94,000, and that that would be much too large and unwieldy a population for one Member to represent. But if 94,000 was too large for so great a man as the Prime Minister to represent, surely 90,000 would be too many for a humble individual like himself, or many others, to represent. Last night the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board was asked to give another Member to Westminster, and he consented to do so on the ground that the population of St. George's, Hanover Square, amounted to no less than 89,000. If the right hon. Gentleman was able to give an additional Member to Westminster because one of the parishes had a population of 89,000—much more compact, of course, than the population in a county—he had himself acknowledged that he ought to give another Member for the county of Ayr. The right hon. Gentleman ought to do one of two things—either give Ayr an additional Member, which they would much prefer, or, if he could not do that, make some endeavour to separate the urban from the rural population. Like the hon. Gentleman the Member for North Lanarkshire (Sir Edward Colebrooke), he (General Alexander) had no objection whatever to a mixed population, provided that the urban population were not allowed to swamp entirely the rural population. He would like to know why it was that the fair demand of the county of Ayr for additional representation was refused? He had a very strong suspicion of the reason of the refusal; he had a strong suspicion of the reason why a difference was made in favour of Fife, which had only a population of 171,000, as against the county of Ayr with a population of 220,000. As he always said what he thought, he had no hesitation in saying that the real reason why the county of Ayr had been so unfairly treated was that, unlike the other Scotch counties, it had presumed, at two General Elections,

send two Conservative Members to rliament, whereas the county of Fife l steadily adhered to the side of the vernment. He did not wish to take the time of the Committee; but there s one remark he wished to make with erence to something which fell from right hon. and learned Lord Advoe (Mr. J. B. Balfour) the other day. e right hon. and learned Gentleman l he had taken the opinion of the jority of the Scotch Members upon s subject. He (General Alexander) sidered that there was very little use appealing in such matters to a majo- of 51 as against a minority of 9; the jority held 51 seats, and they wished leprive the minority of the 9 which nained. He understood it was one of duties of a Government to protect minority, and not to appeal to the jority. He did expect, from what the ht hon. Baronet the President of the al Government Board said when this stion was first raised, that the right n. Gentleman would endeavour to w some justice to the great county division of which he (General Alexler) had the honour to represent. He s sorry to say, however, that although words of the President of the Local vernment Board were softer than tter, he had war in his heart. He eneral Alexander) would not put the mmittee to the trouble of dividing on s question, and for the simple reason at he did not so much care for adding burghs mentioned in the Amendnt to the existing group of burghs, as have for the whole country the addimal representation of another Memr. If the Government would consider s point favourably, the addition to Ayr Burghs was a matter of sedary consideration. He begged to ve formally the Amendment which od in his name.

Amendment proposed,

In page 17, after line 30, add as new lines—

yr (District of Burghs)	Ayr and Argyll	One	The Burghs of Ayr, Irvine, Campbeltown, Galston, and Old Cumnock."

(*General Alexander.*)

Question proposed, "That those lines there added."

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. LFOUR) said, he understood from what the hon. and gallant Member opposite (General Alexander) had said that he was rather moving this Amendment as a means of introducing the question of increasing the county representation of Ayr than of taking those five towns out of the county and adding them to existing groups of burghs. He (the Lord Advocate) therefore need say nothing on the question, which was fully discussed the other day, except that at that time he did not think that, on either side of the House, they were in a position to say they had an expression of opinion from the places affected by the proposal. But since the discussion the other day he had had a variety of communications from Galston, strongly protesting against the proposal to take it out of the county, and the Committee would feel that that confirmed the resolution which had been come to. In regard to the representation of Ayrshire, he was quite sure they were all alive to the great importance of that county; but he was afraid he could not admit that it was under-represented as compared with other counties which were in possession of a particular representation at present. The county of Ayr had two county Members, and it gave the names to two groups of burghs—the Ayr and Kilmarnock Burghs. Although, no doubt, these burghs overflowed into other counties, they were the head burghs of the county of Ayr, and a considerable representation was given to that county. One of the great objections which was so strongly urged on the part of Ayrshire to the suggested re-arrangement of the Kilmarnock Burghs was that Kilmarnock really did represent a fourth Member for Ayr, so that he thought it could not be said that Ayrshire was at all under-represented in comparison with Fife on the one hand and Mid Lothian on the other. Ayrshire had already two county Members, and it had two burgh Members; and, even on the showing of the hon. and gallant Member, Ayrshire would not come next for an additional Member, because Fife was over the 100,000, and he thought 90,000 was the number that his hon. and gallant Friend said he represented; and even in the case of Mid Lothian, if there had been the addition of Portobello and Musselburgh, there would have been 94,000, which would have come before the division of Ayrshire which the hon. and gallant Member repre-

sented. [General ALEXANDER: There are more than 200,000 in the whole county.] The proposal with regard to Mid Lothian involved that there should be two considerable towns thrown into it. If another Member could not be found for Mid Lothian, he was afraid it would be quite as difficult to find another Member for Ayrshire, even if there were a reason for it.

MR. DALRYMPLE said, his hon. and gallant Friend (General Alexander) had laid special stress upon the desirableness of obtaining increased representation for the county of Ayr; but his speech, in moving his Amendment, went to show the great disproportion between the county and burgh representation. The remarks which had fallen from the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate (Mr. J. B. Balfour) did not at all deal with that disproportion. It was true that in the county of Ayr there were practically four Members—two county and two burgh Members—but there remained still the extreme disproportion between the county and the burgh population, and that was the point to which all the Amendments which had been put down from the Conservative side of the House with regard to the burgh representation in Scotland had reference. The division of the county of Ayr which his hon. and gallant Friend represented had a population of nearly 90,000; whereas the Ayr group of burghs had only between 30,000 and 40,000, and it was in order to rectify that gross inequality that the Amendment which stood in the name of his hon. and gallant Friend was placed on the Paper. It did not, in his (Mr. Dalrymple's) estimation, signify whether Galston or any other place were selected in order to adjust the inequality; but what they contended for was that there should be some adjustment of the great inequality between the county and the burgh population. Her Majesty's Government had declined to make the adjustment desired. The case of Ayrshire was a small illustration of the disproportion between the county and burgh population in Scotland. He could mention two other cases illustrative of the disproportion of which he and his hon. Friends complained. East Aberdeenshire had a population of 83,000, while the Elgin Burghs, a very interesting group of burghs, no doubt, had a population of only 31,000 odd. The case of the county of Stirlingshire was a specially remarkable one, for the population of the county was 78,000, while the burgh population was only 36,000. It was extremely important, whether this Amendment were divided upon or not, that the Committee should be in possession of the cases of extraordinary disproportion between the burgh and the county constituencies in Scotland; and no comparison which might be placed before them by the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke), or anyone else, could in the slightest degree avail to remove the anomalies. He was aware that they had taken a great liberty—that it was positively audacious that hon. Members on the Conservative side of the House should in any way attempt to correct these anomalies—but whatever might be the result of their exertions, he was extremely glad to have the opportunity, by means of this Amendment, of pointing out how very gross these anomalies were. It was no answer to them to say, as his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Trevelyan) said the other day, that the object was to get the free expression of the opinion of the country. It could only be in irony that those words could be used, because it was exactly the opinion of the country parts of the county which would not be obtained if the country parts of counties were so overshadowed numerically by the numbers in the towns. He cared nothing whatever for the epithets which were applied to their efforts in this direction. They knew perfectly well what it was they desired. They had been at great pains to explain to the Committee that their object was to correct what were glaring and outrageous anomalies, and they now knew the Party opposite intended to maintain and perpetuate these anomalies. The credit or discredit of preserving these anomalies indicated by their measure, and their doing nothing whatever to remedy them, rested on the Government and on hon. Gentlemen opposite. He desired to remark once more upon the treatment which Scotland had received in reference to this redistribution scheme as compared with other parts of the country. He did not know how much attention might have been extended to other parts of the country, but the amount of attention which had

The Lord Advocate

en given to Scotland in reference to distribution seemed to have been of a ry limited kind. The other night ere was a solemn discussion as to whe-er Exeter should receive a second ember, though it was not able to uster a population above 48,000, yet a previous evening—he was not quite re whether it was not at an earlier our the same evening—it was found rfectly impossible to give a Member Leith, which had at present 58,000 habitants, and which was known to ave a rapidly increasing population. hat was the sort of inequality he de-red to remark upon. In his opinion, ose who were to blame for this state things were the Representatives of cotland who sat on the Ministerial side the House. If the Scotch Members ho sat opposite asserted themselves, s they were very well able to do, or at ast as they might do in respect of their umbers, Scotland would receive better ttention than it did. The Welsh and rish parts of the Kingdom received onsiderably more attention than Scot-nd, and the reason was not far to seek. he Representatives of those parts of ne Kingdom asserted themselves in the House, and were not merely the old odyguard of the Government. The cotch Members on the other side were o busy supporting the Government that ney forgot or neglected the interests of cotland, and that was why Scotland ad received so very scant attention in egard to redistribution, and why, owing o the breakdown of the praiseworthy ttempt on the part of the right hon. nd learned Lord Advocate to deal with he question, all the anomalies which at resent existed in the burgh representa-ion of Scotland were to be perpetuated or a long time to come. He cared little whether his hon. and gallant Friend vent to a division or not; the case was very strong one, and he was glad it ad had, at all events, the recognition of he right hon. Gentleman the President f the Local Government Board, although hey had received no encouragement to ress it on the Committee.

MR. TREVELYAN said, he felt bliged to say a few words in reply to is hon. Friend (Mr. Dalrymple). He id not think it ought to go out in the Scotch newspapers, which reported the lebates of the House very minutely, hat Scotland had been very ill-used in this matter on account of the apathy of Scotch Members. In what did good-usage consist, and ill-usage in distributing the proportion of Members for the different parts of the United Kingdom? It consisted clearly in the average population to which a Member was allotted. In England, which might be taken, he supposed, as the country most powerfully represented in the House, and which might, therefore, be supposed to come off best, there was one Member to every 53,500 of the population. In Scotland, which, according to the hon. Member, had been shamefully ill-used on account of the short-comings of the Scotch Members, there was one to 53,300 of the population. Statistics told something, and they spoke with a voice which could not be mistaken against the proposition of the hon. and gallant Gentleman (General Alexander). Scotland was actually better used than England in the matter of distribution if they took not what the country had, but what it gained. Scotland had actually gained by this Bill 12 Members—that was to say, some 20 per cent of her representation, which was a gain far exceeding that of any other part of the United Kingdom. The hon. and gallant Gentleman argued that these burghs ought to be taken from the county of Ayr, and added to the Ayr district of burghs, because there was such a contrast between the numbers of the population in the county, and the numbers of the population in the burghs. But his hon. and gallant Friend forgot that these were questions of averages, and that, taking Scotland all over, the counties were exactly as well represented—they were represented within 100—as the burghs. The hon. and gallant Gentleman argued that because the population of the county of Ayr was larger than the burgh population, therefore they must take the burghs out of the county, and add them to the group of burghs. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Dalrymple), however, a little lower down on the Paper, had an Amendment in regard to another Scotch county in which the county population was actually smaller than the burgh population, and yet the hon. Gentleman proposed to take the burghs out of that small county and add them to the burgh population. The hon. Gentleman, in order to be consistent, ought to take the county of Lanark, and cut off consider-

ably from the county representation and add it to the representation of Glasgow, which was very much under-represented as compared with the county. In this matter, they must look to the general average of the county and burgh population, and, accepting facts as they found them in the different counties and burghs, ought to think themselves very fortunate if they could secure so exact a balance, as the Bill secured, between the justice due to the counties and to the burghs.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he must point out what he thought was a fallacy in the argument of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Trevelyan) when he talked about averages. It was not only a question of what the general average of county Members or burgh Members might be throughout Scotland, but it was a question in each individual district how far the one and the other class of population was properly represented. He sympathized very much with his hon. and gallant Friend (General Alexander) in the effort he had made to bring about some modification in the representation of Ayr and the Ayr Burghs, by putting a larger proportion of the county into the burghs, and so bringing about a greater balance between them. The object, of course, which had always been brought forward as one they were to seek was, that there should be a proper arrangement of county districts, so as to take out of the counties the purely urban element. That was what his hon. and gallant Friend endeavoured to do by the Amendment he had on the Paper some time ago, and by the present Amendment. He (Sir Stafford Northcote) thought, after all that had passed on the subject of the Scotch burghs, and considering the difficulties in which they found themselves plunged by the abandonment of the scheme proposed by the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate, it was hardly to be avoided that they should find themselves very much where they were, and that the attempt to make a proper arrangement of the burghs should be found impracticable. He was glad to hear that his hon. and gallant Friend (General Alexander) thought it better, on the whole, not to go to a division on his Amendment; but he (Sir Stafford Northcote) thought it was right to put on record that the hon. and gallant Member, and the hon. Member for Bute (Mr. Dalrymple), had made their protest against the system upon which the proposals of the Government had been framed, and that they should express their sympathy with his hon. Friends in regard to the continuance, in some cases, of an arrangement which did not meet the fair claim of the county interests.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, that no doubt the Bill removed a great many anomalies and inequalities; but it also left a great many behind it. It was not a complete Bill; in his opinion it would have been better, much better, if the Government had not made two bites at a cherry. He was in favour of equal constituencies, and if the Government had brought in a Bill to secure such an end, as nearly as possible, they would have received his support, and he had little doubt the support of most of the Scotch Members on the Liberal side of the House. With regard to the proportions as between Scotland and other parts of the Kingdom, he thought Scotland had got bare justice, and no more. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Trevelyan) seemed to forget that London ought not to be regarded as a part of England. London was the capital of the United Kingdom, and was somewhat under-represented. If the right hon. Gentleman took England, apart from London, he would find that in comparison with England, Scotland was not so favourably treated as he seemed to imagine. He (Sir George Campbell) desired to say a word upon another subject. It would be observed that the hon. and gallant Gentleman (General Alexander) had included in his Amendment a proposal to add certain towns; but that he said nothing as to his omission from the Ayr group of the small burghs of Oban and Inverary, in Argyllshire. He (Sir George Campbell) had put down an Amendment to reconstitute the group, by omitting those places; and he did so because he believed that that was the only part of the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate's (Mr. J. B. Balfour's) scheme, with regard to which there was any general agreement; he understood there was no objection to the proposal of the Lord Advocate to include these two small burghs in the county of Argyllshire. The complaints as to the scandal with regard to the

ouping of Scotch burghs, were chiefly
ie to the Ayrshire group. Oban
d Inverary were situated in the
tremest parts of Argyllshire, and
ey could not be reached from Ayrshire
cept by performing a journey some-
ing like that which was known as
e overland route to India. It would
a very great advantage if these two
rghs could be merged in Argyllshire.
ie county was willing to have them,
id therefore he appealed to the right
n. Gentleman the Member for North
evon (Sir Stafford Northcote) to con-
nt to that part of the Amendment of
s hon. and gallant Friend (General
lexander). He might remind the right
on. Gentleman (Sir Stafford Northcote)
at if by any chance it should be dis-
vered that any parties in Argyllshire
d object to the alteration, there would
e an opportunity in "another place"
making a rectification. The re-
rangement would get rid of the greatest
andal which existed in the system
grouping burghs in Scotland, and,
erefore, he hoped the Leader of the
pposition would see his way to assent
it.

MR. J. A. CAMPBELL said, he had
n Amendment a little further down on
ie Paper of a similar nature to the one
ow before the Committee, but in re-
ard to another group of burghs; but
his hon. and gallant Friend the
Iember for South Ayrshire (General
lexander) did not go to a division, he
ould not trouble the Committee by
loving his Amendment. He wished to
ay, however, that the action taken by
ie Government had made it impossible
r them to have the groups of Scotch
rghs properly adjusted. He had in-
nded to move, but for the decision of
ie Government, that Fraserburgh should
e added to the Elgin group. The
osition of Fraserburgh formed a good
lustration of the inconvenience of the
esolution of the Government. The
lgin group was formed mainly of fish-
ng towns, and in the midst of these was
raserburgh. Under the Bill, that town,
ith a population of 6,000, was to be
erged in the county, though it had no
terest in common with the agricultural
ommunity, but had identical interests
ith the neighbouring fishing towns.
Ie would remark that the mode of
rouping he advocated was in reality
he only way in which, in many parts
of Scotland, the urban and the rural elements in the constituencies could be properly separated. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster had referred to Lanarkshire; but it should be remembered that that was one of the few counties of Scotland in which it was possible, by erecting sub-divisions, to obtain something like a separation of the two interests, because in Lanarkshire there were sub-divisions that were mainly urban, but this was not the case in other counties. It was not the case in the district to which he (Mr. J. A. Campbell) had referred. With regard to the inclination of the population to be classed according to their different interests, he would remark that since this subject had been brought before the House there had been expressed on the part of a population spread over three contiguous centres along the Banffshire coast, and numbering together upwards of 6,000, a desire to be added to the Elgin group of burghs, in order that a group might be formed consisting of the whole of the fishing towns in the North-East of Scotland. Such an arrangement would, in his opinion, be a very reasonable one, as it would give representation to a particular branch of industry, and only pay proper regard to the community of interests in such a constituency. But, in the face of the positive declaration by Her Majesty's Government that on no account would they add any new towns to the old burgh groups, he felt that it would be quite futile for himself or his Friends to press Amendments of this kind, and he would, therefore, conclude by saying that if the hon. and gallant Member for South Ayrshire withdrew the Amendment he had proposed, he (Mr. J. A. Campbell) would not put the Committee to the trouble of pronouncing any opinion on the Amendment he had placed upon the Paper.

MR. WILLIAMSON said, the hon. Member for Buteshire (Mr. Dalrymple) had taken it upon himself to lecture hon. Gentlemen sitting on that (the Ministerial) side of the House for inconsisteney in not having attempted to remove anomalies in the representation of Scotland by taking advantage of the opportunities afforded by this Bill. But the hon. Member did not seem to be aware of the fact that he was himself

amenable to the charge of inconsistency, because he was one of those who had voted against the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arthur Arnold) when he had proposed to draw the limit of population capable of becoming a constituency at 20,000, in contradistinction to the Government proposal sanctioned by the Leaders of the Opposition that the limit should be drawn at 15,000. The hon. Member for Buteshire had gone into the Lobby against the proposal of the hon. Member for Salford, and he (Mr. Williamson) was astonished that having done so, the hon. Gentleman should blame hon. Members on this side of the House for simply endeavouring to carry out the arrangement that had been come to between the two Parties.

MR. E. STANHOPE said, it seemed to him, as the Representative of an English constituency, a somewhat surprising thing that, whereas most of the English Members were going at the next General Election to contest divisions of counties which would, for the main part, consist of from 50,000 to 60,000 electors, his hon. Friends who represented the Scotch counties were able to bring forward a case in which there would be a county constituency in Scotland with a population of 217,000, to whom it was only proposed under the Bill to assign two Representatives. The reply to this extraordinary fact was that there was to be an addition of two Members for the burghs in that county, and that, therefore, on the whole, it would have a fair amount of representation; but he contended that this was in reality no answer to the case. In England there was an endeavonr to adjust the proportions between the urban and the rural elements; but they did not propose to carry out the same principle in Scotland, and the grossest part of the anomaly was to be seen in this—that whereas in Scotland they were perfectly ready to break up groups of burghs for the purpose of throwing them into the county constituencies, they made it a vital principle not to form any of the other burghs into new urban constituencies. Why, he asked, was that the case? He had tried to ascertain the reasons by which such a proposition was supported, but he had heard no reason for it whatever. They had groups of burghs in Scotland that were exceedingly reasonable for many purposes, groups that were found to be exceedingly convenient, because they absorbed a sufficient portion of the urban population of the counties to enable those groups to return Radical Members, and yet left a sufficient number of urban electors to enable them to swamp the rural portions of the counties. Why could they not alter this? Was there any earthly reason why they should not? It was not as though they would thereby be doing something that would destroy the general character of the Bill. What they were asked to do was to make a fair and proper distribution between the urban and rural populations in Scotland, as was proposed to be done in regard to England. [SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Between the urban and rural populations in Ayrshire.] It was all very well to say "between the urban and rural populations in Ayrshire," and he was ready to meet the right hon. Gentleman on that point. If they took the case of Ayrshire, he thought there was a case of very gross inequality presented to the Committee, and he hoped his hon. and gallant Friend (General Alexander) would not rest satisfied with this discussion, but would consider the matter between the present time and the Report, and that, in the meantime, something would be suggested that would enable a fairer adjustment to be made as between the urban and rural populations, so that when the Report came to be considered some scheme might be adopted that would have the effect of securing this result.

MR. TREVELYAN said, the hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. E. Stanhope) had mentioned the English counties in order to draw a contrast between them and the Scotch counties. He had stated that such anomalies as that which he had drawn attention to did not exist in the different counties in England. In answer to what had been said on this point, he (Mr. Trevelyan) would take the case of the first county on the English list taken alphabetically—the county of Bedford. In that county there were two seats, one with a population of 66,000, and the other with a population of 63,000; there was a borough seat with a population of 19,000. Therefore, he put it to the Committee, that the very first of the English counties did not show ill by the side of Ayrshire,

MR. BUCHANAN said, he had understood that, after the discussion which had taken place a few days ago, hon. Members on the other side of the House were going to pursue the same course as hon. Members on that side, and that when the Amendments to the previous Schedule were rejected, all the consequential Amendments to this Schedule were to be abandoned also. That was the conclusion at which he and his hon. Friends had arrived, and they had believed that the same course would be followed by hon. Members opposite. He should like, however, to say a few words upon what they had just heard from the hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. E. Stanhope). The hon. Gentleman had supported the proposal as an attempt to separate the urban from the rural population in the Scotch counties. But, as a matter of fact, there was a much more marked separation already existing in Scotland than in England. In Lincolnshire, as the hon. Gentleman was aware, there were several burghs like Spalding and Louth, each with a population of 8,000 or 9,000 inhabitants, forming part of the county constituency. In Scotland, on the contrary, the number of burghs of a similar size, which were not included in some Parliamentary group, could be numbered on the fingers of one hand. There was already a much greater separation of the elements in Scotland than in England. Another characteristic of Scottish representation which the hon. Gentleman did not seem to be aware of was this. There was a much greater diversity in size between the Scottish county constituencies than between those in England or Ireland. The large Scottish counties would be much larger and more populous than any counties left as separate constituencies in England or Ireland. But there were also much smaller counties left in Scotland than in England. If the hon. Gentleman would take the case of the county of Bute, which was represented by his hon. Friend (Mr. Dalrymple) sitting behind him, he would find that Buteshire had a population much smaller than that of any county constituency in England. The county of Bute had a population of only 17,000, and the united counties of Peebles and Selkirk had no more. But what he (Mr. Buchanan) had chiefly risen to do was to complain of the charge made by the hon. Member for Buteshire that hon. Members on that (the Ministerial) side of the House were to blame for what had taken place, and were doing what they could for the purpose of perpetuating anomalies in the representation of Scotland. For his own part, he had heard nothing on his side of the House which would justify that accusation; and he might even go further, and say that a more unfounded charge had never been brought against them. What were the facts of the case? They knew that the Amendment on the Paper was one of a number which hon. Members opposite representing Scotch constituencies had been prepared to support; and on Wednesday last a statement was made by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition (Sir Stafford Northcote) to the effect that proposals of this character were entirely apart from the compact that had been arrived at between the two Front Benches. Subsequently, however, they had a statement from the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Trevelyan), who plainly informed the Committee that the addition of new burghs to the existing burgh groups was a matter which the Government considered to be a vital innovation, and which they would resist by every possible means in their power. Immediately after this it was found that a very curious change of front took place on the part of the Conservative Members for Scotland, for he believed that, with the single exception of the hon. Member for Dumbartonshire (Mr. Orr-Ewing), all the Conservative Members for Scotland voted in the division that took place on Wednesday against the last Amendment of the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate. Well, what took place after that? As it had appeared in the newspapers, and was a matter of notoriety, he supposed he might refer to it. There was an interview between the hon. Member for Buteshire (Mr. Dalrymple) and the Marquess of Salisbury. Of course, what took place at that interview had not transpired; but they knew very well what was the issue of it, because the very next morning——

THE CHAIRMAN said, the hon. Member was out of Order in going into matters irrelevant to the Question before the Committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN said, he would apologize if he had been out of Order; but he had only been calling attention to a charge which the hon. Member for Buteshire (Mr. Dalrymple) had brought against the Liberal Party, that they were endeavouring to perpetuate the anomalies in Scottish burgh representation. He (Mr. Buchanan) was only endeavouring, to the best of his ability, to rebut that charge; and he would conclude very shortly what he had intended to say. What it was that had happened on Thursday he would, after what the Chairman had said, pass by. They knew, from certain statements in the newspapers, what really did take place; and the result in the House was this—that on Friday the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate got up and stated that all these Amendments were going to be abandoned, because they had received information that the Leaders of the Opposition could not——

The CHAIRMAN said, the hon. Member was again transgressing the Rules of Order by going into a subject which had already been ruled out of Order upon the Question before the Committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN said, he was very sorry; but he submitted that he was only endeavouring to repudiate the charge which the hon. Member for Buteshire had most unfairly brought against hon. Members on that side of the House. The hon. Member for Buteshire had not been ruled out of Order in bringing the charge. It surely could not be out of Order in him to repudiate it. Nevertheless, he did not propose to go into the matter any further. He would merely conclude by saying this—that among the many surprises to which hon. Members on the Liberal Benches had been subjected, the last, and the one least to be expected, was the moving of the present Amendment by the hon. and gallant Member for South Ayrshire (General Alexander). They had all of them regretted the course taken by Her Majesty's Government on the occasion referred to; but they were beaten then, and they had accepted their defeat with as good a grace as possible, it being understood that that decision should govern all the consequential Amendments. But when they came down to the House on the present occasion, and found hon. Members on the other side moving Amendments on the same point, he thought they had at least good ground for the complaint that hon. Members opposite had not faithfully observed the understanding which was supposed to have been come to on both sides of the House.

Mr. ORR-EWING said, the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Trevelyan) had stated that he thought Aryshire was sufficiently represented, and had spoken of the four Members for that county, thereby including the representation both of the county and the burghs. But he (Mr. Orr-Ewing) desired to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that, in reality, Ayrshire had only three Members—namely, one for the burghs, and two for the county, the constituency for the burgh Member being made up from burghs outside the county. He asked the Committee to contrast this with the state of things in Fifeshire, the result of any comparison that might be instituted being that if they were to divide Ayrshire with a population of 218,000 by three, they would have one Member to something like 73,000 inhabitants; whereas if they were to divide Fifeshire by four and a-half, they would have about 38,000 inhabitants to each Member, and yet Fifeshire was to have a new Member under this Bill instead of Ayrshire, which was the county that ought to have had the additional Representative. When they asked themselves whether this was just and fair, and when they saw how unjust it really was, they naturally asked themselves what was the reason for it, and the only answer they could give was that Fifeshire had shown itself to be consistently Radical, while, on the other hand, Ayrshire had been as consistently Conservative. Again, in the case of Stirlingshire, he put it to the Committee, was it just that out of a population of 112,000 the burghs should have a Representative for 29,000, while the county should be restricted to the same representation for 83,000? In Dumbartonshire there was a similar disparity, there being a population of only 13,500 in the county town, while that of the county, with the population of to-day, would have 73,000, He contended that the Government ought not to permit such anomalies as these when bringing forward a great measure for the redistribution of seats.

GENERAL ALEXANDER, in asking ave to withdraw the Amendment, said, e would call attention to the fact that e right hon. Gentleman the President the Local Government Board (Sir harles W. Dilke) had asserted the lher day that a population of 94,000— the case of Mid Lothian—was too nwieldy for representation by one ember, whereas, in his (General Alex- der's) case, the population included in e division he represented was over ,000.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

DR. LYONS, in moving, as an Amend- ent—

In page 17, to add at end, "Royal Univer- y of Ireland | Two (in column for number Members),"

id, he rejoiced to find that hon. embers had, by a large majority, firmed the principle of University re- resentation in that House. Univer- y representation, he contended, was e natural means of affording re- resentation to one of the most import- nt classes in the country; and as they ere about to extend on a very large asis, and, as he believed, in wisely de- rmined directions, the representation the country, it was only right that the easure proposing to do this should cure the adequate representation of l important interests. He had, there- re, sincerely rejoiced at the decision ne House had arrived at on the ques- on of University representation, which ad occupied its attention during the arlier portion of these discussions. The bject of his Amendment was that two embers should be given to the Royal niversity of Ireland. That Univer- ty was the legal heir and successor of ne Queen's University, and the position now occupied was set forth in a paper e held in his hand, which showed that ne number of graduates at the present me was about 2,700, which number as increasing at the rate of about 200 ach year, so that ere very long it might e able to hold a position level with that of ne great historical Universities of Eng- nd and those which existed in Scot- nd. If they compared the Royal Uni- ersity with the University of London, would be found that it had on its ooks more graduates than the latter Jniversity had when the claim of that nstitution to Parliamentary representa- tion was granted. He did not wish to institute any invidious comparison be- tween the great University of Dublin and the Royal University; but for the purpose of showing what had been the position of the former, he would refer to the claim made for additional repre- sentation in 1832. It was then urged that the number of members of the University of Dublin was 200, and that in a certain number of years it would have between 600 or 700; but that number had been far exceeded. With regard to the position of the Royal University, although its increment of members was probable only, and could not be precisely stated, he maintained that it had far superior claims to repre- sentation at the present time than the University of Dublin had at the time mentioned to additional representation. And as it had been conceded that Uni- versity representation was part and parcel of the representation of the country in that House, he contended that he had proved that the Royal University had a claim to the concession of that represen- tation which he advocated in its behalf. He repeated that he entirely avoided raising any invidious comparison be- tween the two Universities; but he felt that this advocacy of the claims of the Royal University was due from him and from everyone within those walls who owed her allegiance. He believed that if a condition of equilibrium was to be established in Ireland, it was to be done not so much by putting down the great historical University of Dublin, as by raising the status of the new University, whose claims he ventured to put before the Committee. Now it might be said, although the question was one to be settled by Her Majesty's Government, that it was incumbent upon him to show where the two Members which he pro- posed should be given to the Royal University were to be found. He be- lieved that at least amongst the Irish Representatives in that House, it would be considered that Ireland had a claim to two seats which, if he might say so, had been in a hasty moment extin- guished. In one sense, those seats had been extinguished; but, as far as he could gather, it appeared to be the intention of Her Majesty's Government, in dealing with the question of redistri- bution, to proceed as if they were still in existence, and to make use of them

[*Ninth Night.*]

for the purpose of English and Irish representation. He believed that this view of the case was one which had not as yet been touched upon; but the question was one which Her Majesty's Government were bound to answer sooner or later. If the Government were going to make use of the two seats of Cashel and Sligo, in order to complete the number of seats proposed to be established by the present Bill, he ventured to say that Ireland had undoubtedly a much stronger claim to them than any of the other portions of the Kingdom. While on this subject of the number of seats proposed under the Bill, he would take the opportunity of tendering his very grateful and cordial thanks to the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) for having acted in a spirit of equity and fairness towards Ireland in this respect. But having gone so far, and having acted in such a generous spirit towards Ireland as to maintain the number of seats at 103, he would venture to ask the right hon. Baronet to go a short step further, and restore the number of seats that were recognized in 1832 as the proper number for the representation of Ireland, after a long series of debates conducted by some of the most eminent statesmen the country had produced. He thought that the Amendment he was about to move had fair claims to the consideration of hon. Members on both sides of the House, and especially of the right hon. Gentlemen at the head of the Government and the Leader of the Opposition. It was with some confidence that he submitted this proposal to the right hon. Baronet on the grounds put forward, and he trusted that before the Bill passed from the House he might be fortunate enough to secure its adoption.

Amendment proposed,

In page 17, at end, add "Royal University of Ireland | Two (in column for number of Members)."—(*Dr. Lyons.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the hon. Gentleman had proposed his Amendment on the Schedule of the Bill which had to do with the boundaries of the new boroughs which the Bill created. No doubt, Universities had sometimes been called boroughs; and, in a certain technical sense, they were so; but this was a Schedule of the towns and places which the Government said ought to be included in boroughs, and he could not help thinking that it was most inappropriate to the question which the hon. Gentleman had raised. The hon. Gentleman had said he was willing to raise the question on Report, which would allow the subject to be discussed on its own merits. But he must point out that there was a great difference between the retention of University representation as existing at present, and the creation of new University seats. The objections to the latter were far more numerous than in the case of the former. There was a great deal of objection taken even to the existing University representation, and he fancied there would be still more objection to the creation of new University seats. The hon. Gentleman proposed to give four University seats to Ireland; but if this suggestion were acceded to, an undue disproportion would be created in favour of that country, seeing that there were but five University seats in England, two in Scotland, and none in Wales. If they were to look beyond these considerations, he would point out to the Committee that the seats of Cashel and Sligo, which the hon. Gentleman suggested might be used for the purpose of the Royal University, were seats which had long since ceased to exist. The boroughs in question had been disfranchised by Act of Parliament, and the seats had been already allocated under the Bill. The proposal of the hon. Gentleman was, therefore, either to increase the total number of seats for the Kingdom, or else to take two seats for University purposes from some part of England or Scotland. He did not think that either of those views was at all likely to prevail with the Committee, and therefore he could not hold out much encouragement to the hon. Gentleman to raise the question again on the Report.

Question put, and *negatived.*

FIFTH SCHEDULE.

CONTENTS AND BOUNDARIES OF BOROUGHS WITH ALTERED BOUNDARIES.

MR. WIGGIN, in moving, as an Amendment, in page 17, line 43, to leave out "Harborne," said, he had been strongly urged by his constituents

in the parish of Harborne to resist its proposed annexation to the county of Warwick. The parish of Harborne had hitherto been considered a part of the county of Stafford, and it was situated at the south-west border of that county, and had been truthfully and graphically described by Elihu Burritt as one of the green border lands of the Black Country. When this Bill was printed a second time, to the amazement of almost everyone acquainted with the district, it was found that Harborne was to be annexed to the borough of Birmingham. Meetings were held, and resolutions proposed by the Chairman of the Liberal Association and seconded by the Chairman of the Conservative Association were passed, unanimously condemning the proposed arrangement which, as a matter of fact, was opposed strongly by everyone in the parish, Conservative, Liberal, or Radical. Deputations had waited on the Commissioners at Birmingham and Stafford; petitions were signed by every householder in the place; but the only answer returned to them was that the Commissioners regretted what had been done, but that the tranference having been scheduled they were powerless to give any relief. He (Mr. Wiggin) had ascertained the fact that, so to speak, Birmingham did not want Harborne, and that Harborne did not want to be transferred to Birmingham, although, no doubt, it might be considered by some that it was an improvement for it to become part of the great borough of Birmingham. He confessed that it was to him most extraordinary that this disturbance of existing arrangements should have been proposed. The parish was to be divided into two under the present scheme, the Petty Sessional arrangements were to be changed, and the inhabitants were to be politically separated from their own people. The population of Harborne was partly rural, and partly engaged in Birmingham and in the iron industries of South Staffordshire, and why they were to be taken from Staffordshire and united with Birmingham they were unable to conceive. All they asked, whether Conservatives, Liberals, Radicals, Churchmen, or Dissenters, was that Harborne should remain as it was at present, and it was in order to effect that, that he moved the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, in page 17, line 43, leave out the word "Harborne."—(*Mr. Wiggin.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Harborne' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had great difficulty in rising to reply to an hon. Member of such overwhelming popularity as the hon. Member for East Staffordshire (Mr. Wiggin); but he was bound to put before the Committee certain considerations against the Amendment, which, looking at the reception they had given to his hon. Friend's speech, he was sure would be necessary to enable them to make up their minds in an impartial manner. In dealing with the suburbs of Birmingham, various courses had been considered. It had been considered how far they could be constituted separate boroughs, how far they could be dealt with as single-Member county divisions, and how far they ought to be annexed to the borough of Birmingham. Harborne was not large enough to be made a new borough; neither was it connected with any urban district in the same county, except as connected with Birmingham; and from its own county it was almost entirely detached. In fact, a right hon. Friend of his had suggested that if the Committee would look at the map of Staffordshire in the Boundary Commissioners' Report, they would see that Harborne, "like a rich jewel in an Ethiop's ear" hung like a pendant to the county by a very narrow thread. It was connected, as the hon. Gentleman had said, with the Smethwick division of Staffordshire. He would ask the Committee to glance at the map to see how the parishes were connected. They were connected by the narrowest strip, and he could not help thinking that it would be inconvenient to throw this particular parish in with Smethwith for Parliamentary purposes. If the map of the borough of Birmingham were glanced at, it would be seen that the four districts in question were all of them completely within the natural boundary of that borough, and that if they were left out, the borough would resemble more than anything else a salmon over which the others had had a good fight. He held a sketch map in his hand which fully illustrated this, and which he should be glad to hand to

any hon. Member who wished to see it. The hon. Member had proposed to make this change without carrying out corresponding changes in other districts, and that, no doubt, made his case very much more easy than it would have been if he had proposed to make corresponding changes in the various divisions of the county of Stafford. But could the Committee make this change, and be content with making this change alone? That was one of the matters which were essential in the consideration of this case. As regarded the town of Birmingham, the change, no doubt, could be effected. He agreed with his hon. Friend, that it would be possible to leave Harborne out of that borough and yet to make no other change; but, in regard to the county of Stafford, he feared that that could hardly be the case. If the proposed change were carried out, hon. Gentlemen who had already spoken to him on the subject would press for similar changes in the county of Stafford, and it would be hard to resist the corresponding changes which would be proposed. It so happened that the district out of which Harborne would come would then be the smallest in the borough, and that into which it would go would be the largest in the county of Stafford. The division of Birmingham which comprised Harborne had a population of 60,000, and that in a borough which was rather well represented in proportion to its numbers. The Handsworth division of Staffordshire had likewise a population of over 60,000, and it was a very large division, the division having been made large on account of the difficulty which had been found in getting a good boundary for it. The 60,000 was a population outside the borough, south of Walsall, Wednesbury, and West Bromwich; there was an additional 190,000 within those boroughs, the total population within the area of the county division being 250,500. All the freeholders of the 190,000 would vote in the Handsworth division, so that the electorate of the division would not only be taken from this population of 60,000, but would also include the freeholders from the population of 190,000. To this district outside the boroughs which, without counting the freeholders, would have a population of over 60,000, the hon. Member would add 6,500. He would add that number to a district suburban in its character, closely connected with Birmingham in its interests, and adjoining Edgbaston. The result would be the formation of a district larger than any other in the county of Stafford, even without the freeholders. If they assented to the proposal, he did not see how they could resist proposals to redivide the rest of Staffordshire; therefore, as there would be great difficulty in doing that, the Committee would, he thought, probably hesitate before it sanctioned the change proposed by the present Amendment.

MR. STAVELEY HILL said, that, judging from the map which the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had been kind enough to hand across to them, if Harborne was separated from the county, or, rather, only connected with it by a narrow strip, it was only connected laterally with the borough of Birmingham. It stood outside it, and in all other respects was entirely connected with Staffordshire. It had existed without Birmingham hitherto, and he was not surprised at the hon. Gentleman the Member for East Staffordshire (Mr. Wiggin) having great dread of its entering the borough of Birmingham in any way and for any purpose. Those of them who lived anywhere near Birmingham knew what this meant—knew how, from the point of view of local government, anyone interested in Harborne would do his best to prevent its coming into any sort of connection with so heavily rated a borough. The hon. Member for East Staffordshire would not advise any poor man to live inside the borough of Birmingham if he could live outside it. The right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had spoken about the freeholders who would come into the borough. He (Mr. Staveley Hill) would remind the Committee how that matter stood. Reference was made to a number of different divisions in the county of Stafford, and it had been said that if Harborne was to go into the division represented by the hon. Member, there would be a considerable number of freeholders added to the 60,000 population who already constituted the division, and this population had been contrasted with the 46,000 of another division, the 49,000 of another, and so on. But let them look at South-West Staffordshire. Into that would come the whole

of the freeholders of the borough of Wolverhampton and West Bromwich, and its population would be raised in a far higher degree than would the population of the Eastern division by the inclusion of Harborne. He was sorry to hear the right hon. Baronet arguing that if this one point were granted it would bring about a general disarrangement of the scheme of the Commissioners. The right hon. Baronet threatened them that if Harborne were thrown into the Eastern division of the county, Rushall might have to be thrown into the Lichfield division. But hon. Members were not afraid of that. If the right hon. Baronet thought that could fairly be done, let it be done; but do not let them do an unfair thing to Harborne, because of the danger of some other district asking for what it considered fair play. The district of Rushall was a mining district, and had nothing to do with the district of Lichfield. In the same way, Harborne had no connection with Birmingham. It had no desire to be thrown into Birmingham, and he trusted the Committee would allow it to remain in the county of Stafford.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I have paid a great deal of attention to this question. Several of my hon. Friends in different parts of the House have spoken to me with regard to it; and, moreover, I have communicated with the hon. Gentleman the Member for East Staffordshire (Mr. Wiggin) on the subject. That hon. Gentleman has explained the matter to me, and I am free to confess that what I have heard from him, from my hon. and learned Friend behind me (Mr. Staveley Hill), and others with whom I have spoken on the subject, I should be disposed to agree to the proposal made, if it could be treated as one standing entirely by itself. I feel, however, that it would be most undesirable to break into the scheme of the Boundary Commissioners, and that if we do break into it we must be prepared for the consequences. So far as I am able to understand the matter, there is very little doubt that if Harborne is removed from its connection with Birmingham, and thrown into a division of Staffordshire, each division will have to be revised, and a proposal will be made—in fact, Notice of such a proposal has been already given by the hon. Member's Colleague (Sir Arthur Bass)—to remove the district of Rushall from the Eastern division of Staffordshire, and to throw it into the Lichfield division. I find there is as much, or even more, objection to that change, as there is desire for the removal of Harborne from Birmingham. I think, therefore, our safest course is to stand on the divisions as they are in the Bill. If it could be shown that the Harborne case would stand alone, and that we should not have other changes forced upon us, it would make a great difference, no doubt, in our position; but, as at present advised, if the change were subject to other alterations to be hereafter made, I believe it would entail the alteration to which I have referred, and which would cause great inconvenience, and, therefore, I am not prepared to support the Amendment.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 104; Noes 50: Majority 54.—(Div. List, No. 78.)

Amendment *negatived.*

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had placed the following Amendment on the Paper for the purpose of correcting an oversight:—

"In page 18, line 8, at end, insert 'and also excluding therefrom a part which is situate on the north side of the borough, and was formerly included in the parishes of Skirbeck and Boston within the borough, but has been added by Orders of the Local Government Board to parishes not situate within the Parliamentary borough, namely, one part thereof to the parish of Sibsey, and the remaining part thereof to the parish of Frithville, all which said parts are in the Sessional Division of Spilsby, in the parts of Lindsey.'"

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would now move the next Amendment standing in his name on the Paper; and here, again, his object was to supply an omission. It had been agreed to extend the boundary, but the necessary words had not been inserted in the Bill.

Amendment proposed,

In page 18, line 38, at end, insert as a separate paragraph,—"And so much of the municipal borough of Darlington as is not above specified, and is not included in the said Parliamentary borough."—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SEXTON said, it appeared to be quite a matter of course that, in England, when the inhabitants of a district desired to have the municipal boundary extended, it was extended for them.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: The same thing which will be effected by this Amendment was done in the case of Ireland by a general provision in 1868—a provision which does not apply to England.

MR. SEXTON: How about the case of Dublin, about which we have been arguing most part of the evening?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: In the case of Dublin, the Parliamentary boundary was in question. In the present case, it is only an extension up to the municipal boundary, whereas the Parliamentary borough of Dublin already comprises all the area of the municipal city and more besides.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

MR. PICTON said, that in the absence of his hon. Colleague (Mr. Alexander M'Arthur) he begged to move the next Amendment—namely, to leave out from "Leicester" to "Soar," in line 13 of page 19. There was a considerable consensus of opinion in favour of the Amendment, both in the town of Leicester and in the district of the county affected by this portion of the Bill; therefore, he begged the Committee to allow him to say a few words on the subject. The object of the words in the Schedule was to add to Leicester the district now included in the place called Belgrave, containing at the last Census about 7,000 inhabitants. The number of inhabitants in the borough of Leicester, where the municipal and Parliamentary boundaries were now identical, was, at the last Census, a little over 122,000, thus, the Committee would perceive, giving one Member to a little over 61,000. Now, the town of Leicester was a rapidly growing town. Within the municipal boundary there had been considerable additions made to the population; in fact, it was believed that many thousands had been added since 1881. Within his own recollection of Leicester, about 50,000 people had been added to the town, and now the vote in the county, with Belgrave included, was worth far more as an instrument of political power than the vote in the town. According to the arrangement of the county in the Bill, there was not one division which had a population of much more than 50,000. There was, therefore, in the county one Representative to rather less than 50,000 people, on the average, while in the borough the proportion was, as he had said, one Member to 61,000. Now, he asked why the Committee should increase that disproportion, which was already a considerable one? He thought it would be most unfair to this large manufacturing town. But there were other reasons besides those of justice which ought to induce the Committee to adopt the Amendment which stood on the Paper, for the proposal to include Belgrave within the town of Leicester sinned in other respects against the directions given to the Boundary Commissioners. For instance, it divided a parish. The parish of Belgrave extended to both sides of the River Soar; but, under the Bill, only the part of the parish east of the river was included in Leicester. The proposed boundary of Leicester was not at all compact. The boundary of Leicester, which at present was the same for municipal and Parliamentary purposes, was approximately circular; if Belgrave were added, an enormous extension was given in one direction, and in one direction only. Again, the proposal sinned against the directions given to the Boundary Commissioners, inasmuch as it forced together populations having very different interests—populations which within the last few years had contested together several points of interest in the neighbourhood, and were likely to do so again. He must say that the Local Board of Belgrave were strongly against their inclusion in the town of Leicester, and the people of Leicester were equally opposed to the change. There had been strong public expressions of opinion in both localities against the proposed extension. In conclusion, he asked the Committee to beware of one mistake which was naturally made when the name of Belgrave was mentioned. He found that it was commonly supposed that Belgrave was only an outgrowth of the town of Leicester, and that it had received its name of Belgrave in imitation of that given to a fashionable part of London. It was far more likely, however, that Belgrave Square and Belgravia in London had derived their names from Belgrave, near

Leicester, which was the only original Belgrave in the country. The place was mentioned in the Domesday Book, under the name of Merdegrave, and in a Charter granted in 1082 it was mentioned by the name of Belgrave. In Nichols' *History of Leicester*, the family which settled there and took the name of Belgrave was traced to other places, and amongst others to the West End of London, and from that fact the fashionable quarter of Belgravia had derived its name. He mentioned this, not as of any antiquarian interest, but to show the locality had an independent history and existence of its own, and that it was not to be imagined that it was an outgrowth of Leicester. He was sorry that the time at which this Amendment had come on was such that many hon. Members of the House who were interested in the locality were not in their places. He believed he was right in saying that the noble Lord opposite (Lord John Manners), who had so long represented North Leicestershire, would, had he been present, have expressed his approval of this Amendment. He hoped, therefore, that no difficulty would be felt about making the very slight alteration proposed, which was only a measure of justice to what he thought a large and important town.

Amendment proposed,

In page 19, line 11, leave out from "Leicester" to "Soar," in line 13, both inclusive. —(*Mr. Picton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, the hon. Gentleman the Member for Leicester (Mr. Picton) had referred to the absence of the noble Lord the Member for North Leicestershire (Lord John Manners). His noble Friend had been obliged to leave London that day on business, and he did not expect that this Amendment would have been reached; but he thought it quite possible, and he therefore requested him (Sir Stafford Northcote), in case of its coming on in his absence, to do that which he would have done himself—that was to say that he was entirely in favour of the Amendment which had now been proposed. He (Sir Stafford Northcote) was afraid it was not in his power to go into the details which his noble Friend would have so well handled. The general feeling of his noble Friend was that this was not a political question, but merely a question of the convenience of the formation of the borough of Leicester. The noble Lord considered that the boundaries, as proposed, would be of very awkward and inconvenient form, and that the proposed alteration would greatly improve the arrangement of the borough. He (Sir Stafford Northcote) only rose to say these were the opinions of his noble Friend, and to express regret on his part that he was not able to be present.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, in face of the general agreement with which this proposal seemed to have been received, he would not object to the change; at the same time, he must make his reply in the same form to that made just now in another case—leave it as a matter for reconsideration on the Report. So far as the Committee stage on the Bill was concerned, he would not propose to make any consequential Amendments. His impression was that the Loughborough division of the county would bear the additional population of Belgrave; but he would consult his Advisers on the point, and on Report he would be prepared to state whether, in their opinion, it was necessary to make the change in the county division. At that stage of the Bill he would accept the Amendment conditionally. If, however, it was the general wish of the Committee to deal now with this particular point, he would prefer to alter the form of the Amendment by leaving out the whole of the lines 11, 12, and 13. He thought that if the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Picton) withdrew his Amendment, and allowed him to substitute what he suggested, the object would be effected much better.

MR. PICTON asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed, in page 19, to leave out lines 11, 12, and 13.—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Question, "That the lines proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule," put, and *negatived.*

VISCOUNT EMLYN said, he wished to bring under the notice of the Committee the manner in which the borough of Pembroke, concerning which he had

given Notice of an Amendment, was dealt with under the Bill. He thought that by merely reciting the facts of the case, he should be able to show to the Committee that Pembroke was to be dealt with in an entirely different way to any other borough in the whole of the United Kingdom. He did not hesitate to say that the treatment of Pembroke was absolutely contrary to the principles laid down by the Government in regard to boroughs; and he should endeavour to show that it would be undesirable in any case to deal with Pembroke in the way proposed. The constituency of Haverfordwest was composed of the boroughs of Haverfordwest, Fishguard, and Narbeth, and the total population was now 9,107. That constituency, of course, under the Bill, lost its separate representation. Now, the constituency of Pembroke was also a group of boroughs, and included the Dockyards of Pembroke. Pembroke had a population of between 25,000 and 26,000; and therefore, under the Bill, it was entitled to separate representation. For some time, while the discussion upon the Scotch groups of burghs was proceeding, it was really very difficult for ordinary Members to ascertain on what principles the Government intended to deal with borough groups; but, at the close of the discussion, there was no doubt at all as to what the Government held to be one of the principles of the Bill, and part of the agreement made with the right hon. Gentleman on the Front Opposition Bench (Sir Stafford Northcote), for they stated, as far as his memory carried him, that with regard to groups of boroughs they had come to the conclusion, he presumed, though of course he did not know it for a fact, after representation from the Leaders of the Opposition, that there could not be any merging of boroughs in any part of Scotland. There had been no merging of groups of boroughs in any other part of the country, and, therefore, he maintained that the present proposals of the Government were absolutely contrary to the principles of the Bill. He had endeavoured to guess at what might be the reasons for this proposed straying away from the principles of the Bill, but he had been unable to discover them. He might be told that the reason for this change was that the numbers did not work out so nicely as they might, unless the change was made. If the Committee would bear with him, he would put before them one or two figures upon the point. The total population of the borough of Pembroke, as he had said, was 25,618. Now, out of that number, no less than 16,000 belonged to the Dockyard of Pembroke alone. Now, in Milford, a town very deeply interested in questions affecting Dockyards, there was a population of 2,000; in two other districts there were 4,000 inhabitants, and a small country district brought up the total population of the borough of Pembroke to 25,600. He wished to point out to the Committee that the bulk of that population was a Dockyard population, distinctly interested in Dockyard and navigation questions. Now, what was proposed to be done was to add the 9,177 of Haverfordwest, which was not a population of one town, but a population of three towns in three different portions of the county—towns which, he might say in passing, had no manufactures of any sort or kind—at least, they were in no sense manufacturing towns, two of them being purely country places—it was proposed to put this 9,000 of population into the borough of Pembroke, raising the population of that borough to 34,795. It might be said—"Oh, you have got in the county of Pembroke, without the population of Haverfordwest, 57,000, and therefore it is perfectly impossible to throw this extra 9,000 population into Pembroke, because then you would make it too large for one Member." He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) was going to advance that argument; but, if so, he would like the right hon. Gentleman to cast his eye to the next county to Pembrokeshire. If he did, he would find that, in Cardiganshire, there was a population of 70,000, with only one Member. That argument, therefore, was not a very strong one; but he did not wish entirely to build upon the population of Cardiganshire. If the right hon. Gentleman would only glance over the list of the populations of the different counties, he would find an enormous number with very much larger populations than 57,000. Take the divisions of Durham and Kent, for instance. In Durham there were eight divisions, and every one had a larger

population than 57,000. There were eight divisions in Kent, every one of which had a larger population than 57,000. There were six divisions in South-East Lancashire, four in North-East Lancashire, and no less than seven in the West Riding of Yorkshire, and every one of these had more than 57,000 of population. Under these circumstances, he maintained that the case he had brought before the Committee was a very exceptional one. In his opinion, there ought to be no exception to the principles of the Bill, unless the very strongest grounds could be shown. No such grounds existed for dealing with the borough of Pembroke in an exceptional manner; indeed, the whole burden and weight of evidence was exactly the other way. Now, there was only one further argument he wished to put before the Committee, and it was this—that when one looked at the combination of the Pembroke boroughs, he could only feel that all it was necessary and desirable to preserve was the representation as affecting the Dockyard and the Haven. He might be told there was a scattered population in the different districts. It was true there was one district in the Pembroke group of boroughs which had only a population of 717 persons. He would not in the least mind wiping that away, if that had been the principle on which the Government had set to work. In his opinion, however, it would be most unwise to weaken the direct representation of this Dockyard, by throwing into its numbers three other towns in three entirely different parts of Pembrokeshire, towns which had no interest in the Dockyards, which were not connected with them in any shape or form. He trusted that if the Government were true to the principles of the Bill—if they were true to what they said was part of the compact with the Front Opposition Bench in regard to their method of dealing with groups of boroughs—they would accept the Amendment which he now proposed.

Amendment proposed,

In page 20, line 20, to leave out lines 34 and 35,—

"Pembroke	The present Parliamentary borough and Pembroke, and the present Parliamentary borough and Haverfordwest."

—(*Viscount Emlyn.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the noble Viscount (Viscount Emlyn) had made out a very good case for his Amendment, as, indeed, he did for anything he moved in the House. He (Sir Charles W. Dilke) should have thought, however, from what they had heard on previous Amendments, that it was rather contrary to the general principles of the Party opposite to try and merge into county districts a borough of the size of Haverfordwest. The groups of Welsh boroughs, with very few exceptions indeed, were county groups; ever since the time of Henry VIII. they had been treated mainly as county groups. One of the groups ran over three counties, and that had been merged altogether under this Bill. In what the Government proposed to do in this matter, they were only following the general, though not quite universal, Welsh system. As regarded the size of the constituency, the noble Viscount had anticipated his (Sir Charles W. Dilke's) argument on that point. He did not wish to press the matter too much, because, of course, there were cases where the disproportions were greater than those created by the noble Viscount. Taking this county by itself, however, there would be a much fairer distribution of population under the Bill than under the proposal of the noble Viscount. Under the Bill the county would have a population of 57,000, and the boroughs a population of 35,000; under the scheme suggested by his noble Friend the county would have a population of 66,000, and the boroughs only a population of 26,000. On the whole, he thought that the balance of convenience was in favour of the proposal contained in the Bill, and, therefore, he was not inclined to disturb it.

MR. GORST said, the noble Viscount (Viscount Emlyn), in proposing his Amendment, made a distinct and lucid speech, not only because the noble Viscount always did make a clear and lucid speech, but because he had, in this instance, an exceedingly good and strong case. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had made an extremely confused speech, not because the right hon. Gentleman could

not make as lucid a speech as the noble Viscount when he chose to do so, but because, on this occasion, he had got an extremely bad case. What was the sole answer the right hon. Gentleman made to the noble Viscount? Why, that the Welsh groups were county groups. What on earth was meant by the Pembroke Dockyard being a county group? That was exactly what it was not. If the Pembroke boroughs consisted of a number of agricultural and rural boroughs, without any manufactures—if they were of a strictly urban character, there might not be much harm in adding a few more boroughs to them; but Pembroke was an important borough constituency—it was a Dockyard constituency—a constituency which had a distinct life of its own, distinct interests of its own, it was of great importance, and it contained not only one of Her Majesty's Dockyards, but it contained also a part of Milford, which had a seafaring population who ought to be represented in the House of Commons. It was quite evident that the purpose of putting Haverfordwest into this urban group was to endeavour to swamp the Dockyard and seafaring interest. It was as clear a case of jerrymandering as any to be found in the Bill. He remembered that when, a few nights ago, the system appertaining to the grouping of Scotch burghs was under discussion, his right hon. and gallant Friend the Member for the Wigtown Burghs (Sir John Hay) challenged the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) upon this very case. His right hon. and gallant Friend said—"What account do you give, if these are your principles, of putting Haverfordwest into the Pembroke boroughs?" The right hon. Gentleman was then unable to give an answer; and he was unable to give an answer now. He (Mr. Gorst) thought it was quite possible that the noble Lord the Member for Haverfordwest (Lord Kensington) was the author of this singular manœuvre. If so, the Committee, no doubt, would like to know the noble Lord's views upon the subject.

LORD KENSINGTON said, he hoped the Committee would excuse him if he troubled them with a few words. He wished, in the first place, to disclaim the authorship which the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (Mr. Gorst) had assigned to him; he quite agreed with the course pursued by the Government, but he was not the author of it. The hon. and learned Gentleman had said that the Pembroke boroughs were not a county group; that they formed a Dockyard constituency, pure and simple; that they were entirely different from the boroughs he (Lord Kensington) had the honour to represent; and that, therefore, Haverfordwest ought not to be thrown into Pembroke. Pembroke, no doubt, did contain a very large Dockyard element; but the rest of the boroughs which formed the group were a great deal more similar to the composition of the boroughs he (Lord Kensington) had the honour to represent than his boroughs would be to the county. Pembroke Dock was the largest constituency by far, and, of course, had the largest electorate in the group. Pembroke town, however, was a purely county town; there were no manufactures in the town any more than there were in the boroughs he represented. Milford was a small town, and was composed chiefly of residences for many of the Dockyard labourers, who came over the Haven in boats. Milford had nothing whatever to do with the Dockyards of Pembroke; it had only to do with the docks that were in course of formation on its own shore. Tenby was a seaside watering-place, and could in no sense be regarded as a manufacturing place; it was inhabited in the summer by a great many visitors, and most of the people there were not a bit more urban in their habits, or more connected with Dockyard interests, than the people of the boroughs he represented. He did not think that the noble Viscount opposite (Viscount Emlyn) would assert, for a moment, that there was a very large urban constituency in Wiston. The Wiston district was a very scattered one, and only contained a population of 1,717. Now, Haverfordwest had a town population, pure and simple, and except on market days, when people came in from the country districts, the occupations of the people were town occupations. Fishguard had a seafaring population, and he really failed to see that the noble Viscount had made out a case why the Haverfordwest and Pembroke boroughs should not be grouped together. He had never himself heard

any objection to the proposal put forward in the Bill.

SIR HARDINGE GIFFARD said, the noble Lord (Lord Kensington) had mentioned the names of several places; but he had not given the Committee the information they might have expected with reference to their situation towards each other, and any community of interest which might exist between them. What relation had Fishguard to Tenby, and what relation had any of the villages which the noble Lord represented to the borough of Pembroke? Fishguard was 15 miles to the north of Haverfordwest, and Pembroke was 10 miles to the south-west. Any number of villages might be got to form into a borough. He believed there had been no map presented to the Committee—nothing by which persons not familiar with the neighbourhood could see the the absolutely monstrous nature of this proposal. These villages could not be made into a group of boroughs at all. When, for some reason or other, the arrangement was made to form the borough of Haverfordwest by collecting these different villages together, it was supposed that they had an identity of agricultural interest, and that there would be a community of interest among them; but the putting together of Pembroke and Haverfordwest—an arrangement entirely outside the general scheme of the Bill—was only to be reconciled with the notion that some Party advantage was to be gained by it. No doubt, Haverfordwest had latterly been entirely faithful to the noble Lord; but Pembroke had been much more fickle, and had altered its political views from time to time, and it was supposed that this arrangement would give a tendency to Pembroke which it did not entirely possess before. He thought the Committee were entitled to some further explanation on this point. The right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had given them no explanation of the meaning of the proposal. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of a county group; but he (Sir Hardinge Giffard) would like him to explain what he meant by that. The right hon. Gentleman illustrated the county group by the Cardigan boroughs; but was there a single county group in Wales which, in respect of distance, community of interest, and the representation of the same class of people, would compare in the smallest degree with the united borough of Haverfordwest and Pembroke? He challenged the right hon. Gentleman to bring forward a single instance, and he thought some explanation ought to be given to the Committee of the reason for this extraordinary exception.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: The hon. and learned Gentleman who has just sat down (Sir Hardinge Giffard) asks us for some example of the present proposal. Well, I should say the case of the Flint boroughs, where small towns are grouped together, is a similar case to this. Or you may take the case of the Montgomery boroughs, where there are no less than six different small boroughs grouped together. In the case of Pembroke, there are two groups of boroughs, and it is now found that one of these groups is to be disfranchised. The question is, whether the places so dealt with and disfranchised should be placed in the county or added to the other existing group. It is more in conformity with the practice, and the way in which we have dealt with other cases, to add these small places to the existing group which is to be continued in the county of Pembroke, than it would be if we were to merge them in the county. I need not go into the figures of the population; but when the hon. and learned Member asks what relation there is between Haverfordwest and Pembroke, I would answer by asking what relation there is between Tenby and Milford and Pembroke? There is precisely the same difference or similarity between the once case and the other. But we say that the convenience of the population is, on the whole, better considered by adding these places to the existing group than it would be by projecting them into the county. The only other Welsh county which at all approaches this case, is the county of Cardigan. With that exception, all the other Welsh counties have between 45,000 and 50,000 people. If you make this exception, you would give Pembroke county a population of 60,000, which would be rather large for one Member.

MR. HICKS said, he wished to know who was the author of this extraordinary provision; and he also wished to draw the attention of the Committee to certain figures which might perhaps throw some

light upon it. He found that, at the last election for the borough of Pembroke, the present Whig Member for that borough was returned by a narrow majority of 33. Seeing the great changes which had taken place of late in the way in which the majority of electors had chosen their Representatives, and particularly within the last few months, he thought there was some reason to imagine that the majority at Pembroke at the next election might go the other way. But when he turned to Haverfordwest, he found that in a very much smaller constituency the majority was 164; and, therefore, if these two boroughs were added together, the Liberals would get a majority of 200, which it might be difficult to shake. These figures might perhaps enable the Committee to arrive at some conclusion upon the extraordinary divergence from the principles of the measure which had been introduced in this particular case. As the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had drawn the attention of the Committee to the Flint boroughs, he (Mr. Hicks) would remind the Committee that all those eight boroughs which constituted the group had been part and parcel of the same borough for many years, and were not a fresh creation under the Bill. Taking all the circumstances into consideration, he trusted that the Committee would act fearlessly and impartially, and that they would adopt the Amendment of the noble Viscount (Viscount Emlyn).

MR. LEWIS said, he thought that after the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) the Committee would be wondering what was the real reason that impelled the Government to make this change. All that the matter came to, according to that right hon. Gentleman, was this—that, on the whole, the Government thought it would be more convenient to attach Haverfordwest to Pembroke than to merge it in the county. He (Mr. Lewis) would ask the Committee to remember what had been the one constant strain throughout the whole of these proceedings—that no addition to existing groups of boroughs should be made, and that any proposal to create a new group should not receive any sanction or encouragement. Why was this change proposed now? Was not this proposal a piece of pure and unadulterated grouping, such as the Government had, all along, been arguing against to the very utmost? It was, perhaps, unpleasant to refer to the extremely pertinent instance which had just been produced by the hon. Member who last addressed the Committee (Mr. Hicks); but when they saw that this particular case was to be made an exception, they were driven to the conclusion that there might have been some little slanting of the eye and divergence of the pen when this portion of the Government scheme was taken in hand. As for Pembroke, it could not be said that it was an insignificant borough in itself. If it could be said that it was an insignificant borough for England or Wales, there might be something in the argument; but when they turned to the statisties of the Welsh boroughs, they found that there were no less than three groups of boroughs which were less in point of population than the borough of Pembroke, for Pembroke had 26,000 inhabitants, while the Flint boroughs had 24,000, the Denbigh boroughs 22,000, and the Montgomery boroughs had only 19,000. It could not, therefore, be suggested that Pembroke needed the stimulus of additional population. They had learnt from the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General, and also from the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke), that the Government, in placing this proposal before the Committee, had proceeded upon no principle, and were not even actuated by any feeling in the matter. Then why did they not relinquish it? It was suggested that if the proposal was not carried out, the county of Pembroke would be made inconveniently large; but when the hon. and gallant Member for South Ayrshire (General Alexander) complained of a population of 89,000 as being too large, and asked to have a group of boroughs constructed, the suggestion met with the most strenuous opposition from the Government. He thought the Committee ought to ask for a little consistency in these matters, and that they should ask the Government for a little fair play. It was impossible for any Member of the Committee who had heard the facts to come to any conclusion in favour of this most exceptional way of dealing with the representation of these small boroughs;

and when they looked at all the circumstances it would be impossible to rest satisfied with a division which might defeat the Amendment. They must, therefore, fight this matter out on Report, if they could not dispose of it now. He entreated the Government to consider whether it would not be fairer and more satisfactory to give way to what was really a fair and reasonable, and, at the same time, a strenuous opposition.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT said, he wished to add his protest against this most jerrymandering proposition on the part of the Government. The Pembroke boroughs were notoriously a purely Dockyard constituency, and it was proposed to add this rural constituency of Haverfordwest to them. The Postmaster General was responsible for an extraordinary statement, for he had drawn an analogy between the Monmouth boroughs and this proposal to join Haverfordwest to Pembroke. The distances in the one case were much greater than in the other, and the analogy failed altogether. The proposal to join a Dockyard constituency to the rural constituency of Haverfordwest, which had been for some time represented by a leading Member of the Ministry in that House, was clearly made in order to turn the natural tendency of Pembroke from one side to the other; and for that reason he thought it should be opposed by every Member of the Committee who had any interest in maintaining the purity of constituencies.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS: I wish to say one word, because it is quite clear that we are now outside the agreement. It gives one great pleasure to be able to speak outside the agreement, and I have already spoken once or twice. But I would rather appeal to the Government to consider this case, because it is clear on their own showing that this is an exception; and, as a general rule, an exception ought not to be pressed upon the House without the very strongest possible ground for it. From the very fair speech which has been made by the right hon. Gentleman who has charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke), it is clear that he wished to leave this as an open question; and he said very fairly that, on the whole, he thought the preponderance of opinion was one way. But it is perfectly clear that he will be satisfied with the decision of the Committee whichever way it goes; and what I want to impress upon the Committee is this—that no special grounds have been placed before us to show why an exception should be made of this particular case. Throughout the whole Bill I have never dwelt on political matters at all, and I do not want to do it now. I would much rather exclude them, and consider the convenience of the electors generally outside political grounds. I would put the matter upon this ground—that, so far as I have learnt from the speeches which have been made in the course of this discussion, it seems to me that no fair case has been made out for adding the Haverfordwest boroughs to the constituency of the Pembroke boroughs. The right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General referred to a considerable number of other places in Wales, and he talked of the boroughs and localities; but he took great care to say nothing about the constituencies. If he went into that matter, he would find that in all the instances quoted there is not the least analogy with the present case. I would strongly appeal to the Committee, if the Government do not give way, as I hope they will, either now or on Report—I would strongly appeal to the Committee to express their opinion that the case put before us by the Government is an exceptional case, and that no good grounds have been submitted to us to show why it should be dealt with in the manner proposed.

LORD KENSINGTON said, he wished to add another word, in consequence of what had fallen from the hon. Member for Eye (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett). So far as he could catch the hon. Gentleman's words, he understood him to say that Pembroke had always been a pure constituency, and that it was now proposed to join it with the corrupt constituency of Haverfordwest. He (Lord Kensington) wished to take the plainest and most distinct exception to that accusation. He believed that both the noble Viscount the Member for Carmarthenshire (Viscount Emlyn) and the hon. and learned Member for Launceston (Sir Hardinge Giffard) would agree with him in saying that there was not a shadow of foundation for such an accusation.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: With reference to what has fallen from the

right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir R. Assheton Cross), I may remark that it is true, as he said, that I did not attempt to put this matter as one of great principle; but after what he has said about it being outside the agreement I will just say how the matter stands. It has not been directly provided for in the agreement, one way or the other. But it was one of the proposals submitted to the right hon. Gentleman and his Friends, and another case was proposed to be dealt with in a similar way. Objection was, however, taken to the other case, and it was dropped; but no objection was taken to this case.

VISCOUNT EMLYN said, the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General had spoken of several groups of Welsh boroughs which he thought had been dealt with in the same manner as this particular group; and he had talked of the Welsh practice. But surely the right hon. Gentleman must be aware that not one single group of Welsh boroughs had had its limits altered by one iota under this Bill. What, then, did the right hon. Gentleman mean by telling the Committee that the Welsh practice in regard to these groups was on the same lines as the present proposal of the Government? That was almost misleading the Committee. His noble Friend (Lord Kensington) had asked him if he (Viscount Emlyn) was not aware that Pembroke was a simple country town? He could inform his noble Friend that Pembroke abutted quite close upon the Dockyards, and a large number of the men who worked in the Dockyards resided in Pembroke itself. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board once more. He (Viscount Emlyn) had not said one word with regard to any false practice in this matter. He did not suppose that anything of the kind existed; and, so far as he had been able to watch the proceedings of the Committee, he thought the right hon. Gentleman had always seemed to meet these questions in the fairest spirit. He appealed to the Committee to say whether the impression produced had not been that if the noble Lord the Member for Haverfordwest, who was personally interested in the matter, because it affected his constituency, had not been alongside the President of the Local Government Board, that right hon. Gentleman would have given way before this.

MR. GORST said, he wished to say one word before the division was taken. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had himself admitted that there was a similar case to this brought forward by the Government; but when it was found that exception was taken to it by the Leaders of the Opposition it was given up by the Government. He (Mr. Gorst) appealed to the right hon. Gentleman's sense of fair play. Now that exception had been taken to this case, as it was taken to the other, ought not the Government to give way here also? He thought the conduct of the Government throughout the Bill had been singularly fair. He had always said it was a fair Bill; and he thought the Government had shown the greatest fairness in conducting it. Was it worth while to impair that character for impartiality and fairness on account of this one wretched little place? The right hon. Gentleman himself admitted that, if it had been challenged by the Conservative Leaders when the compact was arranged, the Government would have given way. Now the matter was challenged in Committee, and there was an almost universal opinion on the Conservative side of the House that the matter ought to be yielded. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to give way, and so allow the Government to carry the Bill through Committee with that high reputation for fairness and impartiality which they had so far earned.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 80; Noes 51: Majority 29.—(Div. List, No. 79.)

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I think it would be unfair to ask the Committee to go on any longer, therefore I will now move that the Chairman report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS: Before that Question is put I wish to express a hope that, after the division which has just been taken, and the strong expres-

sion of opinion it embodies, the right hon. Baronet will reconsider this question on the Report. I wish, also, to call attention to the notes on the bottom of page 22, with reference to this Schedule. It seems to me that the notes belong to the category of the matter coming before the Schedule, and that they should not appear in this form.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I promise the right hon. Gentleman to consider both these points before the Report.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS (VOTING).

APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK said, he wished to move for a Select Committee "to inquire into and Report on the best mode of Voting in School Board Elections." As he understood that Her Majesty's Government did not object to the Motion, he would not trouble the House with many observations in regard to it. Everyone who had paid any attention to the cumulative system of voting at School Board elections would admit that it involved a great waste of votes. When the cumulative vote was originally proposed by Mr. Marshall the voting was open, and the introduction of the ballot had effected a great change in the operation of the system. In illustration he referred to the case of Lambeth, where, at the last election, Mr. Brook, who was at the head of the poll, received no fewer than 35,000 votes, while 8,200 would have been sufficient to return him; he had, therefore, 26,000 more than he required, and these votes were really wasted. He did not say that this was conclusive; but he thought that such cases raised a fair ground for inquiry. However, as he understood that the Government were going to be so good as to support his Motion, he would not trouble the House with any argument, but would content himself with moving the Resolution.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and Report on the best mode of Voting in School Board Elections."—(*Sir John Lubbock.*)

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he was somewhat reminded in this matter of the saying in reference to "fearing the Greeks when bearing gifts;" and he was not sure that if he had noticed the Motion on the Paper in time he would have allowed the hon. Baronet to bring it on to-night. At that hour of the morning, he was inclined to look with suspicion on an insidious proposal of this kind dealing with the present system of School Board elections. The present system had secured for certain minorities in this country an amount of representation which they would not otherwise have obtained. He was rather surprised to find the hon. Baronet, one of whose chief claims to such public reputation as he had was his desire to secure the representation of minorities by means of proportional representation, signalizing himself by proposing a Motion the direct object of which he maintained was the putting down of a fair representation of minorities in School Board elections. The Roman Catholic population of the country was very well pleased with the existing mode of election; and he imagined the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) was displeased with it because it gave Catholics some power at these elections. He hoped the Government would look very narrowly into the constitution of this Committee.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK: I can assure the hon. Member that it is not at all my desire to prevent Roman Catholics from being fairly represented.

Motion *agreed to.*

Select Committee *appointed*, "to inquire into and Report on the best mode of Voting in School Board Elections"—(*Sir John Lubbock.*)

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND) BILL.

MOTION FOR LEAVE.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Sir, in asking for the leave of the House to introduce a Bill on the subject of education in Ireland, I am obliged to occupy a small portion of its time. The Bill is of such importance that I think it deserves explanation, and I will endeavour to explain it as briefly as possible, without wasting time by dwelling on the importance of the subject, or in making

any general observations. The Bill contains three Parts. The first Part deals with the attendance of children at school, and the keynote of this Part is contained in the 1st clause, which provides that—

"It shall be the duty of the parent of every child to cause such child to receive efficient elementary instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic; and if such parent fails to perform such duty he shall be liable to such orders and penalties as are provided by this Act."

The Bill, in short, provides the principle of compulsory attendance. Now, I will not occupy the time of the House by speaking on the general question of compulsory attendance; but I may say that it is some personal satisfaction to myself, and also some proof that I really believe in what I am now proposing, that so far back as 1869 I put on the Paper an Amendment to an Education Bill then before the House in favour of the application of compulsion to attendance at school. That was a year before the first introduction of the principle in a tentative way into the English Education Act. With regard to Ireland, we need not go further back than three years ago. In 1883 my Friend, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, then Member for Limerick City, moved a Resolution in the House, which was carried unanimously, to this effect—

"It is expedient to introduce into Ireland the principle of Compulsory Education, with such modifications as the social and religious conditions of the Country require."

That Resolution having been carried unanimously, it really became imperative that any large Bill the Government introduced dealing with this subject should embrace this proposal. Now, compulsion has two objects—in the first place, to bring into school those children who at present fail to come; and, in the second place, to insure greater regularity in the attendance of those who do come; and I think myself that most of those who have looked into the question of education in Ireland will be of opinion that the great evil occurs from want of a provision dealing with the latter case. I was myself startled at finding—I promise not to trouble the House with many figures — that out of the total number who attended school in Ireland during the latest year that I have seen analyzed only 19·7 per cent attended 150 times and over; 24·7 per cent attended between 100 and 150 times—that is days according to the Irish way of reckoning; 24 per cent between 50 and 100 times; while, under 50 times, there were as many as 31·6 per cent. This last degree of attendance is really so small as to produce results hardly worth considering. Apart altogether from book learning and instruction of the ordinary kind, the disciplinary effect of regular and sustained subjection to school control is most valuable; but these and other advantages are impossible of attainment by children who only give this small modicum of attendance. I will say no more as to the general necessity of this provision, but will give some outline of the particular method of the application of the principle. In the first place, as to the enforcement of the obligation. There are two modes provided—first, by imposing penalties on the parents of the children who fail to attend school; and next, by prohibiting, under penalty, the employment of such children. These are substantially the same as the English provisions. Next, for the enforcement of the Act, a Local Authority, to be called the School Attendance Committee, is created—it is impossible to introduce the system which prevails in England of School Boards—and on the School Attendance Committee will be represented the three bodies of persons who may be presumed to be interested in the subject—namely, the National Board of Education, the managers of National and other schools in the district, and the Boards of Guardians, who represent the ratepayers, and may also be taken in some degree to represent parents and employers. The next point is as to the degree of attendance required. In order that a child may become exempt, it must either have obtained a certificate of proficiency or a certificate of what is known as "previous due attendance," and previous due attendance in Ireland is stated by this Bill to mean 75 attendances at a National school in each half-year for four years, or 150 attendances in each year. In England the rule is that education commences at five years of age and continues for five years; but in Ireland, according to this Bill, it will commence at six years of age and continue for four years. It must be explained to those who are not aware of the fact that in Ireland a child can only put in one attendance in a day, and not two as in

England, so that the 150 attendances, of which I spoke, are really equivalent to 300 attendances in this country, and the manner in which this number of 150 is arrived at is this. If you deduct Saturdays, holidays, and vacations, you are left with a number of available school days in the year of about 200; but we must bear in mind that there are an enormous number of small farmers in Ireland who absolutely require the assistance, in seed time and in harvest time, of every member of their family, and therefore it is that we make an abatement of 25 school days in each of these two seasons, making 50 in all, and thus we arrive at the 150, which I think hon. Members will agree is not an unreasonable demand to make on children, and is really as small an amount of attendance as is consistent with proper instruction. Then, lastly—and this is the most critical point of all, perhaps—I will state what are the conditions as to reasonable excuses for non-attendance, and the shortest way is to read the very words of the Bill—

"Any of the following reasons shall be accepted as a reasonable excuse:—

"(1.) That there is not within two miles, measured according to the nearest road from the residence of the child, any public elementary school which the child could attend, or any such school to which the parent of the child does not object on conscientious religious grounds to send such child.

"(2.) That the absence of the child from school has been caused by sickness, delicacy, or any unavoidable cause.

"(3.) That the child is under seven years of age and lives at too great a distance from any public elementary school which he could attend, even though such distance is less than two miles.

"(4.) That the child is receiving suitable elementary education in some other manner."

These, briefly stated, are the conditions under which we propose, by this Bill, to introduce the system of compulsion; and, with these guarantees and conditions, it is our hope and belief that it will involve no hardship, while it will do much to extend the blessings of sound education in Ireland. Then, Sir, I turn to the second Part of the Bill, about which I shall have very little to say in detail. It gives compulsory power for the acquisition of sites for schools and teachers' residences. If it was necessary, any amount of evidence could be produced from all parts of the country, from the Reports of Inspectors and otherwise, to show how grievously the system of education has been hampered and embarrassed by a want of some provision of this kind. Sometimes from unwillingness on the part of the owners of land, and sometimes, I am bound to say, from reluctance on the part of the occupiers, but for some reason or other, there has been, in many cases, a difficulty, and the consequence is that new schools have not been built, and that schools continue in a condition which makes them unfit for the purposes for which they were built. I will not go into details, but will merely say that the removal of these grievances will be accomplished by the Bill. Now I come to the third and most important question—as to the remuneration of the teachers. I will begin by stating that I believe that we are all agreed that there is no body of men who perform more useful services for the community, and who deserve greater consideration at our hands, than the teachers in our public elementary schools. At the same time, I would say that it is allowed by general consent that the emoluments of Irish teachers may with propriety be increased. A good deal has been done in this direction in recent years. On going back to 1872 I find this—that a principal teacher of the third class received £24, and now he receives £35. Passing over to the intermediate classes, the teacher in the first class, who then received £52, now received £70. In like manner a mistress of the third class in 1872 received £20 a-year, and now gets £27 10*s.* a-year; while a first class school-mistress now gets £58 a-year against £42 a-year in 1872. There has thus been a very considerable increase in class salaries. It must be borne in mind that although the salaries of the lower grades are not very great, yet it has always been open to a qualified teacher to pass from rank to rank, and obtain the full privileges of the higher ranks by examination. Besides that, within the last 14 years the system of result fees has been introduced and developed. This has now reached to such an amount, owing largely to the intelligence and successful energy of the teachers themselves, that in the next year's Estimates the sum of £166,460 has been provided for this purpose, all of which is a pure addition in the last few years to the emoluments

of the teachers. [Mr. SEXTON: Is that for next year?] Yes; that is the Estimate for next year. In fact, it has been calculated—I think not unfairly—that the income of a teacher in 1871 amounted, on an average, to 13*s.* 11*d.* per pupil; whereas now the average salary per pupil is 23*s.* 8*d.*, or nearly double. Of course, we must now look forward to a very considerable increase under the head of result fees from the influence of compulsion. Compulsion will not only bring more children into the schools, but will make the children more regular in attendance, and thus provide more material out of which the teacher can earn his fees. I do not mention these matters to prove that the present state of things is satisfactory, but to show that there has been no indisposition on the part of Parliament and of successive Governments to recognize and meet the claims of these deserving public servants. But this system of results fees appears to deserve somewhat closer attention. I know enough of education and of educational systems to be aware that this results fees system is approved of by all educational authorities whose experience is of weight, and whose opinions are deserving of attention. It does good all round. It stimulates the energy of the teachers, it attracts the interest of the managers. It excites a spirit of emulation in the pupils, and its good practical effect can be proved by the fact that in Ireland, in the first 10 years after the introduction of this system, the attendance of children at school increased at the rate of no less than 32 per cent, and the quality of the instruction increased almost in an equal degree. It is, therefore, by extending this system, and by giving a greater security for the fees given for results, and not by any addition to the fixed salaries of the teachers, that we propose to raise their emoluments. I am glad to say this conclusion, which has been the fixed conclusion of the Government for some time, has received the most striking corroboration within the last few days, in a Memorial which has been addressed to the Lord Lieutenant by the Episcopal Committee on Education acting for the Catholic Bishops in Ireland, who have most strongly expressed their opinion that this is the proper course to be followed in improving in any way the pay of the teachers.

Mr. SEXTON: Is that document to be laid on the Table?

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No; I do not imagine it will.

Mr. SEXTON: No!

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: But now arises the question from what source shall these additional fees be paid—shall they be paid from Imperial or in some part from local funds? The principle of the local ratepayers co-operating in paying teachers was introduced by the late Government in 1875, when they passed an Act authorizing Boards of Guardians to become contributors. Up to that time £60,000 a-year was the settled amount of the results fee; but by this Act a second amount of £60,000 was made available to be paid conditionally on the Poor Law Unions providing an equivalent sum. Comparatively few Unions, however, exercised this power. I am sorry to say that still fewer exercise the power now; and I am not altogether surprised, because when a duty like this is left in a voluntary position it is apt to be treated in that way. But in 1876, finding so few Unions availed themselves of this opportunity, the Government agreed to accept, in lieu of contribution from the rates, any *bond fide* subscription or endowment to a like amount; and in 1881 there was a further step taken, when it was allowed that even if these local contributions did not quite come up to the full amount received, so much of the contingent part of the result fees should be paid as was equal to the local subscription. That is to say, suppose the maximum result fee for a certain subject is 2*s.*, there is 1*s.* given absolutely by the Treasury without any condition whatever. Then, if it is in a contributory Union the rate gives a second 1*s.*, and the Treasury meet that with a third 1*s.* so that the teacher receives 3*s.* altogether. Elsewhere, if the local subscriptions are equal to it, he also receives 3*s.*; but otherwise he receives his unconditional 1*s.*, he receives all that may be subscribed or contributed locally, and he receives as great a proportion from the Treasury as is subscribed locally. That is how the matter stands now. Now, we have to consider whether this scheme of local contribution in one form or another is to be carried further, so as to secure the income of the successful teacher, or is the whole new

burden, such as it may be, to fall on the Exchequer? That, of course, raises the question, does the Imperial Exchequer already bear a sufficient proportion of the cost of Irish education? In round numbers, the Imperial Exchequer bears four-fifths of the cost of Irish education, and two-fifths of the cost of that of England and Scotland. The actual proportions are these—For educational purposes money is derived from Imperial funds; secondly, from local rates and subscriptions, and so forth; and, thirdly, from fees paid by parents. The figures from these three sources are—in England, 41 per cent, 31 per cent, and 28 per cent respectively. In Scotland 41 per cent, 29½ per cent, and 29½ per cent. In Ireland 80 per cent, 10 per cent, and 10 per cent. I am aware that a great deal can be urged in extenuation of these facts. A great deal can be said and has been said that I may be allowed to say is not very much to the point; but a good deal can be said that does deserve attention. But even making any admission you like, the figures I have quoted are awkward and stubborn facts to get over. After any deductions that can be made from the figures I have mentioned, in face of them it is impossible for the Government to submit any proposal to increase the proportion paid out of the Imperial funds as against local funds. This House will never grudge anything that is required for the true development of education; but it will be quite unfair to place upon the Imperial taxpayer a larger burden than the very great proportion of the cost he now bears of the cost of Irish education. We, therefore, propose that a sum shall be contributed from the local rates and paid to the teachers equal to half the results fees received from the Treasury in each year, so that the teachers will be in all cases assured of the three moieties of the results fees. Taking, as before, a subject for which 2*s.* is the maximum, the teacher will get 3*s.* altogether—that is, 2*s.* from the Treasury, and 1*s.* from local rates. But now we are met by the fact that if each Union is treated separately some of the very poorest Unions in Ireland will have the largest sums to raise. If ever there was an object in reference to which there ought to be solidarity throughout the Island it is surely this. It is to the interest, the direct interest, of every man in Ireland, that all his countrymen should be well educated, whether living in his own neighbourhood or not; and I cannot but believe that a small equal contribution to this great object would be cheerfully paid. The Bill, therefore, provides that all Unions shall contribute rateably in proportion to their valuation—in fact, that the requisite sum shall be raised by means of a national rate. It is exceedingly difficult to estimate with anything like accuracy how much the rate that may be required will be. To begin with, apart from other reasons, it is so uncertain what the result of the compulsory provisions may be; but, according to the best calculations that can be formed, it is believed that at first the rate would not exceed 1½*d.* in the pound, and it is to be observed that the local contribution cannot exceed one-half of the Treasury payment, and thus Parliament will control the amount of the rate by controlling the estimate for result fees. Well, Sir, these, plainly stated, without argument or embellishment, are the main outlines of this Bill. It is a measure of great importance, and if it receives the sanction of Parliament we trust that it will do much to attain that which ought to be our object in any great educational measure—namely, not only to remove a grievance, or to improve the position of public servants, however worthy they may be, but to advance still further towards the higher end of improving and developing the education of the people.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill to improve National Education in Ireland."—(*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY said, he certainly would not attempt to criticize the Bill now at anything like considerable length; but it appeared to be a more extensive and enterprizing measure, whether for good or for evil, than he had expected. As to the first Part—the question of compulsory education—that was a difficult one, and would depend altogether on the way compulsion was applied. He fancied they were all in favour of the principle of compulsion; but, taking the words of the Resolution passed by the House into account—namely—

"It is expedient to introduce into Ireland the principle of Compulsory Education, with such modifications as the social and religious conditions of the Country require,"

it was impossible to give this part of the question any serious consideration before they knew how the compulsion was to be applied. He did not think the proposal that the increased remuneration of the teachers should be derived solely by an increased rate of results fees was at all satisfactory, and there was nothing clear as to the teachers' residences. He was told there was to be compulsory power to hire them; but they were not told how that was to be done, and how the teachers were to derive benefit. As to the proposal of a national rate, and also in the case of the compulsory principle, the measure would largely depend for its beneficial results on the way in which it was applied. Under the present circumstances of the election of Poor Law Guardians, and the manner in which the Boards were constituted, they would have to consider carefully that part of the Bill before it could be received with anything like approval. He had no intention of pledging himself or his Colleagues to support or disapprove of any of the provisions of the measure. All he would say was that it was less limited in its scope and more enterprizing in its character than he expected, and that, whatever its present defects as to remuneration and housing, he and his hon. Friends would endeavour, if they could, to make it in its ultimate shape a useful and workable measure.

MR. MELDON said, he would not criticize the proposal of the Government at any length at that moment. In the first instance, he must say that he was glad, even at that late day, to see some kind of tangible proposal brought forward by the Government. There was one observation which the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant had made with which he could not agree—namely, that the Executive Government had by their acts shown their disposition to improve the system of primary education in Ireland. The present Government, though pledged hilt deep to do something, had taken no steps to do anything since they came into power to redeem their pledges or forward education in Ireland. And now that they brought forward a Bill it was exceedingly unfair to mix up in it such a multiplicity of subjects. The present Government, as well as the late Government, were pledged as deeply they could be to remedy the defects of the system introduced in 1875 with regard to the Irish National Teachers. And what had they done now? Why, they had introduced a general Bill dealing with all educational questions which must necessarily, so far as he could understand it, raise many different and difficult matters for discussion, and which might very probably end in wrecking the measure. That, he thought, was not a fair thing for the Government to do. They should fulfil their pledges, and deal with the questions of remuneration and residences of teachers, without, in the same Bill, going into those vast educational questions raised in the measure—he referred particularly to the question of compulsory education. The Resolution passed by the House in favour of compulsory education was one to which nobody could take objection; but it really meant very little, for until they had a definite system of compulsion applicable to Ireland before them it was impossible for anyone to form an opinion as to whether they could support it or not. With regard to the observations of the hon. Gentleman who last addressed the House (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) on the question of teachers' residences, so far as he (Mr. Meldon) could see, the Bill appeared to be exceedingly satisfactory. Parliament had provided very large funds indeed for the purpose of teachers' residences; and the only reason, heretofore, why the large sums which had been voted had become utterly useless, and had been retained at the Treasury, had been the impossibility of acquiring the buildings. It had been pressed on the Government, as it had been urged on their Predecessors in Office, that the only way to bring about the desired result was to render the acquisition of the residences compulsory. No ground in Ireland should be taken for school residences unless it were proved to the Commissioners that the schools to which they were to be attached were fit places to continue as schools. The Commissioners were to blame for having neglected to improve the conditions in all but one or two exceptional cases. In the future they should see that the school was a proper one, and—what was equally important—that the residence was attached to the

school; and if the Bill did not provide for that at present he trusted it would be amended in order to insure that it should do so. With regard to the proposal to make the Act of 1875 compulsory—as it virtually was—he approved of it. Hon. Members might differ from him, but he might mention that the plan now proposed was not by any means a new one. It was proposed to the late Government in 1875—a plan of national rating was distinctly proposed to the then Chief Secretary, and had his thorough approval; but for some reason or other was objected to by the Treasury. The advantages of that system were very great. It would get rid of a vexed and difficult question—that was to say, the claims of School Boards and Boards of Guardians to interfere in educational matters in Ireland, which, to his mind, was a thing as detrimental to the interests of education in that country as anything could possibly be. The establishment of a system of rating would obviate that difficulty, which was a more important point than that called attention to by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary—namely, that the heaviest rate would be on the poorest Unions, which would be the least able to pay it. The question as to residences and national rate for supplementing the fund for paying results fees appeared to him to be, as far as they went, satisfactory. But he regretted to hear that there had been any decision come to upon the great question of results fees itself. That system was introduced in 1872 as a novel one, and he thought he might say that it had not worked satisfactorily. But in 1875 it was demonstrated that the system had been carried far enough, and that any further help to the National teachers must, in the future, be effected by adding very substantially to their salaries. He hoped that it was not because an opinion was expressed in some Memorial to the Government that the position of the teachers should not be improved by direct additions to their salaries that the course proposed had been decided upon. In regard to the payment of teachers by results there were considerations of the utmost importance which should induce the Government to abandon, at any rate, to a great extent, the development of a system which was injurious to the cause of education in Ireland, and was certainly most unjust to the very class of teachers in primary schools who most wanted help—namely, those who were most unsatisfactorily situated as regarded scholars, and to whom it was most difficult to obtain result fees. Those were the teachers who required the assistance most, and would get it least, if the system of result fees was extended. On those heads he had thought it only right to express his views to the House, in the hope that hon. Members would not make up their minds to pass the Bill in its entirety without necessity being shown for it in Committee, and without its being altered in some most material points.

MR. SEXTON said, he thought the last remark of the hon. and learned Gentleman who had just sat down was one which deserved the best attention of the Government. This was a very serious Bill—it dealt with some very grave and contentious matters, and it was indispensable that the Government should refrain from obstinately or stiffly making up their minds not to accept Amendments. If there was to be any hope of making progress with the measure, they must be prepared to accept such modifications as might be shown to be desirable. He agreed with the hon. and learned Member, when he called in question the conduct of the Government in mixing up in the Bill the question of the remuneration of the teachers with questions of a contentious character. The Government had acted in regard to the Bill pretty much as they had acted in regard to a Bill which was lately the subject of discussion in the House—that was to say, they had given a pledge that they would deal with one question, and had then brought in a Bill dealing with several. The Irish Members had expected a measure dealing with one subject; but they now found that the right hon. Gentleman not only proposed to legislate in the matter of the salaries of teachers, but to ask the assent of the House and the public to a proposition which certainly would not command the same general approval as that which had been made the subject of the pledge. He spoke in unreserved commendation of that part of the Bill which proposed to make compulsory the giving of sites for the residences of school teachers. Unquestionably, the absence of good schools and residences for teachers had been a great drawback to the cause of

education in Ireland; and if the provisions of the Bill in that respect answered the words of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman), and if the provisions were properly carried out by the Department in Dublin, much good would result. He thought, however, that it was a thing of evil omen for the future of the Bill that the essence of it was compulsion. Both as regarded attendance and the other objects of the Bill the method it was proposed to apply was force. Now, the principle of compulsory attendance was well, perhaps even requisite, in this country; but in a country like Ireland it would be found that the success, and even the practicability, of the principle would depend upon the discretion and the good judgment with which it was applied and worked out in the various localities. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) had quoted the Memorandum addressed to the Lord Lieutenant by the Bishops, in which document the Bishops expressed their approval of the system of payment by results. He (Mr. Sexton) would like to know if, before the Bishops sent the Memorandum to His Excellency, they had had laid before them the scheme which had been announced at the Table that night; did the Bishops know it was proposed to compel parents to send their children to school on 150 days in each year? There were only about 200 school days in a year, and the right hon. Gentleman would compel attendance on 150 out of that number. Did the right hon. Gentleman imagine that the agricultural operations in the spring, and in the harvest and potato seasons, would be covered by seven weeks? He (Mr. Sexton) ventured to say that 150 attendances in Ireland was in excess of the figure at which there was any hope of arriving. The people of Ireland were poor; they needed the assistance of their children in their fields; and therefore the figure mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman was in excess of the figure which could be applied. Moreover, if the compulsory system was to be successfully applied, or rather if they were to procure regular attendance at National schools, the system of education must be made one that would command the confidence of the people. He was bound to say that the two methods which the right hon. Gentleman proposed for the purpose of procuring regular attendance at school were two of the most questionable that could be suggested. If it were not that he was desirous of avoiding extreme language on this subject, he might employ a much stronger phrase. Now, with regard to the improvement of the condition of the teachers. It had always been contended by the teachers, and the associations of teachers, who had spoken upon this question for years past, that the one method of improving their condition was that of increasing their salaries. They were now told that that was the one method the Government would not adopt—that the result fees were to be increased. The right hon. Gentleman said it was always open to teachers to improve their rank by examination. He (Mr. Sexton) had shown that the system of examination for promotion was so surrounded by the interference and red tape of Marlborough Street, and so impeded by humiliations, that many a teacher who, by his own voluntary act, had presented himself for examination with a view of improving himself had retired, heartbroken, from the contest. They had not been told to what extent the emolument of the teacher would be improved—it might be little or more. The proposal was so vague that it was impossible to see to what extent it would meet the right of the teacher to a decent living. They were to have compulsion with regard to the local rate. While they were to have that compulsion, the question of results was to be governed by a Committee composed partly of the Board of Works, partly by managers nominated by the Government, and partly by the Board of Guardians. It was not known to what extent the Government proposed to give the ratepayers control over the system of education. He must say he was extremely surprised that, although lately an Irish Member of the House suggested a national rate of 1*d.* in the pound for a purpose more urgent than the present—namely, for keeping the roofs over the heads of the labourers of Ireland, and although a Select Committee was induced to assent to the proposal, the Bill brought in by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) made no reference to the proposal. If the right hon. Gentleman thought that a rate in aid was not a suitable proposal for improving the wretched homes

of the labourers of Ireland, his refusal on that subject would not recommend his present proposal. He (Mr. Sexton) stated frankly that upon the whole his first impression of this Bill was that the clause respecting compulsory attendance would not commend approval in Ireland, but would be regarded as arbitrary, injudicious, and ill-judged. He believed that until they brought the whole system of education in Ireland into accord with the popular sentiment of the country, and under popular government, a proposal to levy 1½*d.*, or even ¼*d.*, in the pound on the rates of Ireland, would not only be received with discontent, but would raise a storm of disapprobation, which it would be impossible to withstand. He had no expectation whatever that the Bill would be treated as a serious attempt to approach the solution of the Education Question; on the contrary, he thought the Bill would be immediately signalled out by public opinion of Ireland as adding to the long list of failures to legislate on the question.

COLONEL COLTHURST regretted very much the tone of the speech of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton). Having taken much interest in this subject for many years, and knowing something of the opinions of those most concerned in education in Ireland, he (Colonel Colthurst) believed there was a great deal of good in the Bill. He regarded the measure as an honest attempt to deal with some of the difficulties of the Irish National teachers. If they were establishing a new system some of the remarks of the hon. Member (Mr. Sexton) might be apposite; but this Bill, on the contrary, was merely intended to redress some of the grievances existing in the actual system. Now, as to the compulsory clauses of the Bill, he believed that a great many of the managers of schools in Ireland, especially in towns, wished for a modified compulsion. In the Irish towns there were many children running about the streets. Although there were schools in accord with their religious convictions, parents would not take the trouble to send their children to school, and therefore it was that the managers would welcome some compulsion. He was sorry to differ from his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Meldon), who he knew had greatly interested himself in this subject. He (Colonel Colthurst) believed that the addition to the teachers' salaries by result fees was a proper system. Seven or eight years ago the Bishops, or, at any rate, a great many of them, deprecated in the strongest terms any addition to the class salaries, but recommended the adoption of the system of results fees. It was incumbent upon the Government and upon Parliament to see that the teachers were in a position to earn their salaries, and without compulsory education he did not see how they could. As to the question of sites for residences, he believed the payment of £5 was but a very small burden to put upon a parish. As a matter of fact, the teacher was always very willing to bear half the burden—in some cases, even the whole of it. He (Colonel Colthurst) was sorry that the Bill had excited so much opposition as had been evinced that night; and he hoped that when the hon. Gentleman the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) and others came to gauge public opinion they would be inclined to look at the measure in a more favourable light.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he quite agreed with his hon. and gallant Friend who had just spoken in his views upon compulsion; and he thought his hon. Friend the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) was expressing what was really public opinion on the subject, when he said the principle of compulsion must be safely guarded where large masses of people were engaged in a deadly struggle with the severest forms of want, for that was no exaggerated description of the position of the population in Ireland. The Bill, universally acknowledged to be one of very great moment, was much more ambitious than he and his hon. Friends had anticipated; and they were entitled to make some complaint that matters that were still contentious were mingled in the Bill with matters that were thoroughly ripe for settlement. The Bill was ambitious, he said; but where he thought the Government were to blame was, that the Bill being so ambitious in one direction should be so abortive—so feeble in another. He would not go into the general question; but it was perfectly well known what was the real cause of the disinclination of the Irish people to compulsion, and he must say it seemed a very curious thing, that when the Government were making up their minds

to take so long a leap in the dark as to take up this question of compulsion, they did not at once decide to make the system of education more national, and governed by a body more representative of the people of the country. He was sure, if the Government were to take another step and make the Central Board of Education for Ireland a Board in which the people of Ireland could have confidence—he would not say now whether an elective Board or not—but, at any rate, a Board such as the people could accept as fairly representative of National instincts, then the feeling of all Ireland would be that they would more cheerfully subscribe the money for schools and teachers than for any other purpose to which the ratepayers were called upon to subscribe. He feared the Bill contained principles that would not work well together. But he would not commit himself to an opinion now—he and his hon. Friends would give to the measure that frank and honest consideration it deserved.

Mr. KENNY said, he approved of a system of compulsory education, and would be glad to see the principle applied in Ireland; but there were a great many circumstances in Ireland that prevented the application of the compulsory system in the same organized manner as in England. Not long since he had had the advantage of a conversation with a reverend gentleman, a friend of his, and a high authority on educational matters; and he expressed a decided doubt as to enforcing a system of compulsory education. He was a gentleman of whose judgment the Government would have a very high opinion; and in his view a Government system of compulsory education would have to be surrounded with many safeguards, or it would press irksomely on the people, and raise a feeling antagonistic to education. In Ireland everything was done to make it unpopular; whereas in England everything was done in the other direction, by such means as breakfasts and dinners for the children of the destitute poor. In Ireland, on the other hand, the comfort of the children was not consulted. In the depth of winter they had to travel miles to school sometimes, and they might often see the children carrying sods with them to keep up a fire to warm their schoolroom during the day. It would be almost impossible to enforce a system of compulsory education unless it were modified in accordance with the circumstances of the case. It was also an important matter to take into consideration the position of the assistant teachers. There were 2,000 or 3,000 of these, and they constituted an important element in the question, and something would have to be done to improve their condition. When did the Chief Secretary propose to circulate the Bill, and ask for the second reading?

Mr. O'BRIEN said, he would not enter upon the Bill in detail; but he wished to express agreement with his hon. Friend the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton), that the provisions in reference to compulsory education would meet with very grave and close scrutiny and suspicion in Ireland until they had a National and truly representative system. As to the unworkable character of its provisions he need only point to the West Coast, where for six months in the year the people were so miserably poor that it was perfectly idle to expect parents would send their children half-starved and half-clad along two miles of road to the schoolroom. The Chief Secretary would have to add insufficiency of food to the reasonable excuses for non-attendance. As to the provisions for improving the condition of teachers, he thought they would be received with hearty disfavour by teachers and ratepayers in Ireland. The proposal to confine the improvement in their condition to results fees entirely was flying in the face of all the National teachers had been demanding and agitating for years. The proposal to lay an enormous burden on the local rates was certain to meet with fierce resistance. There was a storm of indignation rising in Ireland at the extent to which the local rates were burdened and overloaded. The people were crushed—the ratepayers were crushed—with all sorts of taxes, the Blood Tax, the Extra Police Tax—the charges for Parliamentary registration, and all the rest of them, and public opinion in Ireland would be directly opposed to the proposal. The Irish people paid something over £8,000,000 a-year in taxes, besides the millions that found their way to England in the way of absenteeism for rent. With this constant drain, and considering the vast sum paid for dragooning them, the people might fairly ask the Government to

expend something like £700,000 on education, instead of laying £100,000 a-year additional charge on the rate-payers.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Mr. SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND, and Mr. HIBBERT.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 111.]

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said, the Bill would be circulated immediately—to-morrow, he hoped.

TELEGRAPH ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Telegraph Acts, 1863 to 1878."—(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre.*)

Debate arising.

Debate *adjourned* till *Thursday.*

POLICE BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HENRY H. FOWLER, Bill to make provision respecting the pensions, allowances, and gratuities of Police Constables in Great Britain, and their widows and children, and to make other provisions respecting the Police of Great Britain, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HENRY H. FOWLER, Secretary Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, The Lord ADVOCATE, and Mr. HIBBERT.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 113.]

COUNTY OFFICERS AND COURTS (IRELAND) [PENSIONS] BILL.

Resolution [March 23] *reported*, and *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN and Mr. SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 112.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 25th March, 1885.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS — *Ordered—First Reading* — Public Health (Members and Officers) * [114].

Committee—Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) (*re-comm.*) [49]—R.P. [*Tenth Night*].

Third Reading—Cape of Good Hope (Advance) * [101]; Consolidated Fund (No. 2), and *passed.*

ORDER OF THE DAY.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (REDISTRIBUTION) (*re-committed*) BILL.—[BILL 49.]

(*Mr. Gladstone, The Marquess of Hartington, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Attorney General, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 24th March.*]

[TENTH NIGHT.]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

FIFTH SCHEDULE.

CONTENTS AND BOUNDARIES OF BOROUGHS WITH ALTERED BOUNDARIES.

MR. LEWIS moved, in page 22, line 23, to leave out—

"Warwick—the present Parliamentary borough of Warwick, and the Municipal borough of Royal, Leamington, Spa, and the Local Government districts of Milverton and Lillington."

The hon. Gentleman said, that in introducing this Amendment it was necessary that he should explain, in the first instance, the course he proposed to pursue. He had intended to move the insertion of Warwick in Schedule No. 1; but circumstances, over which he had no control, had prevented him from being in his place at the time it was necessary to make that Motion. The object of the present Motion was to exclude from Schedule 5 the proposal to extend the boundaries of the borough of Warwick by including Leamington and two other outlying parishes. If he were successful in carrying the Motion, the course he would then take would be, on the Report, to move to insert "Warwick" in Schedule No. 1, among the boroughs which were to cease to return a Member. But in point of fact there was some little convenience in taking the course he was now about to take—namely, in asking the Committee to decide, in the first instance, what was to be done in regard to the question of the extension of boundaries. He assumed, on the one hand, that if the Committee were against the extension of the borough boundaries of Warwick, they would, on the Report, be prepared to include the borough in the disfranchising Schedule; whereas, on the other hand, if the Committee were of opinion that

the boundaries of the borough should be extended by including Leamington and other parishes, it would not be necessary to discuss the question further. What were the facts of the case? The facts were that the borough of Warwick, according to the Census of 1881, had a population of over 11,000. He was not in a position to say that the borough of Warwick was a decaying borough, because he believed that, as a matter of fact, the population had somewhat increased during the last 15 or 20 years, but not to any considerable extent. It was now proposed—and it would be presently seen why the proposal was made—to add to the borough of Warwick not a less quantity, as in the ordinary case of a borough extension, but a much greater quantity, outside. In other words, it was proposed to include with Warwick and its population of 11,000 an outside constituency of more than 26,000. It was not adding the less to the greater, but adding the greater to the less. It would, no doubt, be contended by the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke) that Leamington and Warwick were continuous places; and he believed, as a matter of fact, that there were villas from Leamington on one road, stretching between Leamington and Warwick, so as to justify the statement that one continuous line might be traced between the two towns; but it was only on one road and on one side. Why was it that this proposed extension of the borough boundaries was proposod? It was simply to save the borough of Warwick from falling into the hard-and-fast and irrefragable line which they had heard from the Government, over and over again, formed one of the main principles of the Bill. From first to last there had been two leading vital principles upon which the Government proceeded. The first was to disfranchise, absolutely, every existing constituency which did not possess 15,000 inhabitants, totally irrespective of collateral considerations, of historic associations, or the possibility of extending the boundaries so as to make up 15,000. Ruthlessly, without any exception, a borough not having 15,000 was to be disfranchised. He stated that boldly, emphatically, and authoritatively. There was to be no exception, under any circumstances, which was to be allowed or permitted by the Government to interfere with this leading and vital principle of the Bill. What was the second vital principle of the measure? It was that boroughs not having 50,000 inhabitants should lose one Member, and the Schedule of disfranchisement No. 1 had been framed on the strictest and most fair lines applicable to all boroughs that were obnoxious to the first of these leading principles. Hon. Members would find in Schedule 1 that the result had been to include no less than 103 constituencies, which were wholly disfranchised, because they had not had a sufficient amount of population to exclude them from the disfranchising clause. That was the position of matters as regarded the proposal of the Government. But how did the Government proceed to carry it out from the Treasury Bench? Within the last three or four days, in reference to Scotland, the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy (Mr. Trevelyan) stated that it was one of the vital principles of the Government in regard to the Bill that no borough in Scotland, not at present enfranchised, should be added to an existing group of boroughs that was enfranchised. They laid that down in the broadest and most distinct manner, and they resisted any breaking in upon that vital principle of the Bill by refusing to add any Scotch borough from any Scotch county in order to extend the boundaries of an existing group. He should have thought that, under those circumstances, it would have been utterly impossible for the Government to present the case of Warwick to the Committee with the hope of obtaining support, and maintaining the proposal they made. Why should not Warwick fall? Was it because there were no cases that were similar to it? If so, he could mention cases infinitely better. There were some scores of boroughs in the disfranchising Schedule No. 1, many of which could make a far better case than Warwick, and each of which could make some case in favour of the extension of the borough boundaries, in order to exclude them from the disfranchising rule. But what did the Committee see? Why, that whenever any number of cases were brought forward for the purpose of justifying an appeal to the clemency of the Government and of the House, in order to avoid the disfranchisement of some ancient

borough having special claims for consideration, and distinct interests, the one ruthless answer given was—"By the hard-and-fast line we have laid down you are within the disfranchising rule." As the tree falls so it must lie; *non possumus*—the Government must apply the principle. He ventured to say that there had not been the slightest declension to the extent of one line, or one word, or one item, from this leading principle in the way in which the Government had hitherto proceeded. No doubt the Committee would be told two things. They would hear, in the first place, that Warwick was an old city; they would hear that it was a very respectable place; and they would hear, further, that it had a very respectable and fashionable neighbour. But if it took a fashionable neighbour into partnership, or formed a marriage tie with it, was that any reason for appealing to the clemency of the House or of the Government? Was there ever heard such a case as this? Was there any case so weak? The proposal was to convert a very small place with 11,000 inhabitants into a respectable borough by adding to it an outside population of 26,000. The Committee would secondly be told what the recommendations were of the Boundary Commission in 1868. There had been several attempts to draw the Government Front Bench on that subject during the progress of the Bill through Committee. When cases worse than that of Warwick were proposed to be dealt with, and the Government had been taunted with the difference of treatment, the recommendations of the Boundary Commission of 1868 to extend the area of Warwick had been referred to. But in order to show how fallacious that argument was he would remind hon. Gentlemen of the circumstances under which that Boundary Commission was appointed. In 1867 the Reform Bill for England was passed and came into law. By that Reform Bill the borough of Warwick was not only saved from extinction, but was entitled to retain its two Members; and for the purpose of justifying the retention of two Members a Boundary Commission was issued which required all boroughs, in regard to which an extension of boundaries was proposed, to go before the Commission and have their case inquired into. That being so, the case of Warwick, already declared entitled to retain its representation by two Members, went before the Boundary Commissioners, who recommended that Leamington should be included within the borough of Warwick. But did it lie in the mouth of Liberal Members to appeal to the Boundary Commission of 1868, seeing that no sooner were the results of the investigation of that Commission made known than they were deliberately violated by the Liberal Party, and contemptuously thrown on one side by a Committee of this House being appointed to revise the Returns of the Commissioners. If hon. Members would take up the Report of the Commissioners of 1868 and go alphabetically through it they would find that the House of Commons, altogether irrespective of Warwick, declined to adopt the recommendations of the Commissioners. The first case was that of Birkenhead, where a large extension of the borough boundaries was recommended; but the recommendation was thrown on one side. The same course was pursued in the case of Birmingham, where also a large extension was recommended. It was not convenient for the Liberal Party to carry out that extension, because it was strongly obnoxious to the Members for Birmingham that Aston Manor should be included within the borough boundaries. Therefore, the Report of the Commissioners was contemptuously thrown aside by the Liberal Party. The Boundary Commission of 1868 was issued in totally different circumstances from the Boundary Commission of the present year. The former Commission was issued after the lines of representation, and the number of Members each place was entitled to return had been settled. Therefore it was not for the purpose of saving the reputation of Warwick, or for entitling it to two Members as against one; but it was altogether as an independent matter of inquiry that the last Commission was appointed. He had adverted to the vital principles of the Bill as expounded by the Government. He would now invite hon. Members to see what it was that the Government had already done in Committee on this Bill. In the case of the borough of Lisburn it was proposed to save it by extending its boundaries. That proposal was strenuously resisted by Her Majesty's Government. Lisburn had a

few more inhabitants than the borough of Warwick, and it was proposed to save its representation as one of the seats of one of the greatest and most important industries in Ireland by giving her an extension of boundary. By the proposed extension, as the Committee would recollect, sufficient population would have been included as was now proposed in the case of Warwick. But Her Majesty's Government set their face against it; the proposal could not be carried out, and Lisburn must fall. He would take another case that was stronger still—the case of Drogheda—which was a very remarkable one. In that case it was proposed to extend the boundaries of the borough by continuing a line of streets that already formed part of the borough. It was quite true that the line would have to be extended into the country, more or less, in order to make the population sufficient; but it was not necessary to go out of the leading street of Drogheda in order to extend the boundaries. That proposal was also resisted by Her Majesty's Government, and successfully resisted. He came next to the case of Limerick, where it was not a question of preventing disfranchisement, but of saving one Member out of two. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board appeared to be very much struck with the position of Limerick, and gave it that cold icicle sort of sympathy which enabled him to indulge in bland and smooth words, and yet ruthlessly to throw the claims of the city aside. Limerick also was sent empty-handed away. Then there was the remarkable case of the old borough of Wigan, in Lancashire, with all its traditions and history, and its great commercial prosperity. The borough of Wigan had an exceptional case to rely upon, because in 1881, when the Census was taken, there happened to be a strike, and a great many of the inhabitants were temporarily away. They were told that the population of Wigan was not quite 50,000 on the precise night the Census was taken. The Government, therefore, said—"We cannot assist you; we must judge you according to the existing circumstances. You say that you have a good case; so have many other boroughs. We are sorry for you, but we cannot help other boroughs, and, therefore, we cannot help you." Under these circumstances why had the Government stretched out their right hand for the purpose of saving Warwick? They had adopted the *non possumus* argument in every other case. For what special reason did they now extend a hand for the purpose of preventing Warwick from being disfranchised? It was very remarkable that two of the things which smelt most—to use no stronger expression—two of the things which smelt most in the Bill succeeded one another. They had last night a case that smelt a good deal, and now they had another which smelt a little, and perhaps there might be a third. It was very remarkable that the Government could not keep their hands from doing these dubious things, and thereby spoiling a measure of otherwise goodly structure. He should have to show another case by-and-bye in connection with a town represented by a Member of the Government, where a third exception had been made for the benefit of somebody, or of some party or other. He would not go into that case at the present moment; he would only say that it was not a case of disfranchisement, but rather a case of extension of representation. All he would point out was, that it had been over and over again laid down by the Government that when any borough constituency had fallen below 15,000 in the case of a single Member, or of 50,000 in the case of two seats, the rule, without a single exception, was to be disfranchisement. In many cases the knife had already been applied, and the borough affected had not been allowed to save its life by extending its boundaries, however easily that might have been done. Now, he thought he had said enough to justify him in appealing to the Committee very confidently and earnestly to accept this Amendment, and not to spoil the measure by putting such a dubious piece of work into the Bill as this particular enfranchisement, or saving from disfranchisement, really was. There was one thing which, throughout the Sittings of the Committee, had been remarkable—namely, the genial manner and the pleasant way in which the President of the Local Government Board had conducted the Bill. But, in conducting it, the right hon. Gentleman had always one strong standpoint. He had been appealed to from all parts of

the country and from all parts of the House not to effect a particular disfranchisement, or to consent to some enfranchisement; and after he had used every argument which the circumstances of the case in any way justified, he always wound up as a clincher that the proposal submitted to the Committee would not only violate the leading principles of the Act, and place the Government in a difficulty in regard to every other constituency; "but," said the right hon. Gentleman, "you have not told us where we are to get the seat." That had been the standpoint of the right hon. Gentleman on every occasion; and whenever any addition of Members was suggested, no matter whether in connection with a borough or a county, all the ravenous wolves and birds of prey seeking some addition to themselves that could be conceived were ready to join together as allies in resisting the proposal. But on this occasion the right hon. Gentleman could not rest upon his *non possumus*. He (Mr. Lewis) was not asking the right hon. Gentleman to take a seat from any other place. He was simply asking the Committee to be consistent, and not to give this particular seat. The only effect of adopting the Amendment would be that the Committee would have one more seat to give away to some deserving mendicant, or the number of the House would not be increased by one, and would be only an increase of 11 instead of 12. He thought he had stated a pretty strong case for the consideration of the Committee. He wanted to know what the inhabitants of the 103 boroughs, which were totally disfranchised by the Bill, would think of the fairness and justice of the Government, and the fairness and justice of the House, when the circumstances came to their knowledge which he had ventured to relate to the Committee, and which could not be disputed? What would the disfranchised constituencies say? They must be convinced that there was favouritism somewhere; and he could not help thinking that the Bill would be discredited in its birth by such a defacement as the particular proposal now contained in it involved. He thought it was deeply to be regretted that one of the evil results of that ill-starred compact between the two Front Benches—ill-starred not in its inception and design, but in the way in which it had been carried out to its extremity—was that it had deprived independent Members on his side of the House of the assistance, on this occasion, of any single Member of their Front Bench. On such a subject as this it might have been desired and expected that an independent tone would have been heard even from the leading Members of the Opposition Bench, in order that fair play and justice might be maintained throughout the whole of the proceedings upon this Bill. He knew that he should be beaten. He was perfectly content to be beaten, because he believed that on this, as on other occasions, the victory would be with those who, without any organization, without the power of appealing to Party Leaders, had presented so strong a case, and one entitling it, at all events, to a considerable amount of support in the interests of equity, justice, and fair play.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if the hon. Gentleman moved the Amendment?

MR. LEWIS: Yes.

Amendment proposed,

In page 22, line 23, to leave out from the word "Warwick," to the word "Lillington," in line 26, both inclusive.—(*Mr. Lewis.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he should like, in the first place, to correct a misapprehension on the part of the hon. Member. He hoped the hon. Member would accept his assurance that there was no Party consideration involved in this particular case.

MR. LEWIS said, that he had never used the words "Party consideration" at all.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the hon. Member had spoken of another instance of favouritism, although he did not speak of it by name, which had been extended in a similar way to a borough now represented by a Member of the Government. He happened to know the borough to which the hon. Member alluded, although it had not been mentioned. No doubt it had been talked of.

MR. LEWIS remarked, that it need not have been talked of in order to be known.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he could assure the hon. Gentleman that,

so far from there being any Party feeling in the matter in either of the cases mentioned, Party consideration told in the opposite direction to that which had been suggested. It was impossible that there could be any Party interests for the Government to serve in connection with the present case. He certainly could not think that Warwickshire was the county to which the Liberal Party would wish to give five seats instead of four, seeing that there was much more probability of those seats being occupied by Members of the Conservative Party than of the Liberal Party obtaining any large share of them. But, putting aside any question of Party bearing in the particular case now before the Committee, he was prepared to argue the question on its own merits, entirely apart from Party considerations. The hon. Member had referred to his (Sir Charles W. Dilke's) statement with regard to the Boundary Commission of 1868. He would ask hon. Members, who took a special interest in this case, to look at the map appended to the Report of the Commission of 1868 as well as the map of the present year. There was already in the possession of the House the map appended to the Report of the Boundary Commission of 1868, and there was also a map of Warwick and Leamington made in the present year. In the first instance, it did not rest with the hon. Member to say that the Liberal Party in 1868 opposed the proposals of the Boundary Commissioners of that year. The hon. Member had not told the Committee that in the present Bill the Government had generally reversed the position taken up by the Liberal Party in 1868 with regard to borough extensions, and had incorporated in the case of something like 40 boroughs the proposals which were made by the Commissioners in 1868, and which were opposed by the Liberal Party on that occasion. That was part of the agreement made between the two Front Benches, and it was supposed, generally speaking, to be satisfactory to hon. Members opposite. On the whole, it was the doctrine of the Party opposite that the borough boundaries should be extended rather than urban populations should be added to the counties, and the Government had endeavoured to meet that view. So much for the general consideration. As to this particular case, and the Report of the Boundary Commissioners of 1868, the Commissioners in that year reported that it was ascertained at a public inquiry that the interests of the two towns of Warwick and Leamington were identical, that the majority of the inhabitants desired the extension of boundaries so as to include both towns in one borough, and as Leamington was rapidly extending into Milverton and Lillington, that the extension should include those places. There was constant communication and trade between the two towns, which were connected by a high road lighted throughout by gas, and a tramway from Leamington Railway Station to the centre of the town of Warwick. The area of Warwick is 5,512 acres, of Leamington 1,720, of Milverton, 1,180, and of Lillington 1,305, making a total of 9,717. The town of Leamington, and the parishes of Leamington Priors, Milverton, and Lillington, adjoined the borough of Warwick. Leamington, which was joined to Warwick by an almost continuous line of houses, had originally sprung into existence as a watering place, and had now become a considerable town, containing a large number of permanent residences. It was also a large and important agricultural centre; and there was every prospect, not only of the further extension of the town, but of the three parishes of Leamington Priors, Milverton, and Lillington. The proposition of the Commissioners in 1868 was rejected by Parliament, chiefly owing to the fact that the Liberal Party, which possessed then a large majority, was opposed, not in any special manner, to this extension, but to all extension of boroughs. The Liberal Party fought all the cases of borough extension, and in most instances they fought them successfully.

MR. BIGGAR: How about Drogheda?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he really could not pursue suggestions of this kind further. It was felt that, unless there was a general assent, the population which it had been proposed to throw into the boroughs could not be taken from the counties. He now came to the present circumstances of Warwick and Leamington. Whatever might have been the consideration of the proposal for the extension of the boundaries of Warwick in 1868, the case was much

stronger now. There could be no doubt that between the urban population, of which Warwick was the chief centre, and the urban population, of which Leamington was the chief centre, there was a continuous line of houses. The houses between Warwick and Leamington, which in 1868 were said to be almost continuous, had now become quite continuous. That was the present condition of affairs, and hon. Members would understand the extension that had taken place by comparing the present map with that of 1868. The Commissioners this year recommended exactly the same extension as was proposed in 1868, and these were their words—

"This extension is the same as that proposed by the Boundary Commission appointed in 1867, and Warwick and Leamington may be said to form practically one continuous town."

That was really the case, for what was almost continuous in 1867 had become quite continuous now. There were houses the whole way between the two towns. Having regard to the general proposal for extending borough boundaries, as submitted to Parliament in 1868, this was one of the most proper and fair extensions that could be made. He had only a word or two more to say. There could be no doubt that the inhabitants of Leamington would prefer a borough representation, in conjunction with Warwick, to a county representation; and they would prefer it in the way proposed by the present Bill. He was not now raising the question of name, because he knew there would be a difference upon that point. The area of the proposed borough had been represented as being very large, and it had been stated that the two places were only connected by a neck of land. Neither of those statements was true. The area was not large, and the population was more than four to an acre, which was very much more considerable than in the cases which had been named by the hon. Member. In this case the population was over four to the acre; whereas, in the two other cases mentioned, it was only one to the acre, and it would be seen by a reference to the map that the common boundary was five miles in length.

MR. SEXTON asked what the area was?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the area was 9,000 acres, and the common boundary was five miles in length. The hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis) had spoken of Leamington being a flourishing and increasing town, and had referred to Warwick as a decaying and decreasing town; whereas, as a matter of fact, the increase in Warwick was slightly higher than in Leamington. Since 1871 the increase of the two boroughs had been from 34,000 to close upon 38,000.

MR. LEWIS remarked that the right hon. Gentleman had not given the increase of Warwick, but only the increase of the two boroughs in common.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the Return in his hand showed a common increase; but, as a matter of fact, the increase was slightly greater in the case of Warwick than in that of Leamington, the increase of the two having been in the 10 years from 34,000 to 38,000. On those grounds, therefore, he thought he had made out a fair case for maintaining the proposals of the Bill.

MR. SAMPSON LLOYD wished to say one word upon this question before the Amendment was disposed of. He had always deplored that, in regard to the disfranchisement of a constituency, the number of a population deemed necessary to justify disfranchisement had been fixed as low as 15,000. He believed that the lowering of the number to 15,000 would deprive the House of many men it could ill afford to lose—men of great ability and business experience. He had, therefore, cast in his lot with the Scotch Members on several occasions when he thought a borough was being hardly dealt with. He desired now to say a word in favour of the retention of the borough of Warwick, because he thought that it stood upon the same principle. There was a strong feeling in Warwickshire in favour of the retention of the representation of that borough. No doubt, the population was below 15,000, but it had a fair claim to take in an adjoining town which was rapidly increasing; and he believed that if the Census were to be taken to-morrow, instead of having been taken in 1881, the population of the borough of Warwick itself would approach much more nearly the limit for a single Member than it did four years ago. The Committee ought not altogether to disregard the fact that Warwickshire was being deprived of one Member for the ancient

city of Coventry, while a mass of Members was being heaped upon Birmingham, the bulk of whom must necessarily be persons representing the interests of one particular class. He therefore felt that he was justified in doing all he could to secure the retention, where possible, of one or two Members who did not represent the great mass of Birmingham interests, but who would represent distinct and varied interests. He considered that Warwick was in that position, and he therefore hoped that the Committee would retain the representation of the borough by including within the boundaries the town of Leamington. There was a strong feeling, both in Warwick and Leamington, in favour of the proposal of the Government. As far as he had been able to hear, there was no opposition whatever in the locality to the proposal contained in the Bill; and, so far as Party considerations were concerned, he did not believe that either the Conservatives or the Liberals knew which would gain by the arrangement either in one way or another. He therefore supported the proposition of the Government to retain the borough of Warwick.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, he had not hitherto troubled the Committee with a single word upon the Schedules of the Bill, and he would not have felt disposed to make any observations now if this had not been the first proposal to disfranchise a borough which had an extension of its boundaries. As he took great interest in the question of the disfranchisement of small boroughs, he desired to say a word upon the subject. He thought that the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had never justified more the compliment paid to him by the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis) than he had in regard to the Report of the Boundary Commissioners of 1868, because, although it was perfectly true, as the right hon. Gentleman stated, that the Government had adopted many of the recommendations of that Commission by extending the Parliamentary boundaries so as to reach the municipal boundaries, and in so doing no objection had been raised in any quarter, yet it was not proposed to extend the boundaries of Warwick to any municipal limit, but to include another and a separate municipal borough within the boundaries of Warwick. The question, therefore, was whether the Committee should retain in the Bill, not the borough of Warwick, but the borough of Warwick made into a borough of 30,000 or 40,000 people by adding another borough to it. That was the question they had to consider, and the difficulty he felt in taking part in the discussion of the Schedules of the Bill was that he was unwilling to take action in regard to a single and individual case. He had made an humble effort, on the clauses of the Bill, to deal with the matter as a question of principle; and if his wishes had been carried out there would have been no borough in the United Kingdom with a population of less than 50,000 returning a Member to that House. That, however, was impossible under the present arrangement of the Bill, and he was not disposed to disturb that arrangement by entering into individual cases. He would illustrate the matter by a case which must be familiar to the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would forgive him if he referred to the borough which he (Sir Arthur Otway) represented—the borough of Rochester. The borough of Rochester included the borough of Strood, which borough was separated from the City of Rochester by an interval longer than any which separated the boroughs of Warwick and Leamington. [MR. LEWIS: No!] He knew both boroughs very well, and certainly between Rochester and Strood there was a longer interval without a house than between Warwick and Leamington. Nevertheless, the town of Strood and the City of Rochester were combined, in order to send a Representative to Parliament; and, so far as he was concerned, he would rather disfranchise the City of Rochester, with 25,000 population, including Strood, than he would disfranchise the borough of Warwick, because those who had arranged the provisions of the Bill had provided for the new constituency a much larger population. For that reason he was not disposed to enter into individual cases; but he would prefer to lump all the small boroughs together and get rid of them, if it were possible that that could be done, rather than single out particular constituencies. Certainly, although the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr.

Lewis) had brought various cases before the Committee, he had not cited any parallel case to that of Warwick. As a matter of fact, there really was none, so far as he (Mr. Arnold) was aware of. The case of Warwick stood absolutely and entirely alone. The district it was proposed to include was in the same watershed, and the two towns formed one united urban district. Anyone dealing with the county of Warwick would certainly regard the district occupied by Warwick and Leamington as a continuous urban district. He would only express a hope that when the united boroughs of Warwick and Leamington had Parliamentary representation, they would very soon afterwards place themselves under the same municipal government.

MR. REPTON said, that his hon. Friend the Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis) had given him Notice that he intended to make this proposal. On a previous occasion, in 1867, he (Mr. Repton) had successfully resisted a proposition for the union of the two boroughs of Warwick and Leamington, and he was prepared to do so again if he saw the slightest chance of success. The question had now come to this—whether Warwick was to be blotted out altogether, or united with Leamington for the purpose of Parliamentary representation. He would certainly prefer that it should continue to be represented, even on the condition of an alliance with Leamington. The connection between the two places was daily becoming more close. Year after year lines of houses were springing up between them; and he was bound to say that, to all intents and purposes, they were virtually the same town. Many persons who were engaged in business in Warwick resided in Leamington; and, in some instances, persons engaged in business in Leamington resided in Warwick. As the sitting Member for Warwick, in conjunction with the right hon. Gentleman who filled the Chair of the House, and who, from the position he occupied, was unable to take part in the debate, he supported the proposal of the Government; and he was authorized to say that his right hon. Colleague took the same view that he did. He regretted the necessity of the case; but, in fairness and justice, he was bound to say that if ever there was a case in which any town in the Kingdom might properly be united to another it was this. As he had stated, the two places virtually formed one town; there was no distinction between them, no intervening fields, no turnpike, but a strong and steadily-growing community of interests. Under those circumstances, much as he disliked the proposal, he felt that he could not do otherwise than support it.

MR. SEXTON said, the hon. Member who had just addressed the Committee was one of the sitting Members for the town of Warwick; and therefore the speech he had just delivered had been delivered in performance of a function which could scarcely be avoided. No one was obliged to consent to his own execution. The right hon. Gentleman who recently addressed the Committee assured the Committee that there was a strong feeling in Warwick and Leamington in favour of the Ministerial proposal. No doubt there was, for it was obvious that Warwick and Leamington would rather have a Member in that House than be without one. The hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis), who moved the Amendment, had expressed some apprehension that he would be beaten. Well, after having heard the speech of the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill, what was only an assumption before that speech was delivered had become a certainty now. It was impossible to suppose that the Amendment would be carried. He (Mr. Sexton) and his Friends below the Gangway were so accustomed to be beaten that that fact did not affect their action. The habit of defeat was so settled that they would probably regard success on any occasion as an uncomfortable novelty. The right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill had taunted, somewhat unjustly, the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis) with having made Party references. He (Mr. Sexton) had certainly never heard a speech delivered by the hon. Member for Londonderry more free from Party references. The hon. Member appeared, throughout his speech, to adhere rigidly to a purely arithmetical line. He had urged the case on the principle of numbers laid down by the Government themselves; and so far was he from making anything that could be called a Party reference that the most earnest passage in his speech, and that in which he

put forward his most conclusive and effective point, was the one in which he acknowledged that it was impossible to say which political Party would gain by the adoption of the Amendment. Therefore, the hon. Member had not laid himself open to the taunt that he was actuated by Party motives. There was another reason why it might be said that Party references did not form any portion of the argument in this case, because the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill, when he rose at the Table, had proceeded to maintain this extraordinary and grotesque proposal in face of the fact that his own Party, in the year 1868, discredited and rejected the very plan of the Boundary Commissioners on which the right hon. Gentleman now proposed to act. Therefore, there could be nothing of a Party character in the case.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the hon. Member, in order that he might be quite accurate, would perhaps allow him to say that his statement with regard to the Liberal Party opposing the proposals of the Boundary Comsioners in 1868 had a general reference, rather than a reference to any particular case. No doubt, they did oppose this particular case, among a variety of others. They had a majority in the House of Commons, and a majority in the Committee, by which the plan of the Commissioners was rejected; but, as a matter of fact, the Conservative Party opposed this particular proposal, whereas the Liberal Party supported it.

MR. SEXTON: The Liberal Party in Warwick?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Yes.

MR. SEXTON said, the position of the two Parties seemed now to have been reversed in regard to this particular case. The only other remark he would make was that the course pursued by the right hon. Gentleman reflected the highest credit upon his ingenuity, for it had certainly been carried to a considerable state of development in the course of his arguments upon the Bill. It had now reached its climax. The right hon. Gentleman said the rejection of the proposals of the Boundary Commissioners in 1868 by the Liberal Party was not a rejection in this particular case, but a general rejection. The general rejection, however, included this particular case, because within it was included the rejection of the proposal to unite the towns of Warwick and Leamington. He would have thought that if there were any borough in the United Kingdom with regard to which the Government would have been specially careful to adhere to the line laid down by themselves, and to give no ground whatever for discontent or for severe criticism, it would have been the borough of Warwick. It was unnecessary, perhaps, that he should pursue this part of the subject further; but he might say that he entertained too high a respect for the intellect of the right hon. Gentleman to suppose that the proposition which the right hon. Gentleman now found himself unfortunately bound to defend had sprung from his own independent intelligence. He was convinced that, in the volition of his own mind, the right hon. Baronet would never have proposed the extension of the borough of Warwick so as to include the town of Leamington; and whoever had suggested to the Government the proposal which the right hon. Baronet was obliged to defend was certainly a very bad adviser. He had no doubt that if the position of the right hon. Baronet allowed him to express with his tongue the sentiment which existed in his mind, he would be prepared to emphasize the remark that he (Mr. Sexton) was then making. The right hon. Gentleman was nothing if he was not ingenious, and it was no discredit to his ingenuity to say that he was unable to speak with the same effect where no ingenuity was required. He would now examine the arguments with which the right hon. Baronet had endeavoured to support his case. How, he would ask, had the case of Warwick been altered since 1868, when the Liberal Party rejected the proposal of the Boundary Commissioners? The right hon. Gentleman said that the case was stronger now—that the houses, which were not continuous then upon the road between Leamington and Warwick, were continuous. Then it had come to this—that the question of a mile of road, or a question of 200 or 300 houses, was sufficient to govern the disfranchisement of a constituency. The hon. Baronet sitting near him (Sir Eardley Wilmot) was one of the Members for Warwickshire, and he was assured by the hon. Baronet that the statement of the President of the Local

Government Board was incorrect, and that the line of houses between Leamington and Warwick was not continuous at all. [Sir CHARLES W. DILKE dissented.] He held in his hand a map of Leamington and Warwick, and it appeared to him that, at one part of the road between the two towns, there was a mill which seemed to stand by itself in solitary grandeur. Certainly, the map did not convey the impression of a continuous line of houses upon the road. He would, however, put that argument on one side, as not deserving attention for one moment. The right hon. Baronet told them that the Boundary Commissioners, on whose Report they were now acting, recommended the boundary drawn on the map; but he had left out of view the Instructions to the Commissioners. It would seem that, in regard to the Schedules of the Bill, the Commissioners were instructed to make the boundaries as they had actually been made, and as they were officially bound to do. The right hon. Baronet, therefore, had no right to urge as an argument the perfunctory recommendation made by the Commissioners in pursuance of their Instructions. The right hon. Baronet was so hard driven that he cited the fact of a tramway running between the two towns as a reason why they should be joined in Parliamentary representation. But although one tramway was good enough for Warwick and Leamington, four tramways were not good enough for Dublin. He had shown the right hon. Gentleman that the people from the outlying townships went to their places of business in the morning and returned in the evening, and that their incomes were earned in the City of Dublin; but while a single tramway was important in the case of an English 'borough, four tramways were of no account in the case of a great Irish city. It was said that Warwick was increasing rapidly. How rapidly? From 1871 to 1881 it had actually increased by 800. It was thus increasing at the rate of 80 a-year. As a matter of fact, Warwick was a totally insignificant, and practically a stationary town; and there was nothing in the case of Warwick, either in its population, its commercial importance, or in any other particular, to entitle it to be selected for special favour. It was totally an unimportant place, and the source of inspiration must be looked for somewhere else. What was the area of the borough? The proposed borough of Warwick, with a population of 37,000, had an area of 9,000 acres. What a contrast there was between this case and the case which he had pleaded before the Committee last night. He had asked that the City of Dublin, with a population of 237,000, should be extended so as to include 40,000 more, and he had pointed out that the borough thus extended would only cover an area of 13,000 acres, and that it would simply cut off an insignificant part of the county. The total addition would be some 9,000 acres; but the Committee and the Government refused to accede to the proposal. Yet they were prepared to give a Member to the borough of Warwick with a population of 37,000, almost 10 times less than Dublin, and with an area nearly as large. Reference had been made to the cases of Drogheda and Limerick. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General, whose mind was cast in an exact and accurate mould, who was pre-eminently a man of facts, and who never allowed himself to soar from practical regions into the realms of rhetoric—he would ask the right hon. Gentleman if he could in any way explain the contrast between the treatment of Drogheda under the Bill and the treatment of Warwick? The Committee had a map before them, and it would be seen that the town of Warwick was a mere speck. In the centre of a large rural area from that town, a mile and a-half distant, there appeared to be another town represented by another speck in the middle of a rural district. And then this gross political indecency was perpetrated—that while in the case of an Irish borough, with a population of 14,700, they refused to add a street which already belonged to the town, in order to bring the population up to the specified limit, they proposed in the present case to consider a hybrid monstrosity composed of two towns and a large extent of property extending over 2,000 acres. He asked the Postmaster General to apply himself to the consideration of that contrast. In the case of Limerick it was only necessary to include a small village on the verge of the present Parliamentary boundary in order to en-

title that city to retain two Members. That proposal was refused, and it would appear that the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill adopted a kind of kaleidoscopic argument, taking one view one day and another another. The right hon. Gentleman capered about like a Merry Andrew, taking whatever posture the particular proposal before the Committee seemed to warrant. He maintained that to concede representation to the joint borough of Warwick and Leamington would be an offence against the general principles both of borough and county representation under the Bill, whether as applied to the English, the Irish, or the Scotch constituencies. What was the collateral effect of retaining this borough? It was this—that the county of Warwick had 30,000 taken out of it which ought to be retained in it, and by this means the county of Warwick became the smallest four-Member county in England. Would the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General explain how it was that Warwickshire would have one Member for every 47,000 inhabitants, while the county of Bedford would have one for 64,000, Kent one for 62,000, Yorkshire one for 61,000, and Lincolnshire one for 64,000? He asked the Committee to mark the contrast between Warwickshire and Cardiganshire, the population being 47,000 in the one case and 61,000 in the other. In the case of Warwick and Cork there was a difference of 47,000 and 67,000, between Warwick and Inverness of 47,000 and 52,000, and between Warwick and Sterling of 47,000 and 78,000. The contrast was just the same in Ireland. The county of Clare would return one Member for 79,000 as against 47,000 in the county of Warwick, while the Metropolitan constituency of Bermondsey would only return one for 86,000. Chelsea was an extremely painful case, and it showed how the natural feelings of the heart would be uprooted by the crowbar of political exigency. The right hon. Baronet was one of the Members for the borough of Chelsea. He had told the Committee that he lived in the borough, and that it was his personal ambition to continue to represent it. No doubt, it would be scarcely possible to supply it with a more capable Representative; but how would the right hon. Gentleman, when he went to present himself to the electors of Chelsea, explain to them the fact that he had condemned the borough of Chelsea, with a population of 88,000, to only one Member, while he gave to the borough of Warwick, with less than one-half the population, the same amount of representation? Surely the constituency of Chelsea had a right to expect from the right hon. Gentleman, who was not only an official Member of the Cabinet, but the Member of the Government who was in charge of the Bill, with a predominant and almost decisive influence over its fortunes, that a borough with 88,000 inhabitants would, upon all the principles of his own Bill, have received more consideration than it had received when contrasted with the towns of Warwick and Leamington, with only a population of 37,000 between them. If two Members were given to Chelsea, they would each represent 44,000 inhabitants, or 7,000 more than the new borough of Warwick. He had very little doubt that when the right hon. Baronet next met his constituents he would find some difficulty in explaining, notwithstanding his own plausible and insinuating style, how it was that he, having a controlling charge over the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill, had so much more favoured Warwick than Chelsea, or such boroughs as Dudley, Norwich, Southampton, or Huddersfield, all of them with more than double the population for a single member to that of Warwick, and every one of them more entitled to two Members than Warwick was to one. The boroughs to which he had referred were most unfairly treated as compared with Warwick. No violent effort was necessary to extend their boundaries. No rural areas were required to be thrown into them; but each of them possessed a population of more than fourscore thousand people, composed principally of working men with great and varied interests, and who had a right to full representation in Parliament. He maintained that in the case of every borough with more than double the population of Warwick and only one Member the Government were committing an outrage upon the principles of their own Bill and a gross violation of public rights in refusing to those boroughs the privilege they ought

to have of double the representation conferred upon the borough of Warwick. The outrage would be bad enough if Warwick itself possessed a population of 37,000; but the Government had ridiculously strengthened it, for some reason best known to themselves, and without the slightest pretence of justification, by adopting an exceptional rule in connection with an extension of boundaries. A gross outrage had been committed on public right and against many great communities by the inclusion of this borough in order to avert the disfranchisement of the borough; and the principle adopted by the Government in dealing with Warwick was in utter violation of all political decency.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that in order to establish a substantial analogy between the case of the borough now under discussion and that of Drogheda they would have to indulge in one of those flights of rhetoric to which the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) had referred. The population of Drogheda was just under 15,000, and it was quite possible that by extending its boundaries and including a district in which the workhouse was situated they might have brought it within the limit of 15,000.

MR. CALLAN said, the workhouse was just inside the present limits of the borough.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that was not a very important matter; but his own recollection was that it was outside. He would, however, assume that it was inside, and no doubt it would have been possible to have brought up the borough to the limit of 15,000 by extending the boundaries. Certainly the Government admitted that the case of Drogheda was a somewhat hard one, and they had not been unprepared to give way if there had been a general feeling in favour of their doing so, and if they had been able to discover where a Member could be obtained. No such feeling, however, had been manifested, nor had any satisfactory plan of finding a Member been suggested; and, therefore, it was impossible to make an exception in the case of Drogheda, or to provide any solution of the difficulty. What comparison was there between the case of Drogheda and the present case? The borough of Warwick had a population of 12,000, and immediately adjoining and contiguous with it was a larger town, which, they were told by the hon. Member for Warwick himself (Mr. Repton), contained 25,000 inhabitants, so that its inclusion with Warwick brought the united population up to more than 37,000. What possible analogy was there between that case and the case of Drogheda, or of any other place? The hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis) had introduced a good deal of matter into the discussion which was altogether unnecessary, although, perhaps, the Committee were somewhat accustomed to hear strong and irrelevant language from the hon. Gentleman. They would, therefore, be prepared to allow something in the shape of discount for the statement of the hon. Member that there were scores of instances of boroughs in regard to which a stronger case could be made out than for the borough now under consideration.

MR. LEWIS said, the right hon. Gentleman who had undertaken to lecture him would, perhaps, allow him to deliver a small lecture in return. He had said nothing of the kind. What he had said was that among the scores of other cases there were instances of boroughs more hardly dealt with than Warwick would be. He had not said that there were scores of cases that were more hardly dealt with.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the hon. Gentleman had quoted the case of Drogheda, Limerick, and Lisburn; but neither of those cases was analogous to that of Warwick, because in the latter case, by the simple inclusion of the town of Leamington within the limits of Warwick, they obtained a purely urban population of 37,000. What were the two alternatives in dealing with this case? In the one instance it was the disfranchisement of Warwick and the throwing of it into the county, which would have made Warwick the centre of a one-Member district, leaving Leamington still in the county; and instead of providing an urban population of 37,000 persons, it would probably have been necessary to make an addition of some 10,000 persons to Warwick from an agricultural district. That was one way of dealing with the matter. The other alternative was to unite Warwick with Leamington and make both of

them one borough returning one Member. The two modes were not altogether dissimilar; and, on the whole, looking to the past history of Warwick—to the fact that the Boundary Commissioners in 1868 had recommended an extension of boundaries by including Leamington—it was thought reasonable that the case should be dealt with in the manner proposed by the Bill. The hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold) appeared to think that the Government, in the present Bill, had only followed the recommendation of the Commissioners in 1868 where the Commissioners had recommended the extension of the boundaries of the borough to the municipal limit. Now that was not the case, for there were no less than 40 instances in the Bill in which they had followed the recommendations of the Royal Commission of 1868; and in a large number of cases the boundaries were not merely extended to the limits of the Municipality, but were carried beyond it. The case of his own borough—namely, Reading—was an instance in point. It was proposed to extend the present boundaries of Reading; but the boundaries were taken beyond the municipal limit, and were made to include an additional population. In that case the extension was not carried out in order to save the borough from disfranchisement. It would, under any circumstances, be entitled to one Member; and the case of Reading was a somewhat hard one, because, if the recommendations of the Royal Commission of 1868 had been followed earlier, or if the plan now before the House for extending the municipal limits had been adopted somewhat earlier, the possibility was that Reading would have saved its second Member. But he maintained that there was no analogy between cases of that kind, and the case now before the Committee with regard to such a town as Warwick, where the population proposed to be included was practically identical. He would repeat again that, after having gone carefully through the whole matter, and knowing what the result would have been of throwing Warwick into the county, the Government had decided upon uniting Leamington with Warwick. He had been somewhat surprised at the use which the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) had made of the name of the Speaker. The hon. Gentleman had insinuated that the proposal of the Government in regard to Warwick was simply made because it happened to be the borough represented by the Speaker.

Mr. SEXTON begged the right hon. Gentleman's pardon. It was very important that he should at once meet the right hon. Gentleman's assertion. He had not made any statement of that kind at all.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he had understood the hon. Member to say that the Government had taken an extraordinary course in dealing with the borough of Warwick, on account of the peculiar circumstances which attached to it.

Mr. SEXTON said, he had not stated anything whatever about the circumstances.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that in that case he would withdraw the remark; but he had certainly understood the hon. Member to make that statement. The hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold) had alluded to the case represented by the Chairman of Committees—Rochester; but neither that case, nor that of Wigan, nor various other considerations, need be entered into at the present moment. He could only assure the Committee that the Government, in the proposals they had made, had not been actuated by Party motives, nor were they able to say in the present instance what the result would be, so far as Party politics were concerned, either in regard to the borough of Warwick or the county.

Mr. P. H. MUNTZ said, the question before the Committee was whether Warwick and Leamington should form one borough, and be included in the boundaries specified in the Bill. His hon. Friend the Member for South Warwickshire (Mr. Sampson Lloyd) had stated that the feeling of both towns was in favour of the Bill. Living, as he (Mr. Muntz) did, on the confines of Leamington, and knowing the inhabitants of the two boroughs—which were substantially one—he must say that he had not yet met with a single individual who was not in favour of the proposal contained in the Bill. Instead of being a Party measure, the complaint made by the Liberal Party was that it was a Conservative measure, and that in all

probability it would hereafter be impossible to return a Liberal Member. So much for the question of Party feeling by which the Government were supposed to be actuated. Every hon. Member who was acquainted with the district must be aware that Warwick and Leamington were practically one borough. In point of fact, they formed the two ends of one large town, and they had a population between them of some 37,000 or 38,000. He must say that if they were to adopt the suggestion of the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis), and throw both Leamington and Warwick into the county, they would have to alter the whole of the county arrangements. He saw no reason for that course; and as there would be many boroughs with a less population than 37,000, and as the general feeling of the inhabitants of both towns was in favour of the present proposal, he hoped that it would be endorsed by the Committee.

MR. A. F. EGERTON said, the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General had referred, by way of illustration, to the case of Wigan, and had stated that there was no analogy between the case of Wigan and that of Warwick and Leamington. Now, he (Mr. Egerton) ventured to think that there was a certain amount of analogy between the two cases. What did the Bill do? It threw into Warwick a large additional urban population in order to bring it up to the limit that would allow it to return a single Member. Now, it would have been perfectly easy in the case of Wigan to have thrown into that borough a purely urban population, which would have raised it far above the limit of Warwick and Leamington, and would have entitled it to return two Members. If the Government would accept a scheme of that sort, it would be most easy to secure a population of from 80,000 to 100,000. Surely, therefore, there was some analogy between the two cases. So far as political considerations were concerned, he did not think that the Government had been guided in the case of Wigan by Party considerations at all; but he ventured to maintain, on behalf of the borough which he had the honour to represent, that they had done it an injustice in order that they might provide for the retention of Warwick as a Parliamentary borough. He considered that that was not a fair way of treating the borough he represented, nor was it a fair way of dealing with the provisions of the Bill when certain lines had been definitely laid down, which lines the Government now for other purposes proceeded entirely to ignore, and to lay down others that were widely different.

SIR EARDLEY WILMOT said, he had no wish to detain the Committee upon the merits of this question; but as his hon. Friend the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) had appealed to him in regard to Leamington, a town with which he was very well acquainted, he was able to speak with confidence as to its connection with Warwick. It was quite true that it was connected with Warwick by a road of a mile and a-half in length. In point of fact, there were two roads—one a main road, on which there were hardly any houses at all, and an upper road as far as the parish of Emscott, upon which there were villas at some distance from each other. It was impossible to say that Leamington and Warwick formed one continuous street, even as far as Emscott. There were some lime works bordering a canal half-a-mile away, and there were, no doubt, a number of villas; but it was impossible to say that it was one continuous town. He had known the locality for more than 50 years, and he would be very sorry to see Warwick disfranchised. So far as Leamington was concerned, he had a personal interest in what was now being done, because Leamington was in South Warwickshire, and at present it was the stronghold of the Liberal Party, as compared with other parts of that division of the county. By eliminating it from the county and uniting it with the borough of Warwick, as was proposed by the present Bill, the position of the Conservative Party in South Warwickshire would be, he considered, considerably improved. He had only risen to explain, however, that the two towns of Leamington and Warwick were some distance from each other. The fare by hired carriage was never less than 2*s.* 6*d.*, and very often the driver tried to get 3*s.*, which fact, he thought, would show that the distance was a good mile and a-half.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he thought it was a national misfortune for the

country that the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill did not fulfil his late Office of Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; for nothing would have been more interesting or picturesque than to have witnessed him adjusting the frontiers of Afghanistan with the remarkable ability he had displayed in adjusting the boundaries of Parliamentary boroughs so as to entitle them to representation. Certainly, if the President of the Local Government Board could have discussed the frontiers of Afghanistan with the same subtlety and the same inexhaustible arithmetical resources with which he had discussed the boundaries of Warwick and Leamington, the Russian Minister would have had no chance with him. What did the right hon. Gentleman do? He first took one line of argument, and directly he had established it he astonished the Committee by taking up another line of argument altogether. In fact, whatever might be the future in store for the President of the Local Government Board, everybody who had watched the manner in which he had managed this Bill must entertain a greatly increased regard for the right hon. Gentleman's resources and Parliamentary ability. It had, however, required all the ingenuity of the right hon. Gentleman to reconcile the extraordinary inconsistencies of the Bill, although the curious manner in which the right hon. Gentleman had argued, without changing colour, that black was white, could not be exaggerated. There was one other matter which had attracted attention—namely, the extraordinary despatch with which the Bill had been brought on for discussion at that Morning Sitting. It was not the practice, as a general rule, to begin Business very early on a Wednesday; and, although he had entered the House a few minutes after the time fixed for the meeting of the House, he had found the House actually in Committee, and had had the misfortune to miss the opening sentences of the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis). Nevertheless, he had heard the best part of the hon. Member's speech, and throughout the debate upon the Bill he had listened to no speech in which a case had been better put, or more unanswerable arguments offered. The hon. Member had not introduced into his remarks one bit of that Party spite or passion which was generally the chief characteristic of his speeches. The hon. Member, no doubt, had no necessity for indulging in Party spite or passion, because he was able to rest his case upon facts and figures that were absolutely indisputable. What were the cases which had already been disposed of? In order to prevent Drogheda from being disfranchised, it would have been necessary to extend its boundaries so as to give it an increased population of some 300 or 400. In the case of Wigan, in order to entitle it to two Members, it would have been necessary to take in a population of about 2,000, although, if it had not been for the accidental circumstance that the Census was taken in 1881, when a considerable number of the population had left the town on strike, the inhabitants would have been considerably in excess of the 50,000 required for two Members. In order to entitle Limerick to return two Members, it would have been necessary to extend the boundaries of the city so as to include some 1,450 persons; so that in one case all that was necessary was 400, in another 2,000, and in a third 1,450, and yet in the case of Warwick Her Majesty's Government did not shrink from proposing a scheme whereby 26,000 persons were added to an existing borough, in order to bring up the constituency to the proper limit. He would go now to the connection between the two constituencies. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board had over and over again repeated that the two towns of Leamington and Warwick were continuous; but that did not appear to be the case at all. The hon. Baronet below him (Sir Eardley Wilmot) was a far better authority on that matter than the right hon. Baronet, or the Postmaster General. What was the description the hon. Baronet had given? He told the Committee that there were two roads between the two towns, one of them having a large number of houses upon it; but that there were several patches where there were no houses at all, and for the most part the houses were detached villa residences. It was a monstrous misuse of terms, therefore, to describe two towns as practically one, which were joined together by a road

which consisted of villa residences, and villa residences alone. If they were to act upon that principle, all England might be described as one great city; for there was scarcely a large town in England which did not extend for miles into the county in the shape of detached villas until another town was reached. In fact, Richmond and Westminster might be described as one constituency, because if they were to regard roads with villa residences upon them as one street, no doubt Richmond and Westminster were quite as much connected as Leamington and Warwick. Let them compare the nature of the connection between Warwick and Leamington, and the nature of the connection between Rathmines and Dublin. Rathmines was separated from Dublin by nothing more than a narrow canal. Rathmines and Dublin were as much parts of the same city as Parliament Street and Victoria Street were parts of Westminster, and ought practically to be included in the same constituency. There was a small bridge between the two districts, and the people of Rathmines spent nearly the whole of their time, and transacted all their business, in the City of Dublin. There were not 20 yards of a boundary between the two, and, in point of fact, the two places were entirely the same. Nevertheless, Her Majesty's Government had not allowed Dublin to be united to Rathmines, although they were only separated by a canal 20 feet broad, and in the same breath they proposed to join Leamington to Warwick, although there was a road running between the two of a mile and a-half in length. The right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General had made the same rash statement in regard to the case of Drogheda. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to know absolutely nothing of the circumstances of the case; but he had stated that if there had been a general agreement in regard to Drogheda the disfranchisement of that borough might have been saved. Now, he (Mr. O'Connor) had taken no part in the discussion of that question; but he confessed that he was not favourable to the retention of seats for very small constituencies. Although he would like to oblige his hon. Friends who were interested in Drogheda, it would certainly have given his conscience a considerable wrench to have voted for the retention of the representation of Drogheda. If, however, he were asked to make a choice between Warwick and Leamington and Drogheda, unquestionably he would give the preference to Drogheda. In the one case it would only be necessary to add a few hundred people, while in the other they were proposing to add 26,000. In the one case they had to make a conjunction between two towns separated by a mile and a-half of detatched villas, whereas in the other it would only have been necessary to carry the boundaries to the end of a street. The right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General said that the workhouse was outside the boundary, and would be included if that extension were carried out; but, as a matter of fact, it was inside the present boundaries, and he had no doubt that, according to the last Census Returns, the workhouses of Ireland contributed a very large portion of the population of the country. The workhouse was certainly inside the boundary of Drogheda, and what were outside the boundary were cotton-mills, which fact, in his view, lent additional weight to the claim of Drogheda for special representation. There was one thing which had astonished him in the speech of the President of the Local Government Board. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of the increase in the population of Warwick. Now, he invariably perceived that whenever the right hon. Gentleman had any weak fact to advance he was careful not to bring it forward accompanied by details. He assumed an air of official knowledge, and induced the Committee to believe that he had the strongest evidence in support of his statement; whereas, in point of fact, the evidence in his possession was of the slightest possible description. In this case the right hon. Gentleman stated that the increase of Warwick had been very rapid, and that it was larger than that of Leamington. When the Committee heard that, they could not have imagined that the increase of Warwick, which was put forward as such a strong argument, really amounted to the vast number of 814 persons in the course of 10 years. Yet that was the actual increase which the right hon. Gentleman had put forward. In opposition to the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, he (Mr. O'Connor) had received a com-

munication from a local source. One of the many communications sent to him in regard to the changes proposed to be carried out by the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill was a Memorial from the Royal Leamington Spa, which contained a comparison between Leamington and Warwick, and wound up in the following words :—

"The former borough (Leamington) is rapidly increasing, whereas Warwick is stationary or decreasing."

There was, therefore, a distinct statement on the part of the best local authorities that Warwick, instead of increasing, as the right hon. Gentleman said it had, was actually either stationary or decreasing. Certainly, if a town with upwards of 11,000 inhabitants could only add 814 in the course of a decade, it might be fairly described as a town in which the population was either stationary or decreasing. He was astonished at the allusions which had been made by the President of the Local Government Board to the Report of the Boundary Commissioners in this case, when he recollected that only last night, when the Irish Members asked for an increase in the number of Members for the City of Dublin, and referred to the Report of the Boundary Commissioners in support of their application, they were told that the Government were not prepared to take into consideration any of the recommendations which the Boundary Commissioners had made. Although the right hon. Baronet had brought forward the contention that no result ought to have followed the Report of the Boundary Commissioners in the case of Dublin, he had the effrontery to say that their recommendations in the case of Warwick warranted the decision arrived at by the Government in the case of that borough. The Government had not said one word in reply to the strongest argument used by his hon. Friend the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton). Had not his hon. Friend proved that Chelsea was far better entitled to two Members than Warwick was to one? Again, the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. P. H. Muntz) had stated that if this Amendment were carried it would break up the existing arrangements with regard to the county of Warwickshire. But he (Mr. O'Connor) contended that, instead of that, it would place them on a more logical and better basis than at present. It was clear that the attempt of the Government was to make the voting power of Warwick far larger than the voting power of any constituency in the country. If that were carried out the result would be that Warwickshire would have one Member for every 50,000 of its inhabitants, and Warwick would even then be better off than Chelsea with its population of 88,000. The people of Warwickshire, under the Bill, had been placed in a position of pre-eminence over electors of every other part of the country, which, he said, was a proposal at variance with the whole of the rest of the Bill. He would repeat the remark of the hon. Member for Sligo, that this was a case in which it behoved the Government to be extremely particular as to the manner in which they acted; and he might point out that the arrangement with regard to Warwick had created a considerable amount of interest throughout the country, a proof that it was not looked upon with complete satisfaction. He admitted that the Boundary Commissioners had performed their office with much more ease and with much less friction with public opinion than many other Bodies. Everyone must have been surprised that the daily papers had absolutely ceased to report the proceedings of these Commissioners, and it must be taken as an indication of consent on the part of the public to their proceedings that there were few or no reports in the newspapers concerning them. But no sooner was the report published in the newspapers with reference to the shameful jerrymandering proposed with regard to the constituency of Warwick, than everyone in the country took notice of the fact; and he ventured to say that the people of the country at that moment knew more about Warwick, and the district by which it was surrounded, than they did of any other district dealt with in this Bill; in fact, it was not too much to say that the public conscience was greatly shocked by the proceedings of the Government in this respect. The proposal in the Bill would create one of the most irregular and heterogeneous constituencies in the country. Although he had felt it his duty to lay these facts before the Committee, he was bound to say that the time he had occupied was in all probability wasted, because he supposed the Government would be sup-

ported on this question by their large majority. But whatever might be the fate of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis), there was no doubt that he had all the argument on his side, and that the Government must feel that the people of the country would regard the provision with regard to Warwick as a blot upon an otherwise satisfactory arrangement.

MR. LEWIS said, the more they went into this case the worse it appeared. He felt it his duty, before going to a division, to emphasize one or two points which had been brought forward in the discussion. When he made his first statement in support of the Amendment he had not with him the exact figures; but he was now in a position to state that 88 single-Member constituencies were absolutely disfranchised by this Bill on account of their not having 15,000 inhabitants. He was sorry that the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General was not in the House, because he was bound to notice an extraordinary mis-statement on the part of the right hon. Gentleman, in which he had persisted, notwithstanding that he had met it with a direct contradiction. He (Mr. Lewis) had stated that there were scores of single-Member constituencies disfranchised by this measure many of whose cases were harder than that of Warwick. He now repeated that statement in order to give the right hon. Gentleman an opportunity of contradicting it. He considered it important to make this statement, having regard to the fact that the right hon. Gentleman had imputed to him observations which he had not made, and which he persisted in after a denial had been given. He would like to know what the country would think of such cases as those of Beaumaris, the Cardigan Boroughs, Whitby, and the Haddington District? It was to such cases as those that he referred as being many of the single-Member boroughs whose cases were harder than that of Warwick. He had been much amused by one argument from which the Government appeared to derive great satisfaction. The right hon. Baronet had stated that the townspeople of Leamington and Warwick were all agreed on this question. No doubt they were; one might as well ask a child whether it liked the sugar-plum put into its mouth, or a beggar what he thought of the £5 note pressed upon him. Was it likely that the people of Warwick and Leamington would find any fault with the proposal of the Government? Why, Warwick was the only case of a borough retaining its representation contrary to the rule which the Government itself had laid down; and, therefore, he said that to ask the persons interested whether the proposed arrangement was not a pleasant one, and to bring forward their inevitable answer as a reason against his Amendment, was an argument that it was difficult to think that the right hon. Baronet had put forward seriously. There was another point which should not be lost sight of. It was said that Warwick and Leamington were practically one constituency and one town; but he would point out that they had separate Corporations and Municipal Institutions, and if his hon. Friends who represented Warwick were to look into the local newspapers of last week they would find that meetings had been held in Leamington and Warwick, at which the matter of the name of the joint borough was quarrelled over. From this it would be seen that there had never been any agreement about the matter at all. He was not able to make out the argument of the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold), because the hon. Member seemed to him to be proceeding upon two different lines; at one moment it seemed that he was in favour of disfranchisement, and at another that he did not want it. Again, he wound up by saying that this was the only case of a borough that had not been disfranchised, and whose boundaries had been enlarged. But he (Mr. Lewis) would point out that this enlargement was made for the purpose of retaining the enfranchisement of the borough. The right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) was, in his opinion, in error when he said there was not the slightest analogy in this case and the cases of Drogheda and Wigan; but he (Mr. Lewis) contended that the analogy was complete, and in this respect—in order to save the representation by one Member in each case the suggestion was made that the boundaries should be extended, and the Government said that they could not, and would not, do this; in the present

case, in order to save the representation of one Member, they had extended, and were asking the Committee to agree to the extension of, the boundaries. Therefore, he said that, so far from there being no analogy, it appeared to be one of the most complete that could be introduced by way of illustration of an argument. Again, the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General said that he had introduced a great deal of feeling into this discussion; but it was hard that he should lie under that imputation, seeing that he had merely pointed out that the action of the Government in respect of Warwick was a departure from their own principle, as laid down in the Bill, and that, in supporting that contention, he had carefully avoided introducing anything that was not strictly germane to the question. But the right hon. Gentleman had the faculty of saying bitter things in a quiet way, and any comparison instituted between them in that respect he ventured to think would be in his (Mr. Lewis's) favour. The Government had departed, in the case of Warwick, from what the Attorney General declared to be the vital principle of the Bill; and, moreover, they had given no reasons for so doing. Under the circumstances, he felt it his duty to press his Amendment to a division.

Mr. CALLAN said, he had on one occasion walked from Warwick to Leamington by one road, and returned to Warwick by another, and he was bound to say that there was a perceptible difference between the character of the two towns. Warwick, a fine old county town, showed what the county towns were before railways were in existence; Leamington was an instance of what Royal patronage could effect in the way of placing a new town in a prosperous condition. But let the Committee compare the case of Drogheda with that of Warwick. The Government refused to extend the boundaries of Drogheda, although, by taking in the population of a village a mile distant, and by adding the men employed in a single factory at the other end of the main street, they could at once have raised the population to 16,000. But the population of Warwick could not be raised to 15,000, the limit in the Bill, by taking in the inhabitants of the district for a mile around Warwick; it was only when Leamington was approached that any real increase of population took place. In short, on similar conditions, the population of Drogheda would exceed by 1,000, and the population of Warwick fall short by a considerable amount of the requisite number. He asked whether it was honest of the Government to disfranchise the old town of Drogheda, with all its great historic associations—an important borough still, and the seat of the only cotton mills in the Province of Ulster—while they were ready to extend the boundaries of Warwick in one direction five or six miles, for the purpose of retaining a rotten borough? He would be sorry to vote against Warwick; but he was bound to say that if Drogheda was to be disfranchised, Warwick should be disfranchised also. The boroughs in England were well and fully represented; but in Ireland the borough representation was almost entirely lost, and, speaking not as a Nationalist, or in the interest either of Conservatives or Liberals, he said that it was the duty of the Government to devise some means by which the borough representation in Ireland could be preserved.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 108; Noes 28: Majority 80.—(Div. List, No. 80.)

Amendment proposed,

In page 22, line 29, after the words "borough of York," to insert the words "inclusive of the parts added thereto by 'The York Extension and Improvement Act 1884,' 47 and 48 Vic. c. CCXXXII.)."—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed, to leave out the last six lines on page 22."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he agreed with the substance, but not with the form, of the hon. and learned Member's Amendment. He would therefore suggest that the words should be left where they were for the present. On the Report he would agree in any case to leave them out; and if they came to an arrangement with regard to Haverfordwest he would deal with the matter by introducing a clause.

Mr. WARTON said, he was indebted to the right hon. Baronet for the way in which he had met his proposal; and as he intended to deal with the matter

on the Report, he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he would not move the first Amendment standing in his name, which had reference to the inclusion in the Parliamentary burgh of Dunfermline of so much of the municipal burgh as was not included within the Parliamentary burgh. Nor was he in a position to press his second Amendment to a division, because he had not had an opportunity of speaking to the Lord Advocate on the subject. He would, however, move the latter Amendment *pro formâ*, in the hope that the right hon. and learned Gentleman might consider it between then and the Report stage, and that it would be dealt with by the House when that stage was reached. He had a strong opinion in favour of making local boundaries conterminous. There were many cases in which the Parliamentary boundaries exceeded the municipal boundaries; but there were not many instances of the reverse kind. The boundaries of the Parliamentary burgh of Kirkcaldy were less than those of the municipal burgh, and accordingly they found that a great portion of the municipal burgh was within the Parliamentary burgh of Dysart. He believed that in this case the local boundaries were more overlapped than those of any constituency in the United Kingdom, a circumstance which gave rise to much confusion and inconvenience. For his own part, he had never been able to ascertain precisely what was the population of the burgh with which he was connected, and he feared that there would always be a great difficulty in the way of doing so. He repeated that, in his opinion, there was no parallel case to that of Kirkcaldy, and the effect of the present arrangement was so peculiar that his impression was that if the people of Kirkcaldy were agreed amongst themselves with regard to this inconvenience, it would have been rectified before this time. But he freely admitted that there were some differences of opinion on the subject. A difficulty had been started with regard to the municipal union and the school board, the people being afraid that the extension of the Parliamentary boundaries would in some way or other interfere with the existing arrangements. But he believed that to be an entirely erroneous idea. He had been astonished, on reading a Parliamentary Return of the number of public-houses in the burghs of Scotland presented to the House a short time since, to find that Kirkcaldy was represented as having 116 public-houses to a population of 13,000, whereas there were only 24 in Dysart. According to the Return, it was made to appear that Kirkcaldy had more public-houses than Dysart in the proportion of five to one. As a matter of fact, owing to the inextricable confusion in which the boundary question was involved, the number of public-houses had been given for the municipal burgh, while the population given was that of the Parliamentary burgh; and, therefore, he said that if the Crown agents, who were responsible in this matter, got themselves into a muddle and misrepresented the burgh, much more must those find themselves in a difficult position with regard to it who were not so well informed. He hoped the Lord Advocate would look into this matter, and so give the people of Kirkcaldy an opportunity of expressing their opinion upon it before the Report stage.

Amendment proposed,

In page 23, lines 30 to 32, after "Kirkcaldy (in Kirkcaldy District)," leave out "(except so much of such municipal burgh as is comprised within the present Parliamentary burgh of Dysart)."—(*Sir George Campbell.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR): I must say that up to the present time we have not heard anything upon the point which my hon. Friend raises; but it is one which shall be considered before the Report stage of the Bill is taken. The course followed with respect to Kirkcaldy was, I think, in the absence of any representations of the kind which my hon. Friend has made, an obvious one. Kirkcaldy is not a very large town, but the municipal part of it seems to overlap a portion of the Parliamentary burgh of Dysart. In the absence of any special reason and information, it would, I think, be wrong to take away part of the Parliamentary burgh of Dysart and add it to the Parliamentary burgh of Kirkcaldy. It may, however, be otherwise, and we shall be

glad to inquire into the matter and to receive representations from either of the two places concerned, with the view of dealing with the question on Report.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he must admit that it was entirely his own fault that the right hon. and learned Gentleman was not in a position to discuss this question. But they had been so much occupied with Amendments involving the very existence of the burghs, that the minor question in this case had been overlooked. He was glad to hear that his right hon. and learned Friend would look into the matter. His own opinion was that there would be no opposition on the part of Dysart proper; the only opposition to the proposal, if any, would be on the part of the portion of the burgh of Kirkcaldy lying outside the present limits.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

SIR THOMAS BATESON said, he now rose to move the Amendment which stood in his name, and he did so in the interest of a considerable number of the inhabitants of County Down who were voters in that county, and who it was proposed by this Bill should be transferred to the town of Belfast. Some of the people for whom he spoke were occupiers of agricultural holdings, others resided in villas; but all were totally unconnected with Belfast, and were in no way mixed up with the interests of that town. These county voters said it was very hard that they should be annexed to Belfast without their wish, and contrary to their protest. Some portions of the large district of County Down which it was proposed to annex to Belfast were situated as far as four miles from the town. Those districts had as much community of interest with the town of Belfast as Wimbledon had with the borough of Chelsea; and, under such circumstances, he thought it was extremely hard that the people should be driven like a flock of sheep into the borough of Belfast without their leave, and contrary to their wish. The town of Belfast, according to the Government Return was to contain 221,600 inhabitants. If the people for whom he spoke were allowed to continue voters in County Down, the population of Belfast would only amount to between 216,000 and 217,000. Now, if they took England generally, the average population for which there was to be one Member was 54,000; therefore, it could not be said that by leaving these rural districts in the county of Down, the town of Belfast would necessarily have to be deprived of one of its four Members. The other night he had the satisfaction of hearing the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) enlarge in very eloquent terms upon the hardship and the injustice which would be perpetrated on certain urban districts abutting on the borough of Wigan, if they were annexed to that borough without their sanction and contrary to their wish. Under these circumstances, he (Sir Thomas Bateson) thought he could with confidence appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to support this very moderate request of his. Yesterday, he was looking over the Instructions given to the Boundary Commissioners. One Instruction, concerning the extension of the boundaries of a borough, was—

> "Either from community of interest with the borough, or which from other circumstances form part of the town population proper."

Now, the people of whom he spoke did not come under that heading. Another Instruction was—

> "That special regard should be had to the pursuits of the population."

Now, they all knew that the inhabitants of Belfast were chiefly mill-workers, while he was informed that in the districts it was proposed to include in the town there was not a single mill-worker. The populations of the four divisions of County Down would, if his Amendment were accepted, be as follows:—In North Down there would be a population of 61,197; in North-West Down, 59,775; in Mid Down, 58,775; and in South-West Down, 59,290. Under such circumstances it would be quite unnecessary to re-adjust any of the divisions of the county. He begged to move the omission from the boundaries of Belfast of—

> "The Townlands of Ballymaghan, Ballymisert, Strandtown and Strandtown Town, Ballyhackamore and Ballyhackamore Town, and Ballycloghan, all in the Parish of Holywood and County of Down; the Townlands of Knock, Multyhogy, and Ballyrushboy, all in the Parish of Knockbreda and County of Down."

The Lord Advocate

Amendment proposed, in page 24, to leave out lines 5 to 16, inclusive.—(*Sir Thomas Bateson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that Belfast was a town which was rapidly increasing in population, and he was informed that the population was spreading to the districts which the hon. Baronet (Sir Thomas Bateson) considered rural. He (Sir Charles W. Dilke) was informed by those who had made the inquiry that they considered the case very carefully, and they thought that the population which they proposed to include must eventually become a borough population. He was bound to say that if the proposal of the hon. Baronet were carried, it would be impossible to retain the representation of Belfast at four Members. Belfast happened to just overtop the limit of population entitled to four Members; but by the adoption of this Amendment it would be placed below that limit, and therefore would only be entitled to three Members.

MR. SEXTON said, that this was certainly a subject of considerable interest, and as they proceeded with the Bill the arguments advanced by the Government became more and more unaccountably peculiar. Four years ago, Commissioners recommended that the boundaries of Belfast and of Dublin should be extended. The Government had adopted the recommendation in the case of Belfast, but had rejected it in the case of Dublin. No one could discover a shadow of reason for the difference in the treatment of the two places. He was not acquainted with the local circumstances of Belfast; but the hon. Baronet (Sir Thomas Bateson) who had moved the Amendment had said that the inhabitants were chiefly mill-workers, and that the Government proposed to add to the constituency certain rural districts. The right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) in charge of the Bill had said that the result of the adoption of the Amendment would be that a Member would have to be taken away from Belfast—that instead of having four it would only have three Representatives. He (Mr. Sexton) drew the contrast between the two places in this way. If they added to the City of Dublin the merchants, official classes, and artizans who lived in the abutting townships and within a stone's throw of the Parliamentary boundaries, Dublin would be entitled to five Members; they had refused to do that, preferring to maintain an unjustifiable line of demarcation for the City of Dublin. On the other hand, the Government had given their assent to an artificial claim for the increase of the number of the Representatives of Belfast to four, by adding to that borough a body of farmers four miles away, altogether unconnected with the town, and having no conceivable concern with the affairs of Belfast. He left the contrast to the consideration of the Committee.

MR. BIGGAR said, the contention of the Government in respect to their treatment of Belfast and Dublin was perfectly untenable. There was a very much stronger reason for the addition to Dublin of Rathmines and the other districts proposed to be added by the Boundary Commissioners of 1881 than for the addition to Belfast of the districts proposed to be added by this Bill. The districts around Dublin were of a much more urban character than those proposed to be joined to Belfast. But, after all, there was a very substantial amount of argument in favour of adding the districts covered by the Amendment to Belfast. The Boundary Commissioners examined witnesses upon the spot, and having heard what could be said for and against the proposal, they recommended that these outlying parts of County Down should be added to the borough of Belfast. They made the recommendation for the obvious reason that the villages proposed to be annexed were not far from the borough, and that their inhabitants reaped a certain amount of advantage from Belfast. The hon. Baronet the Member for Devizes (Sir Thomas Bateson) had said that the people of Belfast were mill-workers. Although there were a great many people in Belfast who were mill-workers, there were a great number who were not. The people who occupied the villas in the districts to which reference had been made were, as a rule, persons who were in business in Belfast. In point of fact, those people, although they lived in the country, did not partake, as a class, of the nature of a rural community, and for that reason

he thought the contention of the hon. Baronet was quite untenable. At the same time, he (Mr. Biggar) thought the contention of the Government was very much weaker. What the Government ought to do was to carry out honestly the principle of the Bill—strike off from Belfast the people in the scattered villages specified in the Amendment, give Belfast three instead of four Members, and then add to Dublin the districts which were really a part of it, and give to the city a fifth Member. That would be a really sensible way of settling the difficulty. The discrepancies between the actions of the Government in regard to Dublin and Belfast were so outrageously unreasonable that the Government ought now to consider whether it would not be well to take the hon. Baronet (Sir Thomas Bateson) at his word—strike off from Belfast the outlying districts, and bring the town down to the limit which entitled it to three Members. If they did that, they would be able to give the additional Member to Dublin—a city which, as everyone knew, was of very much more importance than Belfast, and therefore entitled to increased consideration.

Mr. SMALL said, that all parties must be agreed that Belfast had been treated in a very exceptional and an extraordinarily favourable manner. He did not think the reason was far to seek. Belfast had always set itself against the Nationalist opinion of Ireland, and therefore he supposed it was part of the agreement between the Government and the Front Opposition Bench that the boundaries of the borough should be so extended as to entitle it to four Members. Belfast had less claim than any other town in Ireland to have its boundaries extended. In 1867 the municipal boundaries of the place were very considerably enlarged, and by a clause in the subsequent Reform Bill the Parliamentary boundaries were extended so as to coincide with those of the municipality. Many of the places included within Belfast certainly could not be considered part of the town, and, that being so, no place had a less right than Belfast to have its boundaries extended. He was not as well acquainted with Belfast as his hon. Friend the Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar); but it did appear to him that many districts were now to be annexed to the borough which had no interest in common with it. He was very much afraid he and his hon. Friends would not succeed in obtaining the alterations they desired in regard to Belfast and Dublin, because the Government seemed to have set themselves resolutely against the changes proposed. He considered, however, that they would be neglecting their duty if they did not make as strong a protest as they could against the exceptional treatment which the minority in Ireland was receiving at the hands of this Liberal Government.

Mr. LEWIS wished to elicit from the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) a further explanation of the statement he made that if this Motion were adopted it would involve the reduction of the representation of Belfast to three Members. He did not know whether he was rightly informed as to the figures, but he understood that even if this alteration were made Belfast would still have a population of 216,000. If that were so, the adoption of the proposal, so far as he could see, would not have the effect of impeaching the validity of the title of Belfast to a fourth Member for the town. He was quite sure the right hon. Gentleman would not willingly play off one constituency against another; but the right hon. Gentleman certainly placed him in a difficult position as to the way in which he should vote, because he would not like to do anything to injure the borough of Belfast. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would say what the Government understood to be the exact position of the constituency supposing this Amendment were carried, and what constituencies Belfast would be similar to?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, the only borough whose position he could at the moment liken to that of Belfast, if this Amendment were carried, was Southwark. Belfast would, in size, greatly resemble Southwark, and the Prime Minister in introducing the Bill stated that any place with a population of less than 220,000 would only be entitled to three Members.

Mr. LEWIS said, he could not regard the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman as at all satisfactory, and for the very reason that the Metropolitan constituencies were confessedly not treated in the same liberal manner as other con-

stituencies. He did not know any newly-made borough in the Kingdom which contained so large a number of people to a single Member as the Metropolitan constituencies.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that St. Pancras and other Metropolitan boroughs were treated on precisely the same scale. The observations of the hon. Member (Mr. Lewis) were caused by the fact that there were no small new boroughs to be added to London, therefore the total average was high. London, however, was not quite so high as Manchester, for in London there was one Member for every 65,000 people, and in Manchester one Member to every 70,000 of the population. The reason was that there were no small boroughs to bring down the average.

MR. CORRY said, he should be glad to support the Amendment of his hon. Friend, if it was not to be carried out at the expense of the representation of Belfast. As he could not be a party to the reduction of the representation of Belfast, he was afraid he should be obliged to vote against the present proposal. As special reference had been made to the exceptional treatment of Belfast, he wished to say, however, that on account of its growing importance the town of Belfast was entitled to every consideration not only from the Government, but from every Member of the House. The hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) had said that Belfast was not at all as important a place as Dublin. The hon. Gentleman ought to know better than that. In point of manufactures, Belfast was infinitely more important than Dublin; if the hon. Gentleman had not been living away from Belfast for some time he must have known that that was the case. A great many new industries had been created in Belfast, and the result was that the population, instead of diminishing, as had been alleged, was very largely increasing; indeed, if the Census were taken now it would be found that the town was justly entitled to four Members irrespective of the extensions either in County Antrim or in County Down. He was perfectly satisfied that the importance of the town of Belfast was far greater than was represented by hon. Members sitting below the Gangway. If their information with reference to other parts of Ireland was as faulty as that concerning Belfast, there was no wonder they created false impressions in the minds of the people. He could not support the Amendment if, as the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) said, its adoption would result in the reduction of the representation of Belfast.

MR. MAYNE said, that upon the present Amendment it was well to recall to mind the argument used by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke), last night, against the proposal of the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) to so extend the boundaries of Dublin as to give the city a fifth Member. The right hon. Gentleman said the Government would not consent to include within the boundaries of a borough a population opposed to the inclusion, and he added that he had received communications from persons in Rathmines objecting to their incorporation with Dublin for Parliamentary purposes. The Committee had heard to-day from the hon. Baronet the Member for Devizes (Sir Thomas Bateson), that it was proposed by the Bill to include in the pet borough of Belfast a population who strongly objected to being brought within the borough boundaries. He (Mr. Mayne) invited the attention of the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) to the arguments which would be used in favour of the Amendment which would presently be proposed by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton). In the face of the statement of the hon. Baronet (Sir Thomas Bateson) in moving the present Amendment, it would certainly be necessary for the Government to start some new argument if they persisted in voting down the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Sexton) concerning the City of Dublin.

MR. BIGGAR said, he listened with some attention to the speech of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Belfast (Mr. Corry). It was all very well to lavish praise upon Belfast at the expense of other parts of Ireland. He (Mr. Biggar) was born in Belfast, and he had lived there a great part of his life. He frequently visited Dublin, and in his opinion that city was a much more important place than Belfast. As to the people of Belfast, he was afraid that if they were taken at their own estimation they would be taken at a much higher value than was really warranted. Now,

in regard to the Amendment of the hon. Baronet (Sir Thomas Bateson), there was one point upon which he was not clear. The Amendment, as it stood, only referred to the newly enfranchised part of Belfast which was in the county of Down; but some of the districts proposed to be annexed to Belfast were in County Antrim. Now, if the districts in Antrim were cut off from the borough as well as those in County Down, the case of the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke)—namely, the reduction of the representation of the town to three Members, would be made very much stronger. He sincerely hoped the Government would, by means of this Amendment, put themselves in a position to do justice to Dublin.

SIR THOMAS BATESON said, that before going to a division, he should like to say a few words. He was surprised that the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) should attempt to draw a red herring across the scent in the shape of a threat to take away a Member from Belfast if this Amendment were adopted. Now, the right hon. Gentleman knew very well that he gave four Members to County Donegal with 206,000 people; and if they compared Donegal, either as regarded taxation, wealth, and manufacture, with Belfast, he (Sir Thomas Bateson) was at a loss to understand why the former should have four Members and the latter only three. Kerry, Tyrone, and Tipperary, with a less population than Belfast, were to have four Members, and therefore it was absurd to threaten that, if this Amendment were carried, the representation of Belfast would have to be reduced. So far from the representation of Belfast being reduced by one Member, he held that if they took into consideration the enormous manufactures, the large commercial and mercantile interests of the town, Belfast ought to have five or six Members. He should think that the taxation which Belfast paid into the Imperial Revenue very nearly equalled half of the whole taxation of Ireland. Under those circumstances, it was absurd to threaten to take away one Member from a town which was the Manchester and Liverpool of Ireland combined. Had the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Devon (Sir Stafford Northcote) been present, he (Sir Thomas Bateson) should have appealed to him to support him on this occasion; but, probably, if the right hon. Baronet had been present, the magic word "vital" would have been uttered across the Table, and he would have been obliged, in accordance with this miserable compact, to follow the Prime Minister into the Lobby against his own Party. He (Sir Thomas Bateson), therefore, feared that, under the circumstances, he should have received no help from the right hon. Gentleman. He ventured to say that had the Tory Leaders, when they went into conference with right hon. Gentlemen opposite, said to those right hon. Gentlemen—"We take no interest whatever in Ireland; we think that the redistribution of seats as regards Ireland had better be left to the hon. and learned Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy), who seems to understand the subject thoroughly," he firmly believed that no measure framed by that hon. and learned Gentleman could have been more damaging or more disastrous to the Conservative Party in Ireland than this Bill, for the parentage of which the Tory Leaders were mainly responsible. He thought he might illustrate his statement by the map which had been published within the last few days by the organ of the hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell)—a map of Ireland most elaborately got up, and which he should have commended to the notice of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Devon had he been present. The other day, the Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Border Burghs (Mr. Trevelyan) spoke in a very flippant manner with reference to the future representation of Ireland. They asserted that the Protestant Party would retain a fourth of the total number of seats; whereas by this forecast the Nationalists claimed 15 certains and three doubtfuls out of 103. Now, the maps of which he (Sir Thomas Bateson) spoke gave, he thought, a very fair forecast of what would be the result in the event of this measure being carried, and he therefore commended it to the notice of the Postmaster General. It would show the position in which the minority in Ireland were placed under

the compact. It was now 41 years since he (Sir Thomas Bateson) first entered the House of Commons, and he must confess that he never knew anything so humiliating or degrading to Parliamentary Government as this miserable compact. Ministers and Members would not come down to the House to register decrees of a cross between the two Front Benches. He believed that if the redistribution scheme had been drawn up by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Monaghan, he doubted whether he would not possibly have treated them less illiberally. His Amendment was one by which, judging from the map to which he had referred, the Nationalist Party were not affected. This was simply a question whether rural voters, in no way connected with Belfast, should be swept into that town. The red herring drawn across the trail by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) was absurd and ridiculous, and he (Sir Thomas Bateson) wished his Friends would vote with him, for it was impossible for the Government to take a Member away from the rising town of Belfast.

MR. BIGGAR said, he did not think they need enter into the question of what the hon. Baronet (Sir Thomas Bateson) had called the "cross" between the two Front Benches. That was an expression he (Mr. Biggar) did not exactly understand; he did not know whether it was a phrase which could possibly be applied to what really took place. He wanted, however, to say a word with respect to the estimate the hon. Baronet had formed of Belfast. The hon. Baronet had referred to the test of taxation. Now, if taxation were to be taken as a test, there was not the slightest doubt that the taxation of Dublin would be found to be double that of Belfast. That argument, therefore, of the hon. Baronet in favour of Belfast, fell to the ground. Hon. Members above the Gangway who claimed to represent the so-called Loyal minority in Ireland were crying out loudly that they had not received fair play under this Bill. He did not mean to say they had got more than fair play, though they had certainly got one or two seats to which they would not have been entitled if the boundaries had been fixed in a more reasonable way. In his opinion, the minority in Ireland had no cause of complaint; indeed, they ought to be thoroughly delighted with the whole transaction.

SIR HERVEY BRUCE said, he wished to make a few observations in consequence of what had fallen from his hon. Friend the Member for Devizes (Sir Thomas Bateson). He intended to vote for his hon. Friend's Amendment, because he did not attribute any importance to the threat of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) to take away a Member from Belfast in the event of the Amendment being carried. At the same time, he could not agree with some of the remarks of his hon. Friend the Member for Devizes as to the conduct of the Leaders of the Opposition. He fully agreed with the hon. Baronet in thinking that the arrangement in regard to Ireland had been most unfortunate; but it must be recollected that the Conservative Leaders were placed in a very disagreeable and uncomfortable position. The other day he put a Question to the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke); but the right hon. Gentleman declined to answer it. That fact showed to him (Sir Hervey Bruce) very clearly that the actual Bill they were now discussing was not in the hands of the Government or of the Leaders of the Opposition at the time the arrangement was arrived at. The details of the Bill, consequently, could not have been distinctly understood. In his opinion, the difference between the Leaders of the Government and the Leader of the Opposition was that the Conservative Leader had more scrupulously adhered to the compact, as he understood it, than the Leaders of the Government had done. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Devon (Sir Stafford Northcote) had acted in a fairer spirit than the Government; for, from a chivalrous notion of honour, the right hon. Gentleman had distinctly refused to support his own Friends, and that on many occasions when he (Sir Hervey Bruce) thought the compact did not prevent him doing so. On the contrary, the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) and the Prime Minister had, on one or two occasions, told the Committee that they did not care for the

provisions of the Bill, and that, on a fitting opportunity, they would not abide by them. He merely made these observations to show that he did not join his hon. Friend (Sir Thomas Bateson) in his wholesale condemnation of the Leaders of the Opposition.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that the hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Hervey Bruce) had probably not heard an answer that he had given to the noble Lord the Member for Middlesex (Lord George Hamilton) the other day, referring to a letter that he had written to the hon. and learned Member for Launceston (Sir Hardinge Giffard), in which he had pointed out that precisely the same reservations had been made by the Leaders of the Opposition as had been made by him.

MR. ELTON said, that as the compact between the Leaders of the two Parties had been mentioned, perhaps the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would say whether there was anything in the compact bearing on this question?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the question was only involved in the compact in the sense that if this Amendment were carried, he would, in pursuance of the compact, have to ask the House to reduce the number of Members for Belfast from four to three.

MR. LEWIS said, it was impossible to sit here and, in the face of the figures in the Bill, hear the statement just made by the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke). Were the Committee to understand from the right hon. Gentleman that, in the face of such cases as those of Donegal and Kerry, the representation of Belfast would have to be reduced to three Members if this Amendment were carried? Donegal had a population of 206,035, and it was proposed to give it four Members. Upon some principle of equity which the right hon Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) seemed to understand, Donegal was to retain four Members; but Belfast, with a population of 216,000, would be reduced to three Members. Did he correctly interpret the proposition of the right hon. Baronet? [SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Yes.] He failed to see how the right hon. Gentleman could reconcile the treatment of the two constituencies. Kerry afforded an illustration even more striking, for it had only a population of 201,000, and yet it was to return four Members.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Lewis) was not in the House when he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) made an explanation on this subject. In that explanation, he reminded hon. Members that the Prime Minister had distinctly stated that there were two scales, and that the borough scale was different to the county scale, the limit of population being higher in boroughs than in counties. They fixed the general proportion between county and borough Members to suit hon. Members opposite, and, having done that, they had to make a scale which would work out equitably. There were a great many more small boroughs than small counties.

MR. T. A. DICKSON said, it was impossible not to sympathize with hon. Gentlemen on the Conservative Benches who complained of having been deserted by their Leaders. In the North of Ireland, last summer, hon. Gentlemen opposite were loudly demanding a Redistribution Bill, and declaring that the extension of the franchise without redistribution would be unjust and unsatisfactory. Now they had both, and yet they were complaining bitterly of the redistribution scheme. He was sure it must be very gratifying to hon. Gentlemen sitting below the Gangway opposite, to hear the confidence expressed by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Devizes (Sir Thomas Bateson) in the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy). The hon. Baronet had said he would much rather have had a Bill framed by the hon. and learned Member than that which had received the assent of the Conservative Leaders.

SIR THOMAS BATESON: I did not say that.

MR. T. A. DICKSON said, he was within the recollection of the Committee, and he thought he had quoted correctly the words of the hon. Baronet.

SIR THOMAS BATESON: I beg to correct the hon. Gentleman. What I did say was that if the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy) had framed a measure of redistribution, it would have been impossible for him, in my opinion, to have framed one more damaging to the Conservative Party than the Bill now before the Committee.

MR. T. A. DICKSON could only repeat that it must be very gratifying to the hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway, to hear the confidence the hon. Baronet expressed in their Colleague the hon. and learned Member for Monaghan. He (Mr. T. A. Dickson) hoped the Amendment would be rejected, for, in his opinion, it was unfair to the county of Down and to Belfast. He should be sorry to see Belfast deprived of one of its Members. Belfast was in every way worthy of four Representatives, and therefore he hoped the Government would stand by the Bill.

MR. HARRINGTON said, it seemed to him that the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) in charge of the Bill was labouring under a great delusion if he thought he would appease the Representatives of the Ulster Tories by explaining to them the rules, if there were any rules, which had regulated the decisions of the Boundary Commissioners. The argument that the right hon. Gentleman had employed against hon. Members sitting above the Gangway was one which might be suited to their understandings, but it did not appeal to their prejudices. It was all very well to threaten hon. Gentlemen that if they carried this Amendment, they would cause a reduction in the number of Representatives allotted to Belfast; but what the Committee were really entitled to hear from the right hon. Gentleman was the reason why the boundaries of the town were extended in order that it might have four instead of three Members. The proposal of the hon. Baronet the Member for Devizes (Sir Thomas Bateson) was to take out of the Schedule the rural districts which had been added to the town of Belfast with the declared object of giving to it an additional Member. In opposition to the very rules which were laid down for their guidance the Boundary Commissioners had added to the Belfast districts inhabited by people who had no interest in common with the town; and yet the argument which the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) employed, in order to solace hon. Members above the Gangway, was that, if their Amendment were carried, he would have to deprive them of that Member which had been given to them as an act of grace. It seemed to him (Mr. Harrington) that that was not an argument which ought to satisfy the Committee. He thought that Parliament would be abrogating its functions if it supported the right hon. Gentleman in the attitude he had taken up in regard to the Bill. He thought also that they would set up a very dangerous precedent if Commissioners appointed to form certain boundaries were to have the entire settlement of those boundaries, and Parliament were to exercise no supervision over their decisions. If, in the future, Commissioners felt that they would be supported by large majorities in any decisions they arrived at, they would, no doubt, make use of their own prejudices and the prejudices of the class to which they belonged, to the detriment of the interests of the county they were supposed to serve.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 124; Noes, 61; Majority 63.—(Div. List, No. 81.)

MR. SEXTON said, that the Government had succeeded in adding to the borough of Belfast certain rural areas in the County Down, and to the industrial population of Belfast there had been added a number of farmers living four miles away. The application he had to make to the Government was to ask them to continue in that line. He failed to see why farmers who lived four miles away from the City of Belfast should be added to the Parliamentary community of that place, whilst persons who spent their days and earned their incomes in the City of Dublin were kept outside the Parliamentary boundary of Dublin. Yesterday he had asked the Committee to consent to add one Member to the representation of the City of Dublin; but the Committee had declined to accede to the proposal, To-day, however, the application he made was of another kind. He merely asked that the actual City of Dublin should be made the Parliamentary City of Dublin, and that the Parliamentary city should not be put in the extraordinary position of being a mere fraction of the physical city as it stood on that ground. The right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had objected to the Amendment he had brought forward yesterday, on the ground that the object of the proposal was to procure an additional Member. That objection dis-

appeared to-day, however. He (Mr. Sexton) did not, to-day, ask for any additional Member, or any dislocation whatever of the arrangements of the Bill. He simply asked to have the physical conditions of the city established and recognized by the extension of the Parliamentary boundaries. Last night, the right hon. Baronet had probably laboured under some disadvantage, for the present proposed representation of the City and County of Dublin might have formed part of the compact between the two Front Benches. Of course, if the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill had agreed with the right hon. Baronet the Member for North Devon (Sir Stafford Northcote) and the Marquess of Salisbury, that the number of Members for the county of Dublin should be four, and the number for the city two, that was a good reason for resisting his (Mr. Sexton's) proposal yesterday. But to-day, at any rate, they had got outside the spirit of the compact. He had understood from the right hon. Baronet yesterday that the question of the boundaries of the City of Dublin had not formed part of the subject of the sacred agreement. If it had, it would have been in the same position as the question already disposed of; but if the right hon. Gentleman was free in the matter, he (Mr. Sexton) would offer some reasons why the boundaries should be extended. In the first place, the right hon. Baronet had to-day declared that he relied upon the Report of the Commission made in 1868, as the reason for the extension of the borough of Warwick. Well, if the Report of a Commission made 17 years ago were to be relied upon as a reason for retaining the borough of Warwick, he thought the Report of the Royal Commissioners, made four years ago, established a very much stronger case for extending the boundaries of Dublin. The Report of 1868, on which the right hon. Baronet relied in the case of Warwick, was discredited by the Government, and rejected by the House; but the Report of 1881, which he advanced in support of the Amendment he was about to propose, had never been discredited or rejected. The Irish Government themselves had never called the propriety of that Report in question; and so far as it related to the extension of the boundaries of Dublin, Earl Spencer had excused himself from carrying it out in 1882, 1883, and 1884, on the ground that the Government were engaged upon large proposals for the local government of cities in Ireland, and had not sufficient time to consider the recommendations of the Commissioners. Lack of leisure was the only excuse for refusing the proposal of 1881; but if that had been carried out, it would have been impossible to refuse the present Amendment. In England, wherever a municipal boundary had been extended, an extension of the Parliamentary boundary had followed; therefore, if the recommendations of the Municipal Boundary Commissioners had been adopted, it would have been impossible to refuse the present proposal. As the cause of the failure to carry out the recommendations of the Commission in 1881 was only lack of leisure and the pre-occupation of the Irish Government, and as the substance of those recommendations was not called in question, the plea he put forward was that, the excuse of pre-occupation not holding good now, the boundaries should be rearranged. What he asked was simply that the four townships abutting on the City of Dublin—namely, Rathmines, Kilmainham, Drumcondra, and Clontarf, having common interests with the city, should not be excluded from the Parliamentary boundaries of the borough. He should ask the right hon. Baronet to answer him one question. Would he give him any reason why these townships should be kept outside the Parliamentary boundary, if the Pembroke township were to be included within it? Of the five townships, Pembroke was the most rural and remote. It extended a far greater distance than any of the others, and contained localities which could scarcely be called urban. It was, to a considerable extent, a rural area, yet it was and had been for years included within the Parliamentary boundary of the City of Dublin. He would, respectfully, ask the right hon. Baronet to offer them some reason why the four townships, which were distinctly and absolutely urban in their nature, should be kept outside the Parliamentary boundary, while a far extending and remote township, which was absolutely rural in its composition, had been for years within it. If they carried his Amendment, they would do

no harm to any public interest that he could see. They would not dislocate the Bill; they would leave the county four Members and the borough two; the county of Dublin, with the areas he sought to include in the city, would have the full number of Members and a population of 51,000 to each, which would exceed the average of fully a half of the counties of Ireland. The claim he made, therefore, was justified on the ground of population. It would not violate the principle of the Bill, and would do no harm to anyone. In reply to a Question put to him to-day, the right hon. Baronet had stated that the area of Warwick was 9,000 acres, and that it had a population of 37,000. What did the right hon. Baronet say to the statement that in the face of this he proposed to shut the Parliamentary boundary of the capital of Ireland within a limit of 5,000 acres? The Parliamentary borough of Dublin was to be half the size of the borough of Warwick—207,000 people in the capital of Ireland were to be shut within an area only half the size of a petty English borough. He hoped the right hon. Baronet would apply himself to that point. The right hon. Baronet had told them yesterday that the boundary he (Mr. Sexton) proposed was open to objection. Well, it was the boundary recommended by a Commission which had inquired into the matter more fully than the House ever inquired into anything. The boundary the Government were determined to uphold was the most fantastic, not only in Ireland, but in the whole of the United Kingdom. It was, beyond precedent and parallel, irregular in its shape, whereas under his (Mr. Sexton's) Amendment it would become symmetrical and almost rectangular. If they took off the township of Kilmainham — and he should have no objection to that course — and added the three townships of Rathmines, Drumcondra, and Clontarf only, they would have what he might call an absolutely rectangular boundary. If that was not a complete reply to the right hon. Baronet he could not conceive what would be. They were told that some of the ratepayers outside the present limits of the City of Dublin objected to being included within the boundary; but the people outside the boundary had not been consulted. He believed that if they were polled to-morrow the great majority of them would be in favour of the extension he proposed. The only objection which had been raised had been that of the Town Commissioners of Rathmines. But that was a body elected upon a restricted franchise, who held their sittings in secret, and conducted their business in opposition to the will and intelligence of the large body of the ratepayers, who, if the Parliamentary franchise were applied to the district, would be thrown out of office to-morrow. Besides, the opposition of these gentlemen to the extension did not rest on the merits of the case. They did not allege, because it could not be alleged, that Rathmines had any Parliamentary interest or position distinguishable from those of the City of Dublin; but what they said was, that if Rathmines were included within the Parliamentary boundary it would form a precedent for including it within the municipal boundary. They wished to have the advantage of residing near the city, without the disadvantage of paying city rates. He would ask the right hon. Baronet whether it was not the fact, as was abundantly shown in the Reports of the Boundary Commissioners for England and Scotland, that wherever in England the population had opposed inclusion within the Parliamentary boundary, and it had appeared to the Commissioners that such opposition was due to the apprehension that hereafter they would be drawn within the municipal boundary also, the Commissioners had not always refused to recognize that as an equitable reason? His contention was that if these four townships were included within the Parliamentary boundary of Dublin, the Government would be satisfied with the general equity of the case. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon) and the hon. Gentleman the Member for Dublin (Dr. Lyons) both knew that what he said was correct, and that if they included Rathmines, Kilmainham, Drumcondra, and Clontarf, they would only be marking out the real urban area. It was true that a fence could not be set up putting exactly on the one side all the rural population and on the other all the urban population; but it was better to have an imperfect reform than no reform at all. The right hon. Baronet had alluded to Tyneside and

other districts in England, where areas really urban had been cut off from great towns and formed into county divisions, and in that parallel he had endeavoured to justify the exclusion of the outlying townships of Dublin, and the inclusion of Kingstown; but there was really no parallel between the two cases. The English outlying districts referred to, such as Jarrow and Tyneside, were themselves business centres, with independent funds for wages. The people in these districts had interests of their own distinct from the cities to which they were attached; but so close was the connection between the townships and borough of Dublin, and so identical were their interests, that the townships had grown within the past 40 years, house by house and street by street, by the exertions and the outlay of the people of Dublin. They were inhabited almost exclusively by men who made their incomes in the city — who spent their days in the city, and returned to the townships in the evening. These people were residents of Dublin; and, if by any extraordinary convulsion of nature, Dublin were to cease to exist, every one of these four townships would have to follow it out of existence, because there were no means, except through the industries maintained in the City of Dublin, by which anyone of them could exist for a single week. He defied the Government to show him in Great Britain any case of more absolute identity of interest. Not only did the townships and the city form a common community, but he maintained that it was impossible for any one of the townships to exist without daily reference to and daily association and dealings with the city. They were told last night that it was dangerous to raise Irish questions in reference to this Bill, and the right hon. Baronet expected the Irish Members to accept the English rule and model. Well, they would do so. In many cases in England included in the Reports of the Commissioners, they had extended the Parliamentary boundary even beyond the municipal boundary. He would refer especially to the case of Bristol. How did the right hon. Baronet account for that? In Bristol the municipal and Parliamentary boundaries were identical before this Bill was introduced; why had the Boundary Commissioners gone outside the municipal boundary and added 47,000 people to the Parliamentary borough? Let the same be done in Dublin and he would be satisfied. The Liverpool municipal and Parliamentary boundaries had also been identical; but in this case, likewise, the Government had gone outside the municipal boundary for the purposes of this Bill, and had added 48,000 people to the Parliamentary borough. All he asked was that Dublin should be treated in a similar manner to Bristol and Liverpool. They had taken the actual cities in both these cases, and all he asked them to do was to take also the actual city in the case of Dublin. All he could say was that if, without showing a particle of reason for it, they continued to deny to Dublin that individual existence to which it had a right, they would give cause for deep and permanent dissatisfaction to the citizens of the Irish capital. If they were determined to retain the boundary as laid down in the Bill, he would assure them they might just as well rebuild the walls as they existed in the time of King John, and keep the Parliamentary boundary within them. He would now move the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

Amendment proposed,

In page 24, at end, to add the words,—

"Dublin

The present Parliamentary borough of Dublin.
The township of Rathmines.
The township of Kilmainham.
The township of Drumcondra, Clonliffe, and Glasnevin.
The township of Clontarf.
The townland of Grangegorman South, the townland of Cabragh, and so much of the townland of Grangegorman Middle as lies south of the road leading from Phibsborough to Cabragh, and so much of the said townland as lies south of Faussagh Lane, and east of Quarry Lane, all in the parish of Grangegorman, barony of Coolock, and county of Dublin.
The townland of Dolphinsbarn, in the parish of St. James, barony of Uppercross, and county of Dublin.
The townlands of Terenure, Kimmage, Rathfarnham, and Newtown Little, all in the parish of Rathfarnham, barony of Rathdown, and county of Dublin.
The townlands of Rathmines Great, Rathmines Little, Farranboley, Churchtown Lower, Friarland, Roebuck, and Trimlestown, or Owenstown, all in

"Dublin	the parish of Taney, barony of Rathdown, and county of Dublin.
	The townlands of Simmonscourt, Annefield, and Priesthouse, all in the parish of Donnybrook, barony of Rathdown, and county of Dublin."

—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "that those words be there added."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that he was afraid he could not add anything very new to the remarks which he had made on this subject last night; indeed, the speech of the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Sexton) was chiefly in the nature of a reply to the remarks which he had himself made. The hon. Member had asked whether there was any case in the United Kingdom similar to that of Dublin. As he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had mentioned before, there were the cases of the Metropolis and Glasgow, which were exactly in the same category. The same arguments used by the hon. Member had been brought forward by the hon. Member for Glasgow, who contended that the districts around his city were undistinguishable from it, that they were densely-populated urban districts possessing an identity of interest. [Mr. SEXTON: You added 21,000 to the borough of Glasgow.] That addition was made in order to bring up the Parliamentary borough to the municipal borough, whereas in Dublin the Parliamentary borough at present exceeded the municipal borough. In the case of the Metropolis, places outside it were undistinguishable from those that were within it; for example, the borough which he himself represented (Chelsea) could not be distinguished from other districts surrounding it. Chiswick could not be distinguished from Hammersmith, because the interests of each place were similar, and the population was practically engaged in the same pursuits. The hon. Member made a proposal to increase the number of voters in Dublin, and if it were acceded to, it would necessarily lead to discussion as to whether the municipal boundary of the city ought to be extended—a question altogether apart from that of representation. He was bound to say that if the hon. Member succeeded in inducing the Committee to carry this Amendment, he feared the Government, to be consistent in their proposals, would be obliged to supplement the representation of Dublin by giving it an additional Member. It would be inconsistent with the general scheme of the Bill to extend the boundaries of Dublin and not to give it five Members.

DR. LYONS said, he regretted that the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) had not taken the course of urging the Government to recommit this question to the Boundary Commissioners. A close and careful investigation was necessary, and as yet nothing of the kind had taken place. There was ample material upon which to go. The argument used yesterday was that the outlying districts objected to being included within the Parliamentary boundary; but that statement had been challenged distinctly in their able Report. The fact that it could be made so loosely by the right hon. Baronet, showed that he had not taken that amount of trouble to inquire that he (Dr. Lyons) thought he was bound to take before deciding not to inclue the four townships within the Parliamentary boundary of Dublin. The statement of the right hon. Baronet had been most emphatically challenged, and on this point he appealed to the Commissioners whose names he had mentioned yesterday, and who had distinctly declared that the assertion, speaking generally, was without foundation, and that so far as any objection to being included within the Parliamentary boundary did exist, it was factitious. Persons had been sent round to certain of the inhabitants in order to ascertain their views; but, instead of confining themselves to eliciting an expression of opinion, they had endeavoured to influence the ratepayers by declaring that one of the consequences of the extension of the Parliamentary boundary of Dublin would be the extension of the municipal boundary and the raising of the rates of the inhabitants of the townships. It had been proved that there was no general feeling against the extension of the Parliamentary boundary, although it was admitted that some persons, under a misapprehension, had taken a view hostile to the hon. Member's proposal. It had been stated that Dublin was in a state bordering on bankruptcy, and that an attempt was being made to extend

the Parliamentary boundary, so that an extension of the municipal boundary might follow, and the outlying districts might be brought to the assistance of the city. On the other hand, however, it had been distinctly shown that that was not the case, and that the city was by no means in a bad financial condition. It had been shown that before long many leases would have fallen in; that the valuation would have increased by thousands of pounds; that the city would then be in a most substantial position, and that there could be no fear that in the future the outlying districts would be chargeable with the debts of the city. The equalization of the rates over the city and the townships, though, no doubt, it would lead to a slight variation in the case of the latter, would lead to a general lowering of the city charges, and when the leases fell in, the state of things, so far as rates were concerned, would be just about what it was now. All these matters were worthy of consideration even now, and should be gone into by the Boundary Commissioners. The whole question should be referred back to that body, the powers being given to them which they had distinctly stated they did not possess. The Commissioners said they had not gone into these matters, because the case was closed from the beginning. In view, then, of the pressing claims arising for reconsideration, he thought that even yet the Government might yield, and have the boundary question thoroughly and conscientiously considered.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY said, he confessed he could not but admire the skilful and dexterous manner in which the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) managed the whole debate on this subject. The right hon. Gentleman's argument appeared now in one shape, and now in another. Last night he opposed a Motion with the argument that another Member could not be given to Dublin, because, if the number were increased, it would be necessary to readjust the boundaries; and to-day, when a demand for a readjustment of the boundaries was asked for, the right hon. Gentleman said—"Oh, you cannot extend the boundary, because, if you do, you will be obliged to have another Member—we shall have to reconstruct the whole thing, and force you to have another Member, whether you like it or not." There was a great deal of inconsistency about this which he owned was particularly attractive and amusing. There was one argument of the right hon. Baronet too misleading to be passed over in silence. He took, as an illustration, some of the Metropolitan boroughs, and said that in those instances they cut off one region from another region identical in character—so identical that a person did not know when he passed from one district to the other. No doubt, that was the case; but let them look at the difference between these cases and the circumstances of the Dublin townships. The Metropolis was being cut up into a great many pieces, large and small, and it would be impossible to maintain a hard-and-fast rule in the apportionment. But in the case of Dublin they had one community, one city, one metropolitan constituency only, and the Irish Members were, therefore, entitled to ask that the whole of the city should be represented in one. There was no parallel at all between this case and that of the London boroughs. He would ask the right hon. Baronet whether there was any extension he would consent to, or accept, to make the City of Dublin in its representation more like the City of Dublin in its actual form? If he would give them an indication of any extension that he could agree to, they would carefully consider it with a view to founding a proposal upon it. If, however, the right hon. Gentleman had laid down a hard-and-fast line, and had ruled that, for Parliamentary purposes, Dublin should remain quite different from the Dublin in its absolute physical proportions, there was hardly much use in continuing the discussion. The Irish Members could only assume that the compact made in secret was such as to preclude the people of Dublin from being anything like fairly dealt with in regard to their Parliamentary representation.

MR. MAYNE said, that, notwithstanding the reply of the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) to the observations of the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton), he (Mr. Mayne) would beg to ask his most earnest consideration for a few points which he would do his best to put before him. Before doing this, however, he

would like to strengthen a point made by his hon. Friend in introducing his Amendment—as to the extraordinary position of the present Parliamentary borough of the City of Dublin. His hon. Friend had said that Dublin included the township of Pembroke; but, as a matter of fact, it went far beyond. It not only included all that township, but extended more than half-way into Blackrock township. It went as far as the Cross at Blackrock. Now, he thought that this fact presented a problem to the right hon. Baronet and Members of the Government that they would find it extremely difficult to solve. Why had a portion of County Down been included in the present Parliamentary borough of Dublin; and why had Rathmines, Kilmainham, Drumcondra, and Clontarf—none of which, except, perhaps, Clontarf, extended so far as the present boundary went in the direction of Blackrock—been excluded? Ever since the Royal Commission had reported in favour of the extension of the municipal boundary, the municipal authorities of Dublin had done their best to bring the question of the boundary up for settlement. They had made representations to the Irish Government, he believed, every year on the subject since that Report had been presented. The question was one which every year became more pressing to the citizens of Dublin. They were financially strangled, it might be said, by the cordon which had been drawn round the present municipality for rating purposes, and the tension had become so considerable that the question was now one of those which would settle itself in spite of the Government. It would have to be approached by the present or succeeding Governments, because it was a question which could not be indefinitely postponed. The population of the townships surrounding Dublin were not only a similar class to the citizens of Dublin, but they were the very same people. They were the people who resided in Dublin during the day, and simply came to the townships to sleep. They enjoyed exemption from the payment of certain rates, which exemption was unjust and must go by the board as soon as there was an inquiry into the subject. The lowness of the rates in Rathmines was chiefly due to the fact that modern sanitary science and arrangements were better observed at present within the municipal boundary than they were outside. Rathmines preferred to have low rates—and dirty roads and dark streets. It preferred to light its streets very inadequately; and even inadequately as the streets were lighted, they extinguished their lamps on every night that the moon ought to shine—not only when the moon was shining, but they extinguished their lamps whether it was shining or not when there ought to be a full moon. When Dublin had the reputation of being "dear and dirty Dublin," it endured dirty roads and dark streets quite as much as Rathmines; and when Rathmines was compelled, as it would be compelled by its inhabitants, to adopt a method of transacting business and of carrying out the sanitary arrangements of the township more in accordance with modern ideas than at present, the low rates which now prevailed would no longer be maintainable. They would gradually go up until possibly they would exceed the present rates in the City of Dublin. Great difference existed between the powers of municipal authorities in Ireland and the powers enjoyed by similar bodies in England and Scotland in one very important particular. In Ireland the municipal authorities did not promote Bills before Parliament without incurring the very serious risk of having themselves personally mulcted in heavy costs. Municipal authorities in England and Scotland were exempt from that risk. They might approach Parliament whenever they had a good case, and, whether they won or lost, the individual members incurred no risk. Now, the last reply made by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland to representations made by the municipal authorities within the City of Dublin was to the effect that, in the next Session of Parliament, the Government would introduce a measure to bring about changes of a general character affecting local government in cities and counties in Ireland, and for assimilating the law between England and Ireland, so as to render legal payments by Corporations in Ireland of costs consequent upon the promotion of measures affecting municipal affairs. The noble Lord also stated that until defects in rating, which he proposed to deal with next Session, were remedied, the question of the extension of the boundaries of Dublin was not ripe for

settlement. He (Mr. Mayne) would call the attention of the right hon. Baronet to the fact that the "next Session" there spoken of was last Session—the Session of 1884. No opportunity appeared to have afforded itself to the Government of introducing that measure affecting the rating and affecting the powers of Corporations in Ireland to pay the expenses of contested Bills before Parliament; but this Session, or next Session, or some other Session, the Government might feel itself bound to redeem this promise, as well as other promises they had made in a similar direction. He invited the attention of the Government to the fact that the municipal boundary of Dublin would then be extended to the very limits proposed now by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Sligo for the Parliamentary boundary, and the position the citizens of Dublin residing in these townships would occupy would then be unique, inasmuch as they would not only have double rating powers, but enjoy a double franchise; but those of them who had the franchise in Trinity College would actually enjoy a three-fold privilege of voting for Members of Parliament. That was a matter which, he ventured to say, was worthy of the gravest consideration. If the Government extended the Parliamentary boundary of the city now, they would simply be availing themselves of a fitting opportunity of correcting disadvantages which would not soon recur when the municipal boundary was extended. The supporters of the Amendment were not asking for an additional Member; and there was no reason to expect that when Parliament came to deal with the question of the extension of the municipal boundary, they would re-open this question of the Parliamentary boundary. That question would probably be settled now for a lifetime, and he maintained, therefore, that it was the duty of the Government to so arrange the Parliamentary boundary of Dublin, that her citizens should not occupy the extraordinarily privileged position he had indicated when it came to have its municipal boundary settled, as it inevitably would at an early date. The right hon. Baronet had replied to the hon. Member for Sligo, that if the Government assented to this proposed extension of the Parliamentary boundary of Dublin, they would be deprived of an argument against the demand for an additional Member for Dublin. But that was really not a serious answer. Sufficient for the day was the evil thereof! The Irish Members only asked for a reasonable concession; they did not press for anything which might follow from the granting of it. Whatever slight disadvantage would accrue would cure itself in time. The question of the municipal boundary was so pressing that it would cure itself at once. The statement of the right hon. Baronet with regard to the Metropolis did not apply to the case of Dublin at all—that was to say, the comparison he had drawn between the townships of Dublin and Chiswick and Hammersmith. Chiswick had not grown out of Hammersmith, nor Hammersmith out of Chiswick, and the people who resided in the one place were not the people who carried on business in the other. In the case of Dublin, not only had the townships grown out of Dublin, but the business people of the city were really the residents of the townships. Dublin was a Parliamentary community in itself, and not at all like London, which was a vast conglomeration of people, more resembling all Ireland than Dublin. There was, therefore, no analogy between Hammersmith and the districts surrounding the Irish capital. Altogether, this question was one with regard to which the citizens of Dublin had been wrought up to a considerable state of tension, and if the reply of the Government still continued to be *non possumus*, it would cause the greatest disappointment in Dublin, and spur on the exertions that had been made in the past to have this question of municipal boundaries once for all settled, because the people of Dublin would now see that if they had forced on the question of the municipal boundary in the last or preceding Session, they would not now have to face the question before them.

MR. PLUNKET said, he did not intend, in the least degree, to go again over the arguments which had been used yesterday, and some of which had been repeated to-day; but he desired to enter his protest and express his opinion upon a subject which was fully discussed by the Commissioners when they sat in Dublin, and in connection with which the points, on the one side and the other, were fully stated by most

able counsel. The Corporation had placed before the Commissioners its view of the matter, and the townships had stated their case. The whole question had been thrashed out, and he had not the least intention of going all over it again. He did not propose to discuss the claims of "dear, old, dirty Dublin," nor the character of the municipal government of Rathmines—whether or not it and the other townships had been an example of good government and salubrity, and everything else of the kind—although he thought that Rathmines was not open to the charge that it was now as Dublin used to be, and though he believed it really was an example of good government. But this was not the point. It had been said just now that there was no parallel between the case of Dublin and the surrounding townships and Chiswick and Hammersmith; but that, he could assure the Committee, was quite a mistake. There were numbers of people in the townships who had nothing whatever to do with the City of Dublin, although, no doubt, there were some who lived in the townships and had business relations with Dublin; but the same could be said of Chiswick and Hammersmith. They could not deal with the townships as though they were really a part of the City of Dublin. As had been pointed out, parts of these townships were practically rural, and it was impossible to tell where they straggled up into the country, and where they remained part of the town. In fact, the distinction between Hammersmith or Chiswick and the rest of London was not nearly so great as that between the City of Dublin and the outlying townships as regarded rural and urban populations. However, he merely rose for the purpose of saying that there was a feeling on the part of those persons living in the townships of Dublin, who some hon. Members were so anxious to see included within the Parliamentary boundary of Dublin, against this annexation. At any rate, there was by no means an unanimous feeling in its favour, even in the city proper.

MR. MELDON said, that this was really a matter of such serious consequence, not only to the citizens of Dublin, but also to the inhabitants of the townships, that he hoped they were not obliged to take the opinion now expressed by the Government as final. He would suggest that the matter should be postponed until the Report, the Government undertaking meanwhile to consult the Boundary Commissioners, and get another Report from them. If, as a matter of fact, the Commissioners had had to report on the merits of the case, it could be gathered, from the Report they had furnished, what their decision would have been; but, as had been already pointed out, they had felt themselves bound not to go into, or consider, the question at all. He thought it was only fair, in a matter of such serious consequence as this, to make the appeal that he now made, for a reconsideration of the question by the Commissioners between this and the Report stage of the Bill. He made the appeal all the more strongly in consequence of the admission of the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) last night, to the effect that a good case had been made out by the Amendment then proposed for an alteration in the Parliamentary boundary of Dublin. A Member might be taken from Tyrone and given to Dublin, and the Government had stated that that was a matter the Committee might deal with. In view of that admission, hon. Members must bear in mind that they were dealing with the capital of Ireland, and, in spite of what had fallen from the right hon. and learned Member who had just sat down (Mr. Plunket), that they were asked to confirm the popular opinion and views of the large majority of the people of the city and of the outlying townships. There was strong opposition before the Boundary Commissioners; but it had been pointed out how that opposition had originated. He admitted that if there was a compact between the Front Benches that the representation of Dublin was to be handed over from one side of the House to the other, the Government would most decidedly adhere to the arrangement which had been come to; but, in the absence of any such agreement, he should like to point out the source from which this opposition came. It came from the Town Commissioners of Rathmines, a body who no more represented the township than he did himself. As had been already declared, the Commissioners were elected upon a very restricted franchise; and to everyone—he did not care on what side

of the House he sat—who were familiar with the circumstances of Rathmines, it must be apparent that this local Governing Body did not represent the views of the majority of the people of the township. The opposition to the extension of the boundary now came from the Conservatives, and it was the Conservative agents who had circulated the statement amongst the inhabitants of the township that this was really not a question of Parliamentary boundary, but of rating. The question was not as to the municipal boundary, and it did not follow that because the township was brought within the Parliamentary borough, therefore it should be brought within the rating boundary. The Parliamentary boundary might be enlarged without prejudice to any question of rating. The only question raised before the Boundary Commissioners was one of rating, which was very different to that of the Parliamentary boundary. He maintained that if Dublin was to be exceptionally treated as the capital of Ireland, such treatment should be in its favour, and not against it. It must be admitted that, so far as Ireland was concerned, the treatment of Dublin had been exceptional. In the case of Belfast, they took in a rural district for the purpose of giving it an increased number of Members. He did not begrudge Belfast its Members; but he complained that Dublin had not received anything like the same consideration. The township of Pembroke, which was the most rural, had been brought within the boundary; but they had refused to include even so much of the other townships as were urban. If they would only do that, the Irish Members who supported the Amendment would be satisfied. They did not object to the exclusion of Kilmainham, not because it was a rural district, but because its inclusion would give the boundary an awkward shape. They did not object to the exclusion of Rathfarnham, because that, they admitted, was as rural as Pembroke, which was included; but they asked the Government—and this, he thought, was a modest request—that they should, before the Report, direct a further inquiry to be made by the Boundary Commissioners, and a Report submitted as to the merits of the question. It must always be borne in mind that Dublin was the capital of Ireland; still the Irish Members did not ask that it might have exceptional treatment, but only that it should be treated like towns in England. The demand he made was one which he thought should be acceded to, when it was put forward on behalf not only of the inhabitants of Dublin, but of the residents in the townships who had a community of interests with them.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that the proposal now made by the hon. and learned Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon) was similar to the one made a few nights ago in the case of Glasgow—namely, that it should be relegated to the Boundary Commissioners to inquire what urban districts were outside the borough which might, perhaps, be added to it; but the Leaders of both Parties were against the proposition, and the Committee rejected it on the ground that it would raise false hopes. Whatever the Commissioners might decide, there was no prospect that the Committee would reverse its decision—that the number of Members for Dublin City should not be increased. He had no doubt many important arguments could be brought forward, looking at the matter from the municipal point of view, as the hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. Mayne) approached it. That hon. Member had addressed the Committee at considerable length, the whole of his speech tending to support the proposal for the extension of the boundary for municipal purposes. The hon. Member must recollect that there was a very strong opposition on the part of the people for the inclusion of the townships. The Exham Commission had reported four years ago; but its Report had not yet been acted upon on account of the great difficulties, Parliamentary and otherwise, which would arise from the opposition of the people living in the townships. The question to be now considered was, whether it was desirable by a side-wind to raise this important question again? It appeared to him that the question of including the townships for purposes of taxation was one which ought to be decided on its own merits, altogether apart from the question before the Committee. The Committee had already decided not to give a fifth Member to Dublin; and, practically, the question before the Committee was the same as that considered yes-

terday, and so decided. The whole question was to be regarded from that point of view.

MR. HARRINGTON said, there was a very great difference, which the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General did not appear to perceive, between what the House had been asked to do in the case of Glasgow, and what it was asked to do in the case of Dublin. The Motion made on behalf of the inhabitants of Glasgow was made solely with a view of increasing the representation of Glasgow; but the Irish Members had abandoned the proposal to increase the number of Members for Dublin. The hon. Member for Sligo, in moving his Amendment, had stated that he had abandoned that ground, and that his proposal was to extend the Parliamentary boundary of the city without making a claim for an increase to the number of Members. The right hon. Gentleman was quite mistaken in the observation he had made in regard to the remarks of his hon. Friend the Member for Tipperary (Mr. Mayne) that they were directed to municipal purposes. The right hon. Gentleman had himself admitted that there was a great deal of justice in the claim the Irish Members were making; but while he admitted that, he appealed to the Committee to throw an obstacle in the way of the people of Dublin by declining to accede to their claim. The right hon. Gentleman had, however, placed an argument in the way of the Corporation of Dublin which would be useful to them in the near future in endeavouring to get their municipal boundaries increased. Although he had admitted that, as a general principle, the boundaries ought to be extended as far as possible in order to include all the municipal boundaries, he was now setting up a case in Dublin, where the Parliamentary boundaries would be far less extensive than the municipal boundaries. He would like to put this view forward, which, he thought, would strengthen the appeal of the hon. and learned Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon). By allowing those people who lived in Rathmines to remain outside the boundary of the City of Dublin, they were giving them double representation, because it was computed that about 80 per cent of them came into town every day, and had their businesses there. They had their offices in the City, and exercised the franchise there, and by merely crossing the canal they had another vote in the county. Some time ago he had discovered that there were 600 freemen of the City of Dublin alone who lived in Rathmines, and he asked the Committee seriously to consider the importance of the step which was now proposed. There was hardly a qualified elector in Rathmines who was not a qualified elector in the City, and by leaving Rathmines outside the City boundaries they were practically giving all these people two votes. The object of the Amendment was merely to deprive about 2,000 of these people of one of their two votes. No reason at all had been given them by the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill for the inclusion of Pembroke township within the City boundaries. That township was far more distinct from Dublin than any other in the neighbourhood of Dublin. It was further away, and was more distinct in every conceivable way. The argument made use of by the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General was precisely the reverse of that which had been used by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke). When the Irish Members had asked for an increase in the number of Members for Dublin, they were told that the boundaries were not sufficiently enlarged; and now that they were asking to have the boundaries extended, they were told that that could not be done, because the right hon. Gentleman would have to go back on the Bill. This was only another example of the extraordinary reasons which they were used to from the Treasury Bench. He charged the Government with a culpable disregard of the claims of the people of Dublin, and with adding to their grievances by placing opposition in the way of the citizens of Dublin in their attempt to secure a measure which was only equitable and just.

COLONEL COLTHURST said, he would advise the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) to institute an inquiry into this matter before the stage of Report. There was a very strong feeling in Dublin in consequence of Rathmines not having been included in the City. It would not interfere in any way with the distribution of Members in Ireland. If it would have interfered with the

Members for the county in any way, he should have opposed the suggestion as strongly as anyone.

MR. BIGGAR said, he thought the Government might give way in this matter. It was clear that these townships were as much a part of the City as any other parts of the City which were as near to the centre of it. It was also clear that these places would one of these days become part of the Municipal Corporation area. It might be argued that if this Amendment were agreed to, the result would be that the Parliamentary boundary would extend beyond the municipal boundary; but that state of things would be of a very temporary nature, because, under any circumstances, the great City of Dublin was certain to eventually absorb these small places. For these reasons, he could not see what the difficulties were in the way of the Government accepting the Amendment. They were not asking for an increase of Members; if they were, an argument might fairly be raised as to where the additional Member was to come from. Since it was not proposed to do so, however, he did think the Government might well agree to the Amendment. The case of Glasgow did not at all correspond with what they proposed to do in this case. He did not believe that the proposed change would have any political effect whatever. The argument against it was all in favour of the people in these districts, who wanted to be still exempt from the payment of City taxes. He thought the Government ought to give way. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Plunket) argued that the people in the township of Rathmines were opposed to the proposed change. That was very natural for two reasons. One was that they wished to be exempt from City taxes as long as possible, and the other was that they desired to retain their two votes—one in the City and one in the county. These desires, however, did not in any way fairly entitle them to those privileges. He thought that the arguments of the Nationalist Party, who were not partizan in regard to Dublin matters, ought to be considered.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said, that, although they had no very great hope of altering the decision of the Government in this matter, he thought they had a right to resent the determination which the Treasury Bench had come to. It was a sad thing, when a majority of Irish Members came down to that House and made a demand upon a matter of which they knew much more than the Government could possibly know, that the Government should put themselves in opposition to them. The Irish Members would be lacking in their duty to the people of these districts, who were anxious to be included within the boundaries of the City of Dublin, if they did not take the opportunity of making the Government feel that if the Irish Members could not enforce their will in that House, they could, at least, enter a very strong protest against what was positively an insult put upon them. The Government had been asked, on a previous occasion, by the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) to include these places within the City boundaries, and to give the City an additional Member from the County Tyrone; but to-day the Irish Members had abandoned that claim, and in doing so he thought they had proved conclusively that they were not prompted by any Party feeling at all. The hon. Member for Sligo pointed out yesterday, in proposing his Amendment for the acceptance of the Committee, that it would be hard to say to which Party the additional Member would be elected. They could not say whether the inclusion of these districts would result in a Conservative gain, a Liberal gain, or a Nationalist gain; and therefore it should be distinctly understood that, in making this demand, they were acting in no partial spirit, or in the hope that the Party which they represented in that House would obtain any benefit from it. The principle upon which the demand was made was that the residents of Rathmines were practically, and in every sense of the word, residents of Dublin; and why the Government should have decided to practically cut the City of Dublin in two was a matter which was in itself exceedingly extraordinary. Hon. Members from Ireland had urged upon the Government the necessity of accepting the Amendment of the hon. Member for Sligo; but they must remember that the present demand which they were making was practically unanimously supported by Members from Ireland of all shades of opinion. The only Irish Member

who objected was the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Plunket). The Irish Nationalist Members in that House were quite accustomed to having their demands refused, and their recommendations treated with no consideration at all; but it was a most extraordinary thing when the Government refused to consider demands made by supporters of their own—Irish Members on their own side of the House. It might at least have been expected that the Postmaster General would have had some consideration for demands put forward by hon. Gentlemen like those who were always so steady in their support of the Government on critical occasions. The only reason he could give for this was, that Dublin was being arranged in this extraordinary way in order to please a certain section of the Tory Party in Ireland. They did not know what were the arrangements come to between the Liberal Ministers and the Gentlemen on the Front Bench on the Conservative side of the House; but, although they were quite ignorant of what took place at those mysterious conferences, and although they could not say how much the Government surrendered, there was one thing of which they were certain—namely, that in those conferences the Government, in many respects, and especially in regard to Ireland, made large concessions in the interests of the Tory Party. Now, the only Member who had raised his voice against the Amendment of the hon. Member for Sligo was the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Dublin University. The Liberal Members were almost entirely unanimous in their support of the Amendment, the Nationalist Members were united with the Liberal Members, and the only Member from Ireland who set his face against this most reasonable demand was the right hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin.

THE CHAIRMAN: I must call the hon. Member's attention to the fact that he has said that already twice before. He is rather wearying the Committee.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said, he was exceedingly sorry if he had been guilty—unwittingly, he begged to assure the Chairman — of transgressing the Rules of the House. He did not know that he was out of Order in referring to the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin.

THE CHAIRMAN said, he did not say that the hon. Member was out of Order in referring to the right hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin. If the hon. Member had been longer in that House he would understand what he (the Chairman) had said. He was not out of Order in referring to the right hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin, but was wearying the Committee by repeating for a third time the argument about that right hon. and learned Gentleman, and the action of the Liberal Members from Ireland; and wearisome repetition rendered him liable to a direction from the Chair to stop his speech.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said, he would try not to be wearisome again. The only reason they could give for the fact that the right hon. and learned Gentleman's refusal to accept this Amendment was that he had got a few letters from certain people in Dublin. The Irish Members were merely prompted by a desire to make the electoral divisions of Dublin as complete as possible, and as convenient as possible, to the people of Dublin. It had been stated there—and if it had been stated upon any authority it would have been a great argument against that Amendment—that the people interested were not willing to be included within the City boundaries. That was a statement which ought not to be made lightly, and when it was made against the Amendment of the hon. Member for Sligo it should be made with some authority to show that it was true. He took exception to the statement, because he knew that the greater part of the people of Rathmines desired to be included within the City. They were already citizens of Dublin. They went into Dublin every day; and it was a matter of regret to them that while they were practically Dublin people, and did all their business there, they should have to put up with the hardship of not being able to give their vote in the City. Now, the people of Rathmines had, so to speak, commissioned his hon. Friends there to make out their case in that House, and they would certainly not attempt to do that if they thought that it would not be pleasing to the great majority of the people of Rathmines. They had had a great many opinions expressed by the people of Rathmines

on this matter; and it was distinctly the opinion of the people of Dublin proper, and of the people of Rathmines also, that it would be for the interests of each that Rathmines should be included in the City, which would form one large electoral division, instead of being split up, as it was at present. In the case of London, what had been done? As a matter of fact, London was very properly and carefully distributed into divisions. They had not taken any very populous parts of London away and put them into the county. But in the case of Dublin they cut it in two, and practically severed one of the principal portions of Dublin from it. Of course, this matter, in reference to the division of Dublin, might be exceedingly uninteresting to many Members in that House; but he assured the Committee that it was only in the interests of the people they represented that they were thus strongly urging this Amendment. He assured the Government also that if they did not make any concession they would give very great dissatisfaction to a great many people in Ireland. He had voted for the inclusion of several districts in the City of Glasgow, because he thought that the Glasgow Members were making for Glasgow much the same demand which the Irish Members were now making for Dublin; but it was no argument, because the Government refused to make the concession in the case of Glasgow, that they should refuse to agree to the demands of the Irish Members in reference to the capital of their country. He ventured to say that it would not be advanced by anyone, not even the Scotch Members, that Glasgow held the same position in Scotland as Dublin did in his country. Therefore, it was simply ridiculous to say that they were to be told that, because the Government refused to extend the boundaries of Glasgow, they should also refuse to extend the boundaries of Dublin. It was on that ground that they objected altogether to the Redistribution Bill. Instead of having had regard to the special claims of Ireland, the Government and Gentlemen on the Front Opposition Bench jumbled up the populations of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and then struck certain lines in regard to proportion of population; but it would have been much more satisfactory if they had had regard to Ireland alone and the special circumstances connected with it. In no case was the necessity of dealing with each place according to the peculiar circumstances connected with it more striking than in the case of Dublin. He did not know what the particular claims of Glasgow were——

THE CHAIRMAN said, he must call the hon. Gentleman's attention again to the many times he had repeated his argument about Glasgow. If he repeated them any further, he would call upon him to resume his seat without concluding his remarks.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said, he was exceedingly sorry that he had made it necessary for the Chairman to call him to Order a second time; but he hoped he should not give further offence. He assured them, however, that although this was not a matter of interest to a great many Members, it was a vital point for Irish Members, and the Government, in refusing to accept this Amendment, were not acting wisely. He was sure that all his hon. Friends would be happy if they could come to terms with the Government, so that a compromise might be effected; and he would point out that so sincere was their desire to come to an understanding that his hon. Friend the Member for Sligo had foregone his claim, which they thought they were perfectly entitled to make, for five Members for Dublin. His hon. Friend the Member for Sligo had made out a claim for an additional Member for Dublin. It was a claim which the Government admitted to be a strong one, and it was a claim which was backed up by the Irish people, and it was supported by nearly all the Irish Members of every shade of opinion; and what was the result? It was not accepted by the Government. The Irish people would only be able to find one explanation of this, and that explanation would be that there was some underhand intrigue between the Government and the Orangemen. When the people of Ireland found that the wishes of the people of Dublin were set on one side, in order that the wishes of a set of anonymous letter-writers might be met, he thought they would——

It being a quarter before Six of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to report Progress.

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow*.

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—THE NEGOTIATIONS.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Before the House rises, I should like to put a Question to the right hon. Gentleman at the head of Her Majesty's Government, as to whether any news has been received to-day of importance connected with the Russian negotiations?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: No, Sir.

MOTION.

—o—

PUBLIC HEALTH (MEMBERS AND OFFICERS) BILL.

On Motion of Sir JOHN KENNAWAY, Bill to amend "The Public Health Act, 1875," with respect to the Members and Officers of Local Authorities, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir JOHN KENNAWAY, Mr. LONG, and Mr. COWEN.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 114.]

House adjourned at ten minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 26th March, 1885.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Burgh Police and Health (Scotland) * (57); Criminal Law Amendment * (58); Consolidated Fund (No. 2) *; Cape of Good Hope (Advance) * (59); Lunacy Acts Amendment * (60).

Second Reading—Municipal Voters (Relief) * (39).

Committee—Elections (Hours of Poll) * (43).

SOUTH AFRICA—BECHUANALAND.

QUESTION.

LORD HARRIS asked the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether it was true, as reported in *The Morning Post* of yesterday, and telegraphed from Cape Town, that Sir Hercules Robinson had ordered the proceedings instituted by Sir Charles Warren with regard to the murderers of Mr. Bethell to be stayed, and had further arrested his general course of action in Bechuanaland?

THE EARL OF DERBY: My Lords, in answer to the Question of the noble Lord I have to say that we do not know anything at the Colonial Office of any proposal to stay the proceedings instituted with regard to the murder of Mr. Bethell; but as regards another matter to which it is possible the writer of the telegram may have referred, I may say that it is the fact that Sir Hercules Robinson has expressed an opinion that the proceedings against Mr. Niekerk for the murder of Mr. Honey are ill-advised. One of these transactions may have been confounded with the other; but I am not aware that in that case any step has been taken by Sir Hercules Robinson to veto, or to put an end to those proceedings. I may add that there have been differences of opinion on points of policy between Sir Charles Warren and Sir Hercules Robinson; but nothing that has come to my knowledge would justify the statement which has been telegraphed that Sir Charles Warren's course has been arrested. Both Sir Charles Warren and Sir Hercules Robinson have referred their differences to Her Majesty's Government, and I am in telegraphic communication with them upon the subject. I need hardly say that both of these gentlemen are very able and efficient public servants, and I venture to hope that their differences will be made up, and that the country will not lose the advantage of their co-operation.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I wish to ask whether Sir Hercules Robinson has taken these proceedings upon the advice of his Ministers, or has he acted simply as an Imperial officer?

THE EARL OF DERBY: As to the case of Bechuanaland, I apprehend, as that is beyond the jurisdiction of the Cape Colony, he would be acting entirely upon his own responsibility as High Commissioner, and not as Governor of the Colony; but no doubt he would consult his Legal Advisers.

ARMY AND MILITIA RESERVE FORCES.

MESSAGE FROM THE QUEEN.

Delivered by The Earl of KIMBERLEY, and read by The LORD CHANCELLOR, as follows:

VICTORIA R.

The present state of public affairs and the extent of the demands on the military forces of Her Majesty for the protection of the interests of the Empire having constituted, in the opinion of Her Majesty, a case of great emergency within the meaning of the Acts of Parliament in that behalf, Her Majesty deems it proper to provide additional means for Her military service, and, therefore, in pursuance

of those Acts, Her Majesty has thought it right to communicate to the House of Lords that Her Majesty is about to cause Her Reserve Force and Her Militia Reserve Force, or such part thereof as Her Majesty shall from time to time think necessary, to be called out for permanent service.

V. R.

Ordered, That the said Message be taken into consideration *To-morrow*.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: As the noble Earl has not given any Notice of this, I wish to ask what the course of proceeding will be with regard to the consideration of Her Majesty's Message?

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: Her Majesty's Message will be taken into consideration to-morrow.

LUNACY ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

BILL PRESENTED. FIRST READING.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR, in presenting a Bill to amend the Acts relating to lunatics, said, it would be convenient that he should explain that the present law was divided into two branches. One related to the class which it might be convenient to describe as Chancery lunatics, whose property was administered by the Court under the jurisdiction of the Lord Chancellor and the Lords Justices. The other related to lunatics not in that position. The law as to the former was very ancient, going back as far as Edward II. It recognized the right of the Crown to the care and custody of the estates of such persons. There were Masters and other officials in Lunacy, who acted under the authority of the several Acts of Parliament, held inquiries, and administered estates, rendering accounts to the Court. This part of the law it was not proposed to alter by the present Bill, although one or two clauses would effect some extension of the powers of the Lord Chancellor and the Lords Justices. The principal Acts of Parliament which had reference to this subject were three in number, passed respectively in 1853, 1856, and 1862, and there were in various other Acts particular sections and clauses referring to the same subject. The Chancery lunatics were comparatively few—they did not exceed 1,300 in number; and the rest of the lunatics throughout the country were on a different footing. He did not think any Acts were passed with regard to the latter class of lunatics until the Reign of George III., and it was not till 1845 that the subject was placed on a firm and lasting footing. There were now nine Acts, beginning with the Act of 1845 and coming down to an Act passed in 1863, upon that subject. It was most desirable and important that all those 12 Acts and sections of certain other Acts should be consolidated; but it would be better not to attempt to pass a Consolidation Bill until it was seen what alterations in the law would be made in consequence of the present measure. When that was done, all the Acts would be embodied in a Consolidation Bill, which would be introduced either in the present, or, more probably, in another Session, and by means of which the whole law relating to lunacy would be presented in one aspect. With regard to those lunatics who were not Chancery lunatics, and who constituted the great majority of the lunatics throughout the country, he might state briefly the present state of the law and its administration. They might be divided into two great classes—pauper lunatics, and private lunatics who were not paupers. The pauper lunatics were by far the most numerous class; last year they numbered 70,470, and of these there were in licensed houses 1,398. Of those licensed houses there were 35 in the Metropolis and 62 in the Provinces. At the time the noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury) addressed the House last year, there were in those houses altogether 4,779 patients. There were of hospitals, which were of a more public character than licensed houses, 13 for lunatics and two for idiots, or a total of 15, maintained either by endowment or subscription. Last year those hospitals contained 3,146 patients. In public asylums for lunatics generally, there were 686 private and 45,164 pauper patients. In workhouses there were 17,377 patients; the out-door pauper lunatics were 6,078. There were 314 in naval and military asylums; and in criminal lunatic asylums 535. Besides those already mentioned, there were 449 single patients kept in other houses, conducted for gain or profit, and visited by the Lunacy Commissioners. They were a body constituted in the year 1845, consisting of three medical and three legal Commissioners, all of whom were paid, and five Commissioners, with the

noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury) at their head, who were unpaid. They had a general supervision and very extensive powers over the whole of this great system. Of the Commissioners he could not speak without paying a humble, though very inadequate, tribute to the invaluable services which had been rendered to the public by them, and particularly by his noble Friend (the Earl of Shaftesbury), who had been their Chairman for more than 50 years. Under their auspices, the enormous abuses which once prevailed had been swept away. A Committee of the House of Commons had been appointed in 1860, and another in 1877, to consider various points in connection with Lunacy Law, and they had taken a considerable body of evidence on the subject. Some of the cases which had been subjects of complaint were investigated by the Committee in 1877; but the Committee did not think that any serious case of abuse had been established before them. He would not refer to any particular cases since that time which had come before the Courts of Justice; but several of the Judges before whom these cases had come had expressed strong opinions as to the insufficiency of the securities for the liberty of the subject under the present state of the law. Their Lordships would find embodied in the Bill most, if not all, the recommendations of the Committee of 1877. The Bill was an honest and carefully-considered attempt to deal with the subject; but he could not conceal from himself that there were some points in it on which considerable difference of opinion existed, and on one very important provision he regretted that the proposition he had to recommend to the acceptance of the House was not approved by the noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury) and his Colleagues on the Lunacy Commission. The Bill did not deal with the administrative establishments either of Chancery or the Lunacy Commissioners, which, on the whole, had worked well and proved satisfactory. He did not say that some changes might not hereafter be necessary in them; but, as they formed a collateral branch of the subject, it was not necessary to encumber this measure with any clauses dealing with them. The point to which he first wished to allude was the important one as to the state of the law with regard to the initial measures for the confinement of persons as lunatics. It had been stated that any man in the streets could confine anybody else as a lunatic if he got any two medical men, however inexperienced, to sign a certificate. He could not accept that mode of stating the case. He did not believe that anything which could properly be so described had ever happened, or was ever likely to happen. But what was really possible was that an opinion might be obtained from two medical gentlemen, who had to sign the certificate, upon insufficient grounds, by relatives or friends of an alleged lunatic, who might be acting in good faith, but whose motives might not be of that absolutely impartial and disinterested character which was desirable. It was possible, though he was not satisfied that there was proof of the fact, that abuses had taken place in that way. In legislating on a subject of this nature, while care should be taken to give the utmost reasonable security for the liberty of the subject, nothing should be done that would prevent the prompt treatment of patients in the early stages of lunacy. It should be clearly understood that, in a large number of cases of lunacy, a cure might be effected by prompt treatment, while delay might be fatal in many of them; and, therefore, the greatest caution should be exercised in interposing between patients and speedy treatment. By the law of Scotland no person could be confined as a lunatic on the sole authority of any private individual. The practice was to present a petition to the Sheriff, accompanied by a statement of the particulars of the case, and supported by the certificates of two medical practitioners, on the strength of which an order could be made for the reception of the lunatic into an asylum, or other proper place of custody. If the Sheriff was not satisfied with the certificates, he could make independent inquiry. The Scottish law also provided means for dealing with cases of urgency without delay. Similar provisions existed in the legal system of New York and other parts of the United States, in France, and in Germany. The Committees of the House of Commons which had sat in this country in 1860 and 1877 to consider the Lunacy Laws had both reported against that kind of public intervention, the former considering that it would do more harm

than good, and the latter being of opinion that even if such intervention might do no harm it would do no practical good. But, unless he greatly mistook the expressions of learned Judges and the demands of public opinion at the present time, this question did not stand now as it stood either in 1860 or in 1877. In principle, it did not seem open to doubt that a man's liberty ought not to be interfered with for any long or indefinite time without the sanction of some public authority; and in practice, the experience of Scotland and other countries proved that this principle might be satisfied without injury to the unhappy class whose liberty was in question, if a measure for that purpose was attended by precautions to prevent its unguarded application. The Bill he was introducing proposed that no person, not a pauper or criminal lunatic, or under the guardianship of the Lord Chancellor, should be received or detained as a lunatic in a hospital, asylum, licensed house for lunatics, or for payment in any other place, without the order under the hand of a Judge of a Superior Court, of a Judge of a County Court, of a Stipendiary Magistrate, or of a Justice of the Peace having jurisdiction where the lunatic was. Should their Lordships, during the progress of the Bill, suggest any better authority in these cases than that of all Justices of the Peace, the Government would be ready to give further consideration to that part of the subject. There must be certificates of two medical men, one of whom was to be, if possible, the ordinary medical attendant of the patient; if not, the reasons were to be stated. The Committee of 1877 had suggested that there should be statutory declarations; but it did not appear that any advantage would be gained by this, while there would be the disadvantage of multiplying the stages at which application must be made to a magistrate. There was, however, a clause providing that, in certain cases, the same penalty should attach as if an oath or statutory declaration had been made. If the magistrate should be satisfied with the evidence of lunacy appearing by the medical certificates, he might at once make an order, or, if not satisfied, appoint a time when a further investigation should be made. The inquiry was to be conducted in private, and those necessarily present were to be bound to keep everything secret that had taken place in the course of the examination, unless required to divulge it by lawful authority. The patient was not to be present; but the magistrate might, if he thought it necessary, visit him. The magistrate was required to give his reasons in writing if he thought it desirable to dismiss the petition. The 3rd clause provided for cases of urgency, which were to be dealt with, substantially as in Scotland, until a magistrate's order could be obtained. They had thus done what they could to prevent the occurrence of the evils apprehended by those who objected to the introduction of the magistrate. With regard to pauper lunatics, the Bill contained provisions founded on the same principle. Besides the securities which they had endeavoured to provide for the initial stages, the Bill, in conformity with the recommendations of the Committee of 1877, proposed that, within a month after the reception of the patient into any authorized establishment, a report, additional to those now required, should be made to the Commissioners of Lunacy, and subsequently an official visit should be made as soon as practicable to the newly-received lunatic by a Commissioner or by the Visitors in the district. It was proposed that every order made should be limited in duration to three years, unless the proper medical authorities certified that the patient ought to be detained, in which case the order was to be renewed from year to year. At the request of any private person, two medical men, if authorized by the Commissioners, might visit any lunatic, who, with the sanction of the Commissioners, might on their report be discharged. The Bill also proposed to give to the Commissioners large powers, on receiving any information that any person was treated as a lunatic in any private house or any religious establishment, to call for information, and, if necessary, to visit the place. Power was given to the Attorney General and the Home Secretary to initiate proceedings for any offence against the Lunacy Laws. The question of licensed houses was one of the most important connected with this subject. Great objection had been frequently made to licensed houses, on the ground that it was inexpedient that any person should have a pecuniary in-

terest in the care and continued detention of a lunatic who might possibly be better off elsewhere. At the present time the asylums provided by the County Justices were mainly for pauper lunatics, and private patients could only be received when there was superabundant room, and they must then be treated in the same manner as paupers. It was proposed by the Bill to give greater facilities for extending the public asylum system, so that it might by degrees become adapted to the reception of private non-pauper patients. The County and Borough Justices were to be authorized to provide for the reception of paying patients, either in the same buildings with the pauper patients, or in special asylums. For the purpose of carrying this out, the Justices were authorized, if necessary, to borrow money. These special asylums might be either for idiots or lunatics. In addition to the powers proposed to be given to the Justices, it was also intended that the Secretary of State should have the same compulsory powers with respect to private patients that he now possessed with regard to paupers. It was hoped, therefore, that the system of public asylums would gradually become, in a natural way, a substitute for licensed houses. At the present time, and looking to the large number of licensed houses and the outlay that had been made upon them, it had not been thought advisable, or indeed possible, to abolish them compulsorily. But there would be nothing to prevent the Justices from buying the licensed houses; though the Bill did not propose, as had been proposed in Bills introduced into the House of Commons in 1880 and 1881, that this should be done upon terms to be fixed by the Act, or that the amount should be ascertained by a jury or by arbitrators. To suppress those houses on which a large outlay had been made, and to do it suddenly, without having in the meantime made adequate provision for the large number of lunatics to be dealt with, was a step which could not be recommended. It was, however, proposed that after five years no paupers should be received in licensed houses, and that no fresh licences for private asylums should be granted by Justices without the consent of the Commissioners. There were many other provisions in the Bill, on a variety of subjects, and particularly some as to asylums for imbecile children capable of profiting by instruction, which he hoped would meet with their Lordships' approval. Having laid this summary of the Bill before the House, he trusted that their Lordships would read the Bill a first time.

Bill to amend the Acts relating to lunatics — *Presented* (The LORD CHANCELLOR); read 1ª. (No. 60.)

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND RUSSIA.

ADDRESS FOR PAPERS.

LORD STRATHEDEN AND CAMPBELL, in rising to call attention to the meeting of the three Emperors at Skiernievice, in September, 1884; and move an humble Address to the Crown for any diplomatic correspondence which exists from Her Majesty's Representatives abroad as to the new concert or alliance between the Courts of Germany, of Austria, and of Russia, said: My Lords, it will not, I think, be difficult to show that the Notice I have given, although going back to an occurrence of the autumn, bears upon the difficulties which cause anxiety at present. But noble Lords may first inquire where is Skiernievice? It is certainly among the places on which geography is rather mute, till history has discovered them. Who ever heard of Königgratz before 1866? Who knew anything of Sedan before 1870, except as a town where a peculiar kind of chair was manufactured or invented? It is difficult to find Skiernievice on actual maps. It will be easy upon future ones. It appears to be distant about an hour and a-half by railway from Warsaw, on the Southern journey to Cracow and to Vienna. My Lords, the Conference at Skiernievice was not the first event which intimated the re-union of Austria, Germany, and Russia. Last year the Royal Speech at Berlin partially acknowledged it. On the 4th of April, when the subject was referred to in this House, the noble Earl the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Granville) declined to question its existence. What took place at Skiernievice gave it a degree of form, of pomp, and of publicity which had not previously existed. It also showed, by vivid details I pass over for compression, that Russia was the power to direct, as she has often been the power to achieve, this kind of combination. The three Ministers of the respective States assisted,

and had long interviews together. The Chancellor of the German Empire, who is never present at unmeaning ceremonials, by joining it himself declared its substance and reality. The choice of the locality in Poland was not insignificant. These facts will hardly be disputed or viewed differently; but it may still be asked on what account an open and accentuated union of the kind ought to be regarded with extraordinary interest?

It cannot be denied, of course, that these august Personages are entitled to assemble when and where they may think proper. It may be granted that each, regarded as an individual, has special titles to regard, sympathy, or approbation in Great Britain. It is true also that domestic circumstances and traditionary habits explain a disposition upon their part to recall from time to time the Treaty of September 14, 1815, by which their brotherhood was constituted. But there are important grounds on which their formally avowed re-union always tends to apprehension among men who reason closely as to international affairs.

The system has been invariably hostile to the objects of Great Britain. If it were not, why should Mr. Canning, when acting for Lord Liverpool and the Conservatives from 1822 to 1827, have been immersed in struggles to resist it? If it were not, why should Lord Palmerston, when acting for the Liberals from 1830 to 1841, have been in no less animated and perpetual collision with it? Whatever page you open of their Correspondence is nearly certain to betray the attitude I have referred to. But, going beyond the range of our interests, the system involves too vast a preponderance of military power to be consistent with the general security. These Empires united can maintain 1,500,000 men, at least, for any object they determine on. Their Fleets are far from inconsiderable; they are reckoned to include 77 iron-plated vessels. I before remarked that the union has been generally brought about by Russia for her objects. It owed its birth to Catherine II. It was reorganized in 1815 by Alexander I. and Madame Krudener. The life of Madame Krudener, by Capefigne, explains the subject with authority and detail. Although I will not recall the history of the system, as I did last year, two illustrations which belong to our time may be remembered. In 1847, against the vehement remonstrances of other Powers, it annihilated the independence of Cracow, which dated from the Congress of Vienna. In 1877 it culminated in the late invasion of the Ottoman Empire, the fall of its Assemblies, and the revival of the arbitrary power which weighs upon it at this moment. The union will be always dangerous to Sweden on the one side, to the Porte upon the other. Its effect inevitably is to create a distance between Great Britain and the German Empire. The German Empire cannot lean at once to Russia and Great Britain, even if the latter Powers are drawn together by the momentary ardour of a Government. Governments are variable; nations go back to their orbit. But when Germany and Great Britain are estranged, the latter is left alone and unsupported to contend with France in a variety of quarters. The France of M. Jules Ferry may be irreproachable; but who can guarantee the coming form or future disposition of that country? These may be mentioned as the standing inconveniences of the alliance now in question. But noble Lords who have been in the Consular or Diplomatic Service of the Crown may be aware of many which escape me.

It is, however, even more important to consider the results or consequences which have followed the revival of this memorable system since the beginning of last year, when it became visible on the horizon. Russia has advanced to Merv, and, later on, to Sarakhs. Herat is seriously threatened. There is no doubt whatever that the posts retained are within the Afghan Frontier. The possibility of having to defend Afghanistan by arms has now become the daily topic of the journalist. A world of controversy between Great Britain and Germany, which did not formerly exist, has sprung into activity. The Chancellor of the German Empire has felt bound, in the Assembly at Berlin, to reprimand the Foreign Office. The Foreign Office, to say nothing of elaborate apologies in this House, has deemed it proper to send written explanations to the House of Commons. A Treaty with Portugal about the Congo has been abandoned, because too many Powers determined to oppose it. A Con-

ference in London was dispersed, because it was in vain endeavoured to render it subordinate to any object of Great Britain. These are the fruits which, within a twelvemonth, the new alliance seems to have created.

It is, therefore, a vital matter to consider in what manner it originated. I rely on the indulgence of the House while dwelling for a moment on this topic. It is beyond my power to do it justice. It must be remembered that in 1879, under the direction of Prince Bismarck, the alliance vanished altogether. Well might enlightened politicians at that time have exclaimed that fate bestowed what hope could scarcely realize or dream of. In 1880 the dreaded union was remote. Germany and Austria were both emancipated from the influence of Russia. What happened to revive it?

My Lords, if I touch upon domestic incidents, it is only because some of them have been a potent factor in European history, and are thus immediately connected with the Notice I have given. The General Election overthrew Lord Beaconsfield. A Liberal majority was formed, of which the noble Earl the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and a noble Marquess who for six years had acted with him in the House of Commons were the accepted and indisputable Leaders. The two were not identified with Russia in any marked degree, although it would be incorrect to say that they had shown peculiar vigilance in watching her encroachments. It is, however, true that when a great occasion took place at St. James's Hall in 1876 to form a Russian Party they were both conspicuously absent. There was nothing, on the whole, to prevent a strict co-operation upon their part with the line which Germany and Austria had adopted. It was essential to the foreign policy of the United Kingdom that they should, according to the programme held out for upwards of five years when Lord Beaconsfield retired, themselves fill up the vacancy created. What followed? To the dismay of Europe beyond the Russian Frontier, in oblivion of engagements and of usages, with no political necessity or popular demand to justify so violent a measure, the noble Earl and noble Marquess took upon themselves to reinstate the Leader who had abdicated for them. I mention it historically, and not in any spirit of invective. But that distinguished person had become the open and indefatigable advocate of Russia over a series of events well known to your Lordships. In the March of 1880, he had more signally proclaimed his allegiance. He was forced by the two noble Lords, who had the whole position in their hands, into what many felt to be disastrous, but what all saw to be at least uncalled for and unnecessary, eminence. Let me remind the House in what manner a new Holy Alliance inevitably followed so astonishing an incident.

My Lords, when, in 1879, the authorities at Berlin broke up the Alliance of the Three Powers, which had maintained itself since 1870, without secret or official knowledge we may see that they did so at no little hazard, at no inconsiderable sacrifice. Ever since the death of the Czarina Elizabeth, which gave its last turn to the Seven Years' War, Russia has perpetually aimed at influence in Berlin. Military orders have been lavished, favours have been multiplied, diplomacy has been exhausted, to obtain it. Beyond that, the two capitals, although separate 1,000 miles, from no great centre intervening, seem to be next door to one another. There is a steady flow of thought and intercourse between them. Ties of blood have interwoven the two dynasties. The Czar Nicholas alluded to them with solemnity and even pathos on his deathbed. The two Powers have been intimately blended by the struggle with the First Napoleon. The fall of Poland has increased their solidarity. In 1870 Russia was thought to have placed German arms under important obligations. It is, of course, remembered that she was once a formidable enemy of Prussia. In spite of all these weighty and alluring grounds for permanent connection, in 1879 a new conclusion was arrived at, a new departure happened. At that time the support of this country in the higher path adopted might be counted on. Great Britain was not under the control of Russia. Nor was there any reason to suppose that the lapse of power from Conservatives to Liberals, if destined to occur, would bring Great Britain under such an influence. By Liberals the Crimean War had been sustained. By Liberals the Treaties of 1856 had been established. The two Leaders of the Party had the aspect I have spoken of already. The startling

event it has been requisite to glance at placed our country in alignment with the Power which Germany had quitted. But still no prompt retaliation was adopted, and no vindictive step was taken. A protest came, indeed, from Austria. Otherwise a *locus pœnitentiæ* was afforded. A First Minister, who has been Russian in his language, may not be Russian in his policy. Or if he is, his Colleagues may be led to throw off an irregular usurping yoke to which they have submitted in a moment of despondency or weakness. Unfortunately, a series of transactions closed all hope, all possibility of that kind. Its last and most emphatic phase appeared at Copenhagen. Is it not rational to think that the German Empire may be led to disregard the vast inheritance of Peter the Great, and the agglomerations which have followed; but not to poise itself against the power of the Czar and that of the United Kingdom both together? Is it not just to reason that the German Empire may be drawn to independence of the greatest Military Power of the world; but not when the greatest Naval Power of the world is flung into the same compartment of the balance? In the meanwhile, M. de Giers—it is not a reproach, but, on the contrary, a tribute—has been an indefatigable agent. No wonder he was listened to, when he could urge that he was only leading the German Empire from a path on which its just and indispensable support had been capriciously annihilated. The evil first betrayed itself at Dantzig. It grew apace. It was matured at Skiernievice. It is invincible until you take away the cause which has produced it.

But if we consider how the new alliance was produced, we see at once how it may gradually be terminated. A Russian flag must cease to hover over Downing Street and Whitehall. But I do not ask your Lordships to be sanguine. The effect may not be instantaneous. You cannot blot out Skiernievice from the annals of diplomacy. It would ill become the Rulers in Berlin, whom we have driven to the arms of Russia, to shake off the embrace the very moment that it ceases to be essential to their safety. They must be faithful to propriety; they must be jealous of appearances; they must be loyal to engagements. But when it is no longer dangerous and imprudent to revert to it, new incidents may soon arise to re-establish the policy of 1879, which we have blindly forced them to surrender. In the case supposed, events may happen to release both Germany and Austria from the new Alliance, they have incurred no reproach and no responsibility in joining. My Lords, it is common out-of-doors to ask — in very unreflecting quarters — why the German Empire is so much less friendly to Great Britain than it used to be; as if no provocation had been offered; as if no outrage had arisen; as if the wanton resolution to unite with Russia in 1880; as if the persisting march along a Russian line for five years subsequent, was not, after the event of 1879, a cause of unavoidable estrangement?

It may be asked, perhaps, in reference to the Motion I submit, is any information wanted? My Lords, a description of what occurred at Skiernievice and the impression it produced from the Consul General at Warsaw would be, in a high degree, appropriate. For an event of this kind we ought not to be dependent wholly upon special correspondents, however graphic and industrious. It would also be desirable to know from our Representative at Buda-Pesth in what manner the new union is regarded in Hungarian assemblies which have so great an influence over the policy of Austria. M. Tisza, the Hungarian First Minister, endeavoured to persuade the world on one occasion that Russia has been absorbed by Germany and Austria, instead of reaching her original ascendancy. Can that opinion be corroborated? Of all revelations the most precious, if we could have it, would be the judgment of the late Lord Ampthill as to the re-union of the Emperors. It is true his lamented death took place on the 26th of August, and the conference began on the 15th of September; but for many months he must have been prepared for such a demonstration. Few in the House would disagree with me as to the gravity with which he would be heard or read upon a subject of this character. His long residence at Berlin of nearly 15 years had made him not only a Representative of the Queen, but an accepted member of the German Empire. His photograph may be seen in shop windows of its capital. He is remem-

bered by the lowest as well as by the highest circles of society. His mental power was esteemed where the standard of mental power may well be deemed a high and an exacting one. The most discordant elements united in regarding him with confidence and favour. He joined, more than any other man, the solidity of a Professor to the accomplishment and tact of a Diplomatist. Having often seen him at his post, I am in some degree a witness. If an Ambassador could have maintained the German Empire on the path embraced in 1879, he would have been qualified to do so. But no Ambassador could overcome the motives to abandon it, which I have touched upon this evening. His parting counsels may be in some degree elicited.

There is one objection against which the Notice ought, perhaps, to be defended. It is thought by some that Egypt ought alone to occupy the House when foreign policy is mooted. I cannot acquiesce in that opinion. Egypt is but a corner of the area in which important problems are arising. We forget sometimes that Egypt is in Africa. But, setting that aside, does anyone suppose that the united force of Austria, Germany, and Russia has no influence on what may pass between Khartoum and Alexandria? Remember there are two Powers who would drive you out of Egypt altogether, if at liberty to do so. France would drive you out; because, according to traditions from the beginning of the century and the First Napoleon, they claim ascendancy over that region. The Sublime Porte would drive you out; because it is the Suzerain authority, and because Great Britain went there without a mandate from the Sultan. The gigantic combination I have brought before the House to-night may render either of these Powers irresistible by merely whispering behind it.

Another objection is that, as the Conference at Skiernievice happened in September, it might have been discussed while this House was sitting in the autumn. No doubt, the facts were then, as much as now, in evidence before us. No doubt, the same considerations on the tendency of such an union might have been submitted. But at that time it was not possible, as now it is, to indicate the mode by which the danger may be obviated. To speak on the Holy Alliance, unless you have some counsel to suggest, would be as puerile a labour as to debate upon tyrannicide, the freedom of the Press, the death of Charles I., or any large and long-exhausted topic, on which our minds in younger days may have been exercised. In October and November it was thought that the existing Ministerial arrangements were essential to a particular transaction—a particular solution on an internal topic generally aimed at. They are essential to nothing now except the aggravated prospect of a war with Russia, and the obvious inability to guide it. They are essential to nothing now except the deeper risk, the more complete humiliation of the Empire. I beg to make the Motion of which I have given Notice.

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for any diplomatic correspondence which exists from Her Majesty's Representatives abroad as to the new concert or alliance between the Courts of Germany, of Austria, and of Russia."—(*The Lord Stratheden and Campbell.*)

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: My Lords, I am exceedingly sorry that my noble Friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Granville) is not present, having been called to Windsor; and I am more sorry because he would have been able, from his great knowledge of foreign affairs, to have followed the noble Lord through the very intricate maze of considerations upon the subject which he has unfolded. I was unable to follow the noble Lord, and the House will pardon me if I do not make a speech upon foreign affairs generally, and enter upon the theme of the speech of the noble Lord, which covered events from the Treaty of the second partition of Poland down to the Treaty of San Stefano.

LORD STRATHEDEN AND CAMPBELL said, he had referred to such events last year, but not on this occasion.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: Then I am still more at a loss, because I thought the noble Lord's speech had reference to the Holy Alliance; but whatever that may be, I have very little to say upon the Motion. Her Majesty's Government have no official knowledge of what passed between the three Sovereigns; but they are perfectly willing to accept the non-official statement which has appeared, that the object of the meeting was for the purpose of showing the union which exists between the

three Great Powers, and talking over politics generally; but that there was no Treaty between the three Sovereigns, and no intention on the part of the Sovereigns there assembled to do anything which would be inimical, but rather to do that which would be favourable, to the peace of Europe. Beyond that I cannot say anything about that meeting. Then as regards Papers, there are none which can be produced. There are a few of a confidential character, but they cannot be produced.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, I think it is to be regretted that the noble Lord brought forward his Motion at a time when the noble Earl the Secretary of State is not present, for I have no doubt the noble Earl would have given more consideration to it; but, at the same time, I do not think we can discuss it with advantage in his absence, and, perhaps, the present state of affairs does not lend itself to a discussion such as the noble Lord invites.

LORD STRATHEDEN AND CAMPBELL said, that if no Correspondence on the subject was available for being presented, the Motion might be withdrawn without any impropriety. As to the remark of the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Salisbury), he ought to mention that he had gone on, in the absence of the noble Earl the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, with the express concurrence of the Government.

Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN) — GENERAL GRAHAM'S FORCE— ACTION ON MARCH NEAR SUAKIN.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

LORD GREVILLE: My Lords, perhaps, before putting the Question I have placed upon the Paper, I may explain that it will be more convenient if I ask the Question of my noble Friend the Under Secretary of State for War. The reason why I addressed the Question to His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief was that I thought no one would be so well able to explain to the House the particulars of this unfortunate and calamitous affair as His Royal Highness; for we all know the very long experience which His Royal Highness has had in connection with the Army, and his opinion would have been received by the country with some sort of feeling of comfort. I can hardly help stating now that there is a feeling existing, not only in the country, but in the Army, that these disasters which have occurred would not have happened if ordinary precautions had been taken. Since putting this Question on the Paper I am told that a zereba has been destroyed, and I believe it is now occupied by an Arab force. I am also informed that a convoy of camels on its march has also been entirely destroyed; and I should like to know if there is any truth in the report that a number of camels, or other beasts of burden, supposed to be conveying water to the troops, had not, when they arrived, a drop of water in their water tanks? I will, therefore, ask the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether, having regard to the unusually heavy loss of officers and men, and the almost complete annihilation of transport in the advance made on Sunday last from Suakin, attributed to the neglect of the most ordinary military precautions, when advancing in an enemy's country, the General commanding on that occasion still retains the confidence of the War Department? But if my noble Friend would prefer it, I will willingly postpone my Question until after the Easter Holidays, when, perhaps, more information may have been obtained.

LORD DE ROS: My Lords, I am very glad to hear that the Question of the noble Lord has been transferred from His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief to the Under Secretary of State for War, because I think that it is quite contrary to all precedent in this House that a Question of that kind should be addressed to His Royal Highness, and that His Royal Highness should have to answer such a Question as that. I cannot help thinking it is very impolitic to put a Question of that kind at the present time to anybody. The Under Secretary cannot know all the circumstances of the affair, and I do not see how he can answer it. It would be positively unfair to make an answer to such a Question without having the fullest cognizance of every single detail connected with the matter. I do not wish to go into the particulars; but I would say that the despatch which was

sent from General Graham had this one paragraph—

"That he deeply regretted the very serious loss, but that he was of opinion that General M'Neill had done everything that was possible under the circumstances."

That, my Lords, was the report of General Graham, the Commander of the Forces at Suakin. If we are not to accept the telegraphic reports which come from our General Officer, I really do not see how we are to carry on the business of war. The authority of those in command over those under them would be weakened, and it would be impossible to expect them to do justice to the work in which they were engaged, if their conduct was impugned in this manner, without full examination and inquiry. Though I abstain from mentioning details in this matter, I would say that General M'Neill served with great gallantry at Lucknow. He was in the Red River Expedition, and in the New Zealand and Ashantee Wars; and I am sure, if this matter comes to a Court of Inquiry, he will be perfectly able to answer every charge that can be brought against him.

LORD NAPIER OF MAGDALA: My Lords, I beg to say a word in support of what the noble Lord has stated. I think it would make the service of this country in the field extremely difficult, if officers were to be put on their trial in this House on the information of a telegram, or of sensational letters from special correspondents. General Graham commanded with great success at Tel-el-Kebir, and won the confidence of his Commander and of every man under whom he served. He afterwards gained two decisive victories upon the ground where he is now operating, and we may be sure that he is perfectly competent to judge of what took place upon the spot, and we shall have full information from him upon the affair when he is able to send it. We shall then be able to judge of what has been done, and whether General M'Neill's conduct has been in accordance with the principles of war, or whether it has not. At present it would be quite premature for your Lordships to form any opinion upon the question raised by the noble Lord, and I trust that the noble Lord will think it wise to withdraw his Question.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, I also trust the noble Lord will listen to the appeal which has been made to him. I think it is the view of the House that the Question should not be put. I confess that, after what has been stated by distinguished military authorities, and this being a somewhat new case, I am disposed to move that the Question be not put.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: My Lords, I am advised that there may be a difficulty in the way of the noble Marquess making an actual Motion, because what is before the House is not a Motion, but a Question. I agree entirely with what the noble Marquess has said as to the impropriety of the Question being put. It is perfectly obvious that this is neither the time nor the place to examine into this affair. I express no opinion whatever beyond saying that this is neither the time nor the place, and I hope the noble Lord will see fit to withdraw the Question.

LORD GREVILLE: My Lords, after what has fallen from the other side, and from the noble Lords on the Front Benches, I shall certainly withdraw the Question.

ARMY—THE MILITARY EXPEDITION TO THE SOUDAN—DEFECTIVE AMMUNITION.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

VISCOUNT BURY, in rising to call attention to the fact that at Abu Klea and at Metemmeh the ammunition supplied to the troops was defective, and that at the former battle the machine gun supplied to the troops stuck and became useless; that the same thing occurred again to the machine gun used in the affair at the advance zareba on the 22nd instant; to inquire whether Her Majesty's Government will produce and lay on the Table a Report in which General Sir Frederick Roberts made complaint of similar defects to those now adverted to; and to inquire, further, whether any other officers had made similar complaints? said, everything that affected the welfare of our soldiers was of importance; and if it were true that some of the cartridges served out to the troops were defective, he should like to give Her Majesty's Government an opportunity of saying what had been done to remove the complaint. Although the information they had received was from the letters of special correspondents only,

yet the fact that in many instances they were very distinguished men rendered their opinion of considerable weight. They were told that at Abu Klea and several other battles the cartridges stuck in the Martini-Henry rifle to a very considerable extent. The rifles that became jammed were useless; and if this happened in the midst of a sudden rush of the enemy, our soldiers had not fair play and disaster was courted. Not only did the special correspondents now in the field speak of the defective cartridges, but he had heard in conversation the same complaint made by many military officers. No later than last year in India, during some field movements on an extensive scale, he was told that the number of rifles that became useless was extraordinary. He knew that Sir Frederick Roberts had sent home a short pithy Report so condemnatory of the cartridges that he trusted to hear that the matter had received the immediate and serious attention of the Authorities.

THE EARL OF MORLEY said, he entirely agreed with the noble Lord opposite that there could be no more important question than this. With regard to the case of the small arms ammunition, he was aware that there had been a report as to the jamming of the Boxer cartridge at Abu Klea, and Lord Wolseley had also made representations with regard to the cartridge. Before that time, however, he was bound to say they had had no complaints, and there had been no reason to suppose that the supply of ammunition was defective. The noble Viscount had referred to the great authority of Sir Frederick Roberts. He had inquired in every hole and corner of the War Office as to any Report from Sir Frederick Roberts with reference to the Boxer cartridge, which he might say was recommended by the Committee who sat in 1871.

VISCOUNT BURY said, that the Report he referred to was dated March, 1884.

THE EARL OF MORLEY said, he should like to know how the noble Viscount obtained that Report; he himself knew nothing about it, and it had not yet reached the professional officers in the War Office. The only Report he could find was one issued in 1880. At that time a Circular had been issued to the officers commanding British regiments under General Roberts with a view of ascertaining whether the Martini-Henry rifle and ammunition acted satisfactorily in action. The question of whether the Martini-Henry was liable to jam in action was answered favourably, and General Roberts reported that the rifle was, on the whole, satisfactory and had jammed but slightly, except on its first issue, necessitating some slight alteration. As far as he knew, the only complaints made were of a certain number of accidents attributed to the presence of sand in the rifle. Some years ago complaints had been made of accidents due to a weakness in the form of the extractor, which had been put right. No complaints had been made as to the Boxer cartridge. He would point out that at present they knew very little about the causes of this jamming. Lord Wolseley had made certain representations on the subject, and it was under consideration whether they should not at once send out a supply of what were called solid-drawn cartridges if possible. It was, however, by no means certain that solid-drawn cartridges would not have jammed under the same conditions. The Boxer cartridge had one considerable advantage over the solid-drawn, in that it was lighter than the solid-drawn by about two ounces in every 10 cartridges; and he need hardly point out how important it was that any addition to the weight carried should be guarded against. No doubt the solid-drawn cartridges had certain advantages over the Boxer. They were not so liable to injury by wet or from rough usage. In the absence of any detailed information he was not very willing to attempt an explanation. But there was no doubt that the presence of sand in the rifle might, to some extent, account for what had been complained of. With regard to the Gardner gun, it must be borne in mind that the five-barrelled gun was only supplied to the Navy. They had no report of its jamming last year or at present, although he admitted that in the newspapers reports had appeared that the gun had jammed in action. They had at present no information on that subject. The five-barrelled Gardner was not sent out for the use of the troops, except those from the ships, the military weapon having two barrels. He could assure the noble Lord that the Authorities were investigating this matter, and would take care that any representation

from Lord Wolseley was promptly attended to.

LORD DORCHESTER asked whether it was not the case that there were various descriptions of Martini-Henry cartridges, and that an inferior description had been adopted on account of its cheapness?

THE EARL OF MORLEY explained that there were two descriptions of Martini-Henry cartridges. They were both of metal, but one was rolled and the other solid-drawn, the former being called the Boxer. It was actually a fact that in 1871 a Committee had recommended that the solid-drawn cartridge should be used for practice, since the cases could be refilled, and the Boxer on general service.

ARMY — THE ROYAL MILITARY ACADEMY, WOOLWICH—NEW BUILDINGS.

QUESTION.

VISCOUNT ENFIELD asked the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether the estimate for building the new wing at the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich, was provided for in the Army Estimates of 1885-86 and subsequently struck out; whether it is the case that 240 young gentlemen of 18 years and upwards are now lodged in 181 rooms; and whether the contributions of the extra cadets, amounting to about £1,600 a year, might not help to provide the interest and a sinking fund for the cost of the new building, said to be estimated at £22,000?

THE EARL OF MORLEY, in reply, said, that no such provision as that referred to in the first part of the Question had been made in the Estimates of this year; but he was bound to say that the question of providing additional accommodation had been considered before the Estimates had been framed, and in consideration of the great expenditure upon other Services it had been omitted from this year's Estimates. He was authorized to say that the Secretary of State for War was reconsidering the question of whether Estimates should not be prepared. He would like to correct one figure given by the noble Viscount. There were only 203 cadets instead of 240, and it must be remembered that of these 181 rooms 32 were especially adapted for three cadets.

BURGH POLICE AND HEALTH (SCOTLAND) BILL. [H.L.] (NO. 57.)

A Bill for regulating the police and sanitary administration of towns and populous places; and for facilitating the union of police and municipal administration in burghs in Scotland: And

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL. [H.L.] (NO. 58.)

A Bill to make further provision for the protection of women and girls, the suppression of brothels, and other purposes:
Were *presented* by the Earl of DALHOUSIE; read 1ª.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (NO. 2) BILL.

Read 1ª; and to be read 2ª *To-morrow;* and Standing Order No. XXXV. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with (*The Earl Granville*).

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE (ADVANCE) BILL.

Read 1ª; to be *printed;* and to be read 2ª *To-morrow;* and Standing Order No. XXXV. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with. (*The Earl Granville.*) (No. 59.)

House adjourned at a quarter past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 26th March, 1885.

MINUTES.] — PUBLIC BILLS — *Resolution in Committee*—Egyptian Loan—R.P.
Second Reading—Royal Irish Constabulary Redistribution * [105].
Committee—Report—Army (Annual) [104].

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

LONDON, TILBURY, AND SOUTHEND RAILWAY BILL (*by Order*).

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Second Reading be deferred till Tuesday 14th April."—(*Sir Charles Forster.*)

MR. RITCHIE, who had the following Notice on the Paper:—

"To move, That this House declines to assent to the Second Reading of a Private Bill which

proposes to set aside the provisions of 'The Disused Burial Grounds Act, 1884,'"

said, he did not propose to oppose the postponement of the Bill, but he felt bound to draw the attention of the House to the great inconvenience which attended the constant postponement of Private Bills. This Bill, which had now been postponed on three or four different occasions, involved a very serious principle—the principle of setting aside a Public Act of Parliament very recently passed, besides other principles which, in his opinion, were hardly less objectionable, and the Bill itself naturally excited, in consequence, very considerable interest. Hon. Members came down to the House from time to time prepared to discuss the provisions of the Bill with a view of giving a vote upon them, and time after time they were put off by the further postponement of the Bill. He had no complaint to make personally, because the Gentlemen who were opposing the Bill had always courteously given him Notice of their intention to postpone it. It was the general inconvenience of which he complained; and he had thought it right, although he was not prepared to oppose the postponement now asked for, to call the attention of the House and those who were in charge of the Bill to the serious inconvenience he had mentioned. He would add further that, while not opposing the postponement now, he should certainly oppose any further postponement when the day now fixed for the second reading arrived.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER wished to say, on the part of the Government, that he entirely endorsed every word that had fallen from the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ritchie) as to the undesirability of these frequent postponements of measures which, although introduced as Private Bills, really involved principles of public importance and the setting aside of provisions of general legislation in which many hon. Members took interest. He only hoped the promoters would not attempt any further postponement of the present Bill; but if they did, he should certainly support the hon. Member in resisting it.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Second Reading *deferred* till *Tuesday* 14th April.

Mr. Ritchie

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

Resolved, That, whenever the House meets at Two of the clock, the Sittings of the House shall be held subject to the Resolutions of the House of the 30th of April 1869.—(*Lord Richard Grosvenor.*)

ARMY AND MILITIA RESERVE FORCES.

MESSAGE FROM HER MAJESTY.

Message from Her Majesty *brought up*, and read by Mr. Speaker (all the Members being uncovered), as followeth:—

VICTORIA R.

The present state of public affairs and the extent of the demands on the Military Forces of Her Majesty for the protection of the interests of the Empire, having constituted in the opinion of Her Majesty a case of great emergency within the meaning of the Acts of Parliament in that behalf, Her Majesty deems it proper to provide additional means for the Military Service; and, therefore, in pursuance of those Acts, Her Majesty has thought it right to communicate to the House of Commons that Her Majesty is about to cause Her Reserve Force and Her Militia Reserve Force, or such part thereof, as Her Majesty shall from time to time think necessary, to be called out for permanent service. *V.R.*

26*th March* 1885.

Ordered, That Her Majesty's Most Gracious Message be taken into Consideration upon *Monday* next.

QUESTIONS.

—o—

WAYS AND MEANS—THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT—LICENCE DUTIES (IRELAND).

Mr. BIGGAR asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If, when framing the Budget Bill, he will take into consideration the inequalities between the Licence Duties payable in Ireland, where the drink is to be consumed off the premises, and, on the other hand, when consumed either on or off the premises, as buyer may prefer; whether he will have any objection to the same scale of Duties payable for full retail licences being applied to licences which only permit sale for consumption off the premises; and, whether it is a fact that the lowest charge for a spirit grocers' licence in Ireland is £9 18*s.* 5¼*d.* while in Scotland the cost is £4 4*s.* the latter including the sale of beer?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): I am happy to take into consideration any financial proposal made by the hon. Member, who, I am glad to observe, takes an interest in economy; but with reference to his first two Questions, I must not at present give the faintest hint to the House of what may or may not be contained in the approaching Budget. As to his third Question, it is true that the minimum charge in Ireland for what is known as a grocer's licence is £9 18*s.* 5½*d.*, while in Scotland it is £4 4*s.*, the latter including permission to sell beer. There are some differences in the hours of sale in favour of Ireland, and the Scotch minimum is on a house valued at less than £10, while the Irish is on a house valued at £25. But the origin of the difference is that the Scotch scale was the outcome of what is known as the Forbes Mackenzie adjustment in 1853, and the Irish scale was settled in 1825, when it was thought fit to interpose a third licence between that of the hotelkeeper and that of the publican. I could not, however, discuss the matter adequately within the limits of an answer to a Question.

INLAND NAVIGATION AND DRAINAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIVER BANN.

SIR THOMAS M'CLURE asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Whether any conclusion in reference to Bann Drainage, in regard to which a deputation waited upon His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland last year, has been arrived at by the Irish Government; if so, what that decision was, and why it has not been carried into effect; and, whether any or what steps will be taken, or help afforded, to remove or mitigate the evils of the system under which a large district is annually flooded, seeing that a large sum has been raised by taxation, and a considerable tax is still levied upon the occupiers for drainage and navigation purposes?

MR. HIBBERT: My hon. Friend may feel assured that the Government are quite alive to the local importance of this matter, which, however, is only to a limited extent within their duties. Certain proposals have been made by the Irish Government to the Treasury which are still under discussion between the two Departments. In any arrangement that may be made it would be desirable that the Boards now having authority over the River Bann should be united into one, with power to consider the desirability of continuing or discontinuing the navigation. Perhaps my hon. Friend will put another Question on the subject after the Recess, when I hope to be able to give a more definite answer.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—ACCELERATION OF MAILS TO THE WEST.

MR. SEXTON asked the Postmaster General, If the negotiations as to the acceleration of the Mail Service between Dublin and the West of Ireland have yet reached a definite result?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: In reply to the Question of the hon. Member, I beg to state that, after an interview with the Chairman and one of the Directors of the Midland Great Western Railway Company, at which the subject of accelerating the day mail service on their line was fully gone into, I made the Company an offer which they have since declined, and I am equally unable to accept the proposal they made.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY: Would the right hon. Gentleman say whether the offer made by the Government was an advance on the offer made by the late Postmaster General?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE could not say what the offer made by the late Postmaster General was.

MR. SEXTON: Has the right hon. Gentleman any objection to say what the offer was?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: I think it undesirable to state what offer I made.

EGYPT (THE MILITARY EXPEDITION)—THE ROYAL MARINES AT SUAKIN.

COLONEL NORTH asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, The name of the Field Officer in command of the Royal Marines under Commodore Molyneux, referred to by him on the 16th instant as—

"Having done such good service that, as a reward, they are to occupy the place of honour, which was the post of danger, under General Graham?"

SIR THOMAS BRASSEY: Lieutenant-Colonel A. H. Ozzard, Royal Marine Light Infantry, arrived at Suakin on the 6th of May, 1884, and has remained there in command of Royal Marines from that date.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—EXTRA PAY FOR ACTING AS INSPECTORS OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

MR. M'COAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the district inspectors of the Royal Irish Constabulary receive £10 a year for one annual inspection of the standard weights and measures in their districts, while the sergeants of the force receive nothing for a quarterly examination of the weights and measures used by every trader within their area of duty; and, whether their claim for some remuneration for such considerable extra work has yet received the "consideration" promised to it by his predecessor; and, if so, with what result?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Government have seen their way to adopt most of the recommendations of the Constabulary Committee of 1883, with the result that considerable improvement has taken place in the position of the men of the Force; but as regards the particular claim referred to in this Question, I have come to the conclusion that the allowance of reasonable expenses, which the existing law permits, and which, I should imagine, is capable of being so regulated as that no actual loss should be incurred by the men, is sufficient to meet the merits of the case, and that it is not desirable to propose legislation which would involve an extra charge on the county cess of Ireland of something like £3,000 a-year. I should explain that the sums paid by some Grand Juries to District Inspectors under this Act are not for a personal remuneration, but for rent of an office. The payment is not compulsory, and the sums vary in different counties.

GOLD AND SILVER PLATE—HALL-MARKING.

MR. SLAGG asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether it is a fact that watch cases of gold or silver with metal domes are not permitted, under the Hall-marking Laws, to be manufactured in the United Kingdom, but that watches of Foreign manufacture, in cases of gold or silver with metal domes, are largely imported into this Country; whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to give early effect to the recommendation of the Select Committee on Hall-marking (1878-9) that "a dome made of base metal should not exclude a watch case from being hall marked;" and, whether he can hold out any hope that the question of hall-marking generally will be considered in his Department during the present Parliament; and, if not, whether he will amend the Law relating to the hall-marking of watch cases?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Member correctly describes the existing state of things, which it would be desirable to remedy whenever practicable. In the present state of Public Business, I am afraid I cannot hold out much hope of legislation during the present Session either on the question of Hall-marking generally or of Hall-marking of watch cases.

LAW AND POLICE (METROPOLIS)—SHAM CLUBS.

MR. HUGH MASON asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he will order an inquiry to be made throughout the Metropolis into the number of sham clubs which are unlicensed drinking and gambling houses, over which the police exercise no power or jurisdiction?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I have more than once made careful inquiry into this matter, and I believe that there is a great deal of misapprehension about it. The Commissioners of Police report to me that there are no sham clubs to any considerable extent in the Metropolis. There are a great number of workmen's clubs, where workmen can have refreshments, without licences, and those are places which I do not think it would be desirable to interfere with; but as to there being sham clubs for the mere purpose of improper drinking—I know some people think that drinking anywhere, except in a public-house, is improper, but I do not—I do not believe that such places exist to any great extent. If there are places where gambling is carried on, and the police have information to that effect, it would be their duty to interfere.

NAVY—TROOPSHIPS.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whe-

ther he can state the reason for the withdrawal of the privilege long enjoyed by the tradesmen at Portsmouth of attending the arrival and departure of troopships in Her Majesty's dockyards; and, whether such privileges cannot be restored to them, if necessary, under regulations and in a modified form.

MR. CAINE: On account of the great inconvenience caused to the Public Service by permitting tradesmen to board the ships on arrival in harbour, it has been decided not to permit tradesmen to go on board until the ships have been secured to the jetty. It is not proposed to make any alterations in these regulations.

MERCHANT SHIPPING—REGISTRY OF SHIPPING.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN asked the President of the Board of Trade, If it is intended to transfer the Registers of Shipping from the various Ports to the Board of Trade Offices in London?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir. What is intended is to place the administration of the registry of British ships at the various ports under the Board of Trade instead of the Commissioners of Customs, but it is not intended to withdraw the local registers from the outports.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—NIGHT NURSING IN WORKHOUSES—RETURN OF ATTENDANTS.

MR. JOHN REDMOND asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether there would be any objection to obtain a Return from the clerks and medical officers of the various Poor Law Unions in Ireland, stating, firstly, what provision exists in their respective Unions for night nursing; secondly, what is the character of such provision, where made, whether by paid nurses of reputable character, or by able-bodied female paupers; and, thirdly, whether the various medical officers are satisfied with the existing provision?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Local Government Board see no necessity for any such general Return as that referred to. If the hon. Member is aware of any Union workhouse in which he considers the system of night nursing is defective, the Board will at once make inquiry; but it must be borne in mind that it is the duty of the medical officer of the Union to report to the Board of Guardians if he thinks the poor suffer from want of efficient nursing.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I beg to give Notice that, inasmuch as my information goes to prove that some lives have been lost in Unions owing to defective nursing, I will put a further Question on the subject.

BRITISH GUIANA—ALLEGED CESSION OF TERRITORY BY VENEZUELA.

DR. KINNEAR asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the Venezuelan Government have granted large concessions of territory belonging to the Colony of British Guiana to an American named Fitzgerald, who has formed a company to work the concession, called the Manoa Company (Limited); whether the concessionarie has taken possession of the land comprised in the concession, notwithstanding notice of its forming portion of the colony, and although some of it is the most valuable, the most fertile, and the most densely populated of any part thereof; whether residents have been seized by those acting for the persons entitled to the concession and suspended by the feet, head downwards, until they fainted, or the time for which they were to be suspended expired, on the ground that they had told the Indians, who were being forcibly taken away to work for the company, to go away into the far forest, or for any other and what reason; and, if these statements are true, what steps have been, or will be, taken by Her Majesty's Government to preserve the territory of the colony intact, to protect its inhabitants, and to punish the persons guilty of the cruel outrages referred to?

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY: The Venezuelan Government have granted a concession of territory for a Company called the Manoa Company. The concession purports to extend to the boundary of British Guiana; but the Company claim as included in the concession territory which Her Majesty's Government consider to belong to the Colony of British Guiana. The agents of the Company have issued notices asserting their claim, but they do not appear to have actually taken possession of any portion

of the Colony. A Portuguese and I believe some others residing in the disputed territory were treated in the manner mentioned in this Question by a person who professed that he was employed by the Company. The Governor of British Guiana, under instruction from Her Majesty's Government, has sent a magistrate with a police force to notify to the agents of the Company and to the inhabitants of the disputed territory that it belongs to the Colony and that the Company will not be allowed to encroach upon it, and has taken steps to protect the inhabitants from further outrage. The person who committed the past outrages has been arrested and committed for trial at Essequibo.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—BALLYMENA—MR. MALLAGHAN.

MR. MOORE asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Government intend to take any step to represent Catholic interests on the Ballymena bench of magistrates; whether a Mr. Mallaghan was strongly recommended by Lord Waveney some two years ago to the then lieutenant of the county; whether Lord Waveney, the present lieutenant of the county, now refuses to recommend this same Mr. Mallaghan to the Lord Chancellor; and, if so, what charge is alleged against Mr. Mallaghan in the interim; and, whether the Irish Government are aware that this gentleman's appointment has been recommended by the bishop of the diocese, by several deputy lieutenants, many magistrates, and others of all shades of politics?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: In answer to my hon. Friend, I can only say that Lord Waveney did some years ago append his name to a recommendation of Mr. Mallaghan for the Commission of the Peace; that recently, when fuller circumstances were before him as Lieutenant of the county, he did not think it would be expedient to recommend Mr. Mallaghan for the Ballymena Bench; and that both the late and the present Lord Chancellor, with full knowledge of the case, felt that they would not be justified in this instance in overruling the opinion of the Lieutenant of the county. The Lord Chancellor is, I believe, most anxious to secure a Roman Catholic magistrate for the Ballymena Bench.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR gave Notice that, in consequence of the unsatisfactory answer of the Chief Secretary, he would call attention to the matter at the earliest opportunity.

SOUTH AFRICA (BECHUANALAND)—TRADE OF THE ZAMBESI.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether his attention has been called to the letters by Correspondents of *The Times* and *The Standard*, pointing out the value of the trade with districts north of Bechuanaland up to the Zambesi, and especially to the following statement:—

"The countries of the interior, called Matabeleland and Mashuanaland, stretching to the Zambesi, are fertile and well watered, infinitely more valuable than the more settled country to the South. It is a fact that those countries abound in mineral wealth, and in products from which we may look in the future to an enormous increase of our Cape trade. Their products will in the future find their way to the outer world by the South. The Transvaal is putting out feelers, and already a number of Boers are endeavouring to establish themselves in Mashuanaland, entering that country by way of Zoutpansberg. A bold policy in the present, a protectorate proclaimed to the Zambesi, would be a simple matter now. It would entail but little expense, it would curtail the power of the Boers, and would give no pretext for German opposition;"

and, whether, in order to secure this promising trade for British colonists and British manufactures, and to produce profitable results from the present expedition to Bechuanaland, Her Majesty's Ministers will encourage in every possible way the construction of a Railway from Kimberley to the Zambesi?

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY: The hon. Member, if he will allow me to say so, is a little in advance of his age. The distance as the crow flies between Kimberley and Victoria Falls, the nearest point on the Zambesi, is 750 miles; and taking £6,000 a-mile as a very moderate estimate for the construction of a railway, without deviations, the cost would amount to very nearly £5,000,000. The hon. Member must therefore see that this is clearly a question for the future, and not for the present.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT said, that he would admit the truth of the hon. Member's imputation, if the words "Her Majesty's Government" were substituted for the word "age."

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—FALSE CHARGE OF FIRING AT THE PERSON —CASE OF MR. SPUNNER.

MR. HARRINGTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether Mr. Spunner, the agent of the Land Corporation, employed in Murroe, county Limerick, reported to the police, on the 21st December last, that he had been fired at; whether the police made inquiries concerning the report; and, if so, what was the result of their investigation; and, if it is true that this alleged firing has been included among the list of outrages supplied by the police in their Returns?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Mr. Spunner did report that he had been fired at; but the police authorities, on investigation, came to the conclusion that there were serious doubts about the case, and it has not been recorded as an outrage.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—THE MAIL SERVICE TO KERRY.

MR. HARRINGTON asked the Postmaster General, Whether any decision has yet been arrived at by him in response to the memorial forwarded him by the Tralee Town Commissioners in favour of the acceleration of the Mails to Kerry; and, whether, in the event of the Great Southern and Western Railway Company not affording facilities, he will communicate with the Waterford and Limerick Railway Company, and ascertain the cost of bringing the Mails over their line to Tralee?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: In reply to the hon. Member, I beg to say that I shall be very glad to find myself able to return a favourable reply to the Memorial from Tralee referring to an improvement of the mail service which now follows the route of Mallow. As regards that route, however, there is, I think, no prospect of the Great Southern and Western Railway Company being able to afford facilities; while as regards the alternative route *viâ* Limerick, I shall be glad to consider any fresh proposal the Waterford and Limerick Company see fit to make, but at present the terms demanded are higher than the amount of correspondence to be benefited would warrant me in agreeing to.

FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—GREYSTONES PIER.

MR. W. J. CORBET asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he can say what progress has been made with the arrangements for the construction of a Fishery Pier and Harbour at Greystones, county Wicklow?

MR. HIBBERT: My right hon. Friend has asked me to answer this Question. All we know of the subject is that the plans and estimates were sent to the Fishery Piers and Harbours Commissioners in April last, but no definite recommendation has been received from them. I would suggest to the hon. Member to apply for information to the hon. and gallant Member for Galway.

COLONEL NOLAN: Has not the money been voted by the Piers and Harbours Commissioners, and has not the secretary forwarded an application to the Chief Secretary for Ireland, who is supposed to know nothing about it?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: If the hon. and gallant Member will put a Question on the Paper I will answer it.

POOR RATES AND PAUPERISM—THE INSANE POOR.

MR. W. J. CORBET asked the President of the Local Government Board, If his attention has been directed to the Return of "Poor Rates and Pauperism" just issued (No. 77, B. 1); whether he can say if the following figures therefrom represent the total number of insane persons maintained at the public expense:—

1st July 1884.	Indoor.	Outdoor.	Total.
Insane, viz.:—			
Males . . .	6,921	*22,492	29,413
Females . .	9,239	*28,720	37,959
Children . .	983	*430	1,413
Gross totals .	17,143	51,642	68,785

* The majority of insane paupers here classed among the outdoor are in asylums.

whether he is aware that the impossibility of giving a full account of the expense of maintenance of pauper lunatics has been alleged on the ground that

no distinction is made in Poorhouses between the cost of the insane and the sane, and will this defect be remedied; and, if not, can the estimated cost be given; whether he is aware that a complete Return of the cost of providing public asylum accommodation does not exist; and, whether he will cause such a Return, and also one showing the total annual cost of maintaining lunatics from public resources, to be laid upon the Table, and continued annually in the Reports of the Commissioners in Lunacy for the information of Members?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: The Return referred to does not give the total number of insane persons maintained at the public expense. The numbers given in that Return are of the pauper lunatics maintained by the Guardians at the cost of the poor rates and do not include the insane who are maintained by the counties and boroughs at the cost of the county and borough rates. It would be impossible to give accurately the cost of the insane inmates of workhouses as distinguished from other indoor paupers without keeping separate accounts with regard to them. An estimate of the cost based on the cost of the workhouse inmates might be obtained from the Unions, but it would involve in some cases considerable trouble, as it could only be made on a calculation of the number of days that each lunatic was an inmate of the workhouse. The Return which was prepared by the Commissioners in Lunacy and presented to the House in June, 1883, contains, so far as the Board are aware, the fullest information available on this subject. The Commissioners are not subject to the directions of the Board, and the difficulty as regards obtaining such a Return has already been alluded to.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—NENAGH ASSIZES—DR. M. J. CAHALAN'S CLAIM FOR ATTENDING AS A WITNESS.

MR. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Is it a fact that Dr. M. J. Cahalan, of Nenagh, having been summoned to give medical evidence at the late Nenagh Assizes, and having attended before the Grand Jury, and in court for five days, in pursuance of the summons, was refused payment of his expenses; was the reason given by Mr. George Bolton, Crown Solicitor, for the refusal, that the prosecution had broken down; and, what will be done with respect to Dr. Cahalan's claim?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Dr. Cahalan was not summoned as a medical witness to Nenagh Assizes. He was summoned as an ordinary witness in a case in which he himself was interested, and in which the prosecution could not be proceeded with in consequence of his failure to produce an essential document which he had undertaken should be forthcoming when wanted. In these circumstances the Crown Solicitor considered he would not be justified in paying Dr. Cahalan's expenses as a witness, and the Government, to whom Dr. Cahalan has applied, have seen no reason to interfere.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THURLES AND TEMPLEMORE PETTY SESSIONS DISTRICTS—APPOINTMENT OF CLERK.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether there have been two elections to fill the position of Petty Sessions clerk at Templemore; whether the first election was annulled as illegal, in consequence of Mr. Boyton, the successful candidate, having entered into a written agreement with the magistrates who elected him to provide an assistant; whether Mr. Boyton is also Petty Sessions clerk of Thurles district, and has the Lord Lieutenant complied with the terms of the "Act to regulate the office of clerk of Petty Sessions in Ireland," 21 and 22 Vic. s. 6, by uniting the districts of Thurles and Templemore for the purpose of being served by one Petty Sessions clerk, and what is the date of the order; whether the Town Commissioners of Templemore had sent a protest to the Lord Lieutenant against the fitness of Mr. Boyton, on the ground that it would be great public inconvenience not to have the Petty Sessions clerk of an important district dwelling within its boundaries, and that the former requirement that he should provide an assistant, as well as his having made application for an assistant or an increase of salary in consequence of heavy work in the Thurles district, was evidence of his inability to fulfil the duties of the position; whether, notwithstanding, Mr. Boyton

was elected, and his appointment ratified by the Lord Lieutenant; and, whether any steps will be taken to disunite the districts mentioned, and have competent officers appointed for each?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Lord Lieutenant has made no order amalgamating the Petty Sessions districts of Thurles and Templemore; but he has approved of Mr. Boyton acting as clerk at both places and on conditions that will insure that no public inconvenience shall arise. Such an arrangement is not uncommon, and it is adopted whenever practicable with the view of securing the services of good men for these posts.

WAYS AND MEANS—INLAND REVENUE—STAMPS ON BILLS OF LADING.

MR. CAUSTON asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he is aware that the Revenue is suffering in consequence of certain English Railway Companies giving merely a penny receipt for warrants for goods for shipment to the Continent, whereas shipowners are compelled to use for similar goods a bill of lading form with a sixpenny stamp attached; and, if it is legal for the Railway Companies to use only a penny stamp, whether he will state that a similar privilege will be allowed to the shipowners?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (MR. CHILDERS): I am not aware of the practice referred to by my hon. Friend, or that a receipt given for warrants for goods is liable under any circumstances to the duty of one penny or any duty. I speak with some reserve; but I believe that shipowners are not compelled by any law, other than the law of custom, to use bills of lading, but if such documents are used they must bear the sixpenny stamp. Railway Companies who are also owners of ships fall under the same rule.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—EDENDERRY UNION—THE CLERK TO THE GUARDIANS.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is a fact that, at an inquiry recently held in the Edenderry Union, Dr. H. Burke, the Local Government Board Inspector, addressing the clerk, said—

"I must say the affairs of this Union seem to be conducted in a most extraordinary manner, and I shall take notice of it in my Report;" whether the Local Government Board have since severely reprimanded the clerk; whether, at a meeting of the Board of Guardians on Saturday last, the *ex officio* Guardians passed a Resolution increasing the salary of the clerk in question, in spite of the protests of the elected Guardians; whether the Local Government Board intend to sanction the proposed increase of salary; and, whether he will have any objection to lay upon the Table Copies of the Correspondence between the Local Government Board and the clerk in the matters referred to?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Inspector did make the observations referred to, and the Local Government Board, when the case came before them, felt it necessary to caution the clerk to be more careful in future. On Saturday last the Guardians, by a majority of 22 to 12, resolved to increase the salary of the clerk. The majority was composed of 13 *ex officio* and nine elected Guardians. The Local Government Board will postpone their decision as to sanctioning the proposed increased of salary until they see how the clerk has discharged his duties at the present election.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: Would the right hon. Gentleman have any objection to lay upon the Table copies of the Correspondence?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am sorry I did not notice the last part of the Question. I will see if there is any objection.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS—REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE ACT—DEPUTY RETURNING OFFICERS.

MR. R. H. PAGET asked Mr. Attorney General, If he will be good enough to state what provisions exist either to enable or to compel High Sheriffs to appoint deputy returning officers for the several Parliamentary Divisions of their respective counties, which will be called into existence by the passing of the Redistribution Bill?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (SIR HENRY JAMES): Section 8 of the Ballot Act, 1872, provides that where the Sheriff is Returning Officer for more

than one county, as defined for the purposes of Parliamentary elections, he may by writing under his hand appoint a deputy for any of the purposes relating to an election in any such county, and may by such deputy do anything which the Returning Officer is authorized or required to do in relation to such election. The provisions of this section are applied to the new divisions of counties under the Redistribution Bill by Clause 9, sub-section 3, of that Bill, which is in these terms—

"Subject to the provisions of this Act, the members for each such division of a county shall be elected by persons qualified in the same manner, and the nomination and other proceedings at Parliamentary elections for such division shall be conducted in the same manner, as if such division were a separate constituency, and the law relating to Parliamentary elections shall apply to each such division as if it were a separate county."

The effect of this clause was intended to be, and, in our opinion, clearly is, to empower the Sheriff to appoint a deputy to act as Returning Officer in each of the Parliamentary divisions of the county.

NAVY—THE BALTIC—PREPARATIONS FOR HOSTILITIES ON BREAKING UP OF THE ICE.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether Her Majesty's Government, in contemplation of the breaking up of the ice in the Baltic, are prepared to despatch an adequate Naval force into those waters?

SIR THOMAS BRASSEY: I think the only answer which can be given to this Question is that we must decline to answer any Questions relating to possible military operations under hypothetical circumstances.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, he wished to know whether the Government intended to miss the opportunity of the breaking up of the ice just as they had missed the high Nile?

NAVY—H.M.S. "CANADA."

BARON HENRY DE WORMS asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is the fact that, on the 25th of last month, a boat of Her Majesty's Ship *Canada* was fired upon by the commanding officer at Cartagena, and the captain and one of the crew wounded; and, whether, as stated in a Reuter's telegram from New York, dated March 22nd, the officer in command at Cartagena continues firing on boats from that vessel; and, if so, what steps have been taken by Her Majesty's Government in view of this outrage to the British flag?

SIR THOMAS BRASSEY said, it had not been reported to the Admiralty that any boats of the *Canada* had been fired upon on the 25th of last month by the commanding officer at Cartagena.

NAVY—EXPERIMENTS AT EASTNEY.

SIR JOHN HAY asked the Chief Secretary to the Admiralty, If he will lay upon the Table of the House a Report of the experiments at Eastney by firing shot and shell at armoured decks?

SIR THOMAS BRASSEY: It is not usual to publish the results of such experiments.

POST OFFICE—POLITICAL POSTMASTERS.

MR. WHITLEY asked the Postmaster General, Whether a country postmaster is justified in taking an active part in politics by publishing letters and making speeches in favour of particular candidates, and by permitting letter carriers to distribute political leaflets which have not been sent through the post; and, if not, whether he will order a discontinuance of the practice?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: A postmaster is certainly not justified in acting in the manner described by the hon. Member, and if he will let me know where such practices have taken place immediate steps shall be taken to prevent their recurrence. In my opinion, it is highly undesirable that a postmaster should act as a political partizan.

LAW AND POLICE—THE RIOTS AT NEWRY—CASE OF WILLIAM ORR.

MR. O'BRIEN asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Whether he has learned that William Orr, charged with discharging a revolver from the Orange Hall at Newry into a Nationalist procession, was acquitted to-day by a Belfast jury; whether it was sworn by the police that the prisoner flung the revolver out of the window, and after one of its barrels had just been discharged; whether the jury who acquitted Orr added an expression of opinion condemning

the procession which had been authorized by the Lord Lieutenant; whether the further charge of riot against Orr will be proceeded with before a Belfast jury; and, whether the trials of the other Orangemen charged with firing upon the Nationalist procession will be entrusted to a Belfast jury?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER): Mr. Orr was acquitted of the charge of firing at persons with intent to wound. The opinion expressed by the jury does not, I think, bear out the suggestion in the third paragraph. The rider added to the verdict in reference to the Nationalist procession was—

"We feel it to be our duty to add that in coming unanimously to this decision, after most carefully weighing the evidence, we extremely regret that any such demonstrations should occur, being calculated to prevent that harmony of feeling which ought always to prevail in the community at large."

I have no doubt it was sworn by the police that Orr flung the revolver out of the window, and that when it was found a barrel appeared to have been discharged. The case for the defence was that the shot was fired in the air after the windows of the hall had been broken by stone-throwing. All the other charges will, I am informed, be proceeded with in Belfast, and, as the trials are pending, I think it more proper to refrain from expressing any opinion upon the cases.

MR. O'BRIEN: Might I ask the hon. and learned Gentleman whether he is aware that since the National demonstration has been held an Orange procession passed through the town without any interference whatever?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER): I am very glad to hear it.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—SERGEANT DELANEY.

MR. BARRY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If his attention has been directed to the appeal case of Levingston, Appellant, v. Murphy, Doyle and Tobin, Respondents, recently tried before Chief Justice Morris at the Carlow Assizes, where the conduct of Sergeant Delaney, of the Royal Irish Constabulary, was strongly condemned by the Chief Justice, who in summing up said—

"That it is lamentable that such a course should have been pursued in justice as was pursued in this case. Certainly the course adopted was an extravagant one, a most extravagant one. Two of these men, Doyle and Tobin, were arrested late in the evening, and Murphy was taken out of his bed in the middle of the night by the orders of this over zealous and active Sergeant Delaney, who appeared to have acted in this case in a most extraordinary and extravagant manner. Instead of inquiring into the case, he said he never knew there was a right of way. Instead of inquiring or finding out whether there was a disputed right of way, and seeing whether it was a case for a summons, and not for arrest, he went and acted as if some desperate act of violence had been committed in the neighbourhood, and arrested these persons without any information at all, arrested them after the Petty Sessions clerk had refused to give him a warrant, and cautioned him against arresting them. He arrested them on his own responsibility. He showed himself over zealous, and to a degree improperly so, and inveigled this Levingston, to a certain extent, into the transaction." "Then he brought Levingston in before the Petty Sessions clerk, and when the case was heard at Petty Sessions, instead of Levingston appearing as complainant, the most extraordinary part of it all, Sergeant Delaney obtrudes himself into the position of complainant. If Levingston had refused to make the information, or if he had nothing to say to it at all, he would have been entitled to a verdict, because if a police constable chose to arrest persons Levingston cannot be made liable for that. Mr. Croker swore that it was stated in the presence of Delaney that there was a right of way. Delaney suggested to this easy going magistrate that it would be better for the men to go to gaol for a few days, that it would not do them any harm. It was most extraordinary;"

and, what steps the authorities intend to take against Sergeant Delaney for the conduct described by Chief Justice Morris?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Inspector General of Constabulary has this matter under consideration; but he is not yet in a position to announce what action he thinks should be taken in it.

WEST INDIAN ISLANDS—GRENADA HIGHWAYS, &c. IMPROVEMENT.

MR. M'LAGAN asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether his attention has been directed to the neglected state of the roads in the Island of Grenada, as described in the Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the affairs of the Windward Islands, published last year, where it is stated that—

"The prosperity of the island is greatly retarded by the want of a complete system of arterial communication;"

and, whether any instructions have been issued, or steps taken, to carry out the recommendations of the Commissioners to put the roads in a proper state of repair?

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY: The Secretary of State, both before and since the Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the affairs of the Windward Islands, has frequently pressed on the Government of Grenada the importance of putting the roads of the Island into good repair. Much has been lately done. In the Estimates for 1885, £6,300 has been provided for both construction and repair. An additional surveyor has been appointed, and a traction-engine and stone-crusher brought into use; but the mountainous nature of the Island makes road-making very expensive, and the requisite work can only be done gradually.

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—GENERAL GRAHAM'S FORCE—THE ACTIONS AT SUAKIN.

CAPTAIN MAXWELL-HERON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether balloons have been sent out to the forces at Suakin; and, if so, whether every effort will be made to bring them into immediate use, in order to discover the movements of hostile Arabs, and to guard against surprises such as that which occurred on Sunday last?

MR. BRAND: It would be impossible for me to tell the House why the General Officer Commanding at Suakin did not use these balloons, and it is entirely out of my power to answer the Question.

CAPTAIN MAXWELL-HERON: Have balloons been supplied to the Forces immediately under General Wolseley?

MR. BRAND: No.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the Secretary of State for War, If it is correct, as reported in the papers, that two Gardner machine guns were jammed at the battle of Sunday last; and, whether he will lay upon the Table of the House, Colonel Gildea's Report as to the inefficiency of the Martini-Henry rifles in the Transvaal campaign of 1881?

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL asked whether the hon. Gentleman could inform the House whether the sticking had not occurred from the use of mongrel cartridges, composed of pasteboard and metal instead of solid metal cases, and whether the necessary machinery for making solid metal cases existed at Woolwich?

LORD ELCHO asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, in view of the further and more detailed accounts that have been received as to the jamming of cartridges in the Martini rifles at Abu Klea, and in view of the fact that these cartridges are again reported to have jammed at Hasheen, Her Majesty's Government will immediately inform the House whether these reports are true; and, if true, whether they are prepared to take immediate steps to prevent the recurrence of circumstances so dangerous to the safety of those armed with the Martini-Henry rifle?

MR. BRAND: We have received no detailed report as to the jamming of the Gardner guns or of the Martini rifles. The Gardner guns are naval guns, and were in naval charge, and since I came down to the House I have ascertained that no report to that effect has been received at the Admiralty. I can only repeat the answer I gave in the debate on the Army Estimates, that Lord Wolseley has sent to the War Office certain recommendations for the improvement of the Martini ammunition, which are now under consideration, with a view to their adoption if they prove feasible and advantageous.

LORD ELCHO asked whether it would not be proper to ascertain whether the report in the papers was true or not?

MR. BRAND: We cannot obtain detailed reports by telegraph; but we have no doubt that a report will be sent to the War Office of any such occurrence.

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL repeated his Question as to whether the machinery existed at Woolwich for turning out solid metal cases for cartridges?

MR. BRAND: Yes, Sir; machinery exists at Woolwich for manufacture of solid case cartridges.

CENTRAL ASIA—THE RUSSO-AFGHAN BOUNDARY COMMISSION.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he can give an assurance that the occupation of part of the disputed territory on the Afghan frontier by the Russians does not prevent the survey officers attached to the British Commission from completing the survey of the country so occupied, and ascertaining

the physical facts necessary to be known with a view either to an agreement or an arbitration; or, in case there is any doubt on the subject, if Her Majesty's Government will at once communicate with the Russian Government in order to ensure freedom of survey?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: No statement to this effect has reached Her Majesty's Government.

PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—MALIN HEAD PIER.

MR. O'BRIEN (for Mr. HEALY) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, What was the amount of the engineer's estimate for Malin Head Pier, county Donegal; how has money been provided; what is the amount for which the work has been taken by the contractor to do the work according to the plans and estimates of the engineer of the Board of Works; if it be the fact that there has been a difference, involving a saving of £2,000 between the estimate and the contract; and, if so, will the proportion of this sum, which has been granted out of the Sea Fisheries Fund, be restored to that fund to enable other works of pressing necessity to be undertaken; and, when will the Malin Head Pier works be commenced, and within what time is the contractor bound to complete them?

MR. HIBBERT: The gross estimate for Malin Head Pier, County Donegal, was £10,000, of which £9,500 was for works. Towards this £7,700 was provided by grant and £2,000 by loan from the Sea Fisheries Fund, while £300 has been contributed locally. A tender has been accepted at £7,765, subject to certain conditions. All savings on such works will, when realized, be returned to the credit of the Sea Fisheries Fund. The contractor is bound to commence the works in 21 days after executing the deed, and to complete them within 18 months. I learn by telegram that the deed was executed on the 24th instant.

FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—CULDAFF PIER, CO. DONEGAL.

MR. O'BRIEN (for Mr. HEALY) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, What was the amount of the engineer's estimate for Culdaff Pier, county Donegal; how has the money been provided; what is the amount of the contract for them; when will the works commence, and within what time is the contractor bound to complete them; and, is the contractor the same as the one who built the Downies Bay Pier?

MR. HIBBERT: The gross estimate for this pier was £4,000, of which £3,688 was for works. Towards this sum £3,500 was provided by grant and £250 by loan from the Sea Fisheries Fund, whilst £250 has been contributed locally. The amount of the contract was £2,349. The contractors are bound to commence the works at once, and to complete them on or before the 1st of November next. They are the same contractors as at Downies.

PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—ARKLOW BREAKWATER.

MR. W. J. CORBET asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, What is the result of the inspection of Arklow Breakwater made by the Chairman of the Board of Works on Saturday 21st inst.; whether it is a fact that the examination took place at high water when the damaged foundations were not visible; whether he is aware that several harbours constructed by the Board of Works throughout the Country have failed; whether the Grand Jury assembled at Wicklow Assizes on Monday last passed a resolution drawing attention to the condition of Arklow Harbour works, and asking that an independent engineer be sent to examine and report on the best means to repair the defects; and, whether their request will be complied with?

MR. HIBBERT: I have received a preliminary Report of his inspection of Arklow Breakwater from General Sankey of a very reassuring character; and, when a definite Report can be made, it shall be laid before the House. It is not the fact that he only saw the works at high water.

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACT, 1883—OPERATION OF THE ACT.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (for Mr. O'SULLIVAN) asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, If he is aware that the building of labourers cottages under the Labourers (Ireland) Act has been greatly retarded throughout the Country owing to the difficulty which exists in getting

the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland to forward the first instalment of the loans to the different Boards of Guardians; and, whether he will take any steps to compel those Commissioners to comply with the terms of the Labourers (Ireland) Act without causing any unnecessary delay?

MR. HIBBERT: The first instalment of these loans cannot be issued until the mortgages are complete, and the legal procedure necessary takes some time. The form of mortgage deed having now been settled, there will be no unavoidable delay on the part of the Board of Works. The hon. Member may not be aware that a separate deed is requisite for each electoral division.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—THE EDUCATION CODE.

MR. J. G. TALBOT asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether he will give instructions that in future the Education Code shall be not only laid upon the Table, but shall be in the hands of Members within one month after the meeting of Parliament, so that the period during which it is required to lie upon the Table may not be curtailed, as it is this year by a week's delay, and also by the interposition of the Easter holidays?

MR. MUNDELLA said, it was impossible for him to give any such undertaking.

MR. J. G. TALBOT asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware that the Code was laid on the Table on March 17, and was not distributed until the 25th?

MR. MUNDELLA said, he was not responsible for the printing. The Code was in type when it was laid on the Table, and the right hon. Gentleman had had the opportunity of availing himself of it and of seeing it in the Library. It would be simply impossible for him to guarantee that Papers should be printed and ready to distribute before they were laid on the Table?

MR. W. H. SMITH asked whether it would not be possible to have the Code printed and then laid on the Table.

MR. MUNDELLA said, he was surprised at the right hon. Gentleman; he must know that an Order of the House was required for printing Papers. As he had said, the Code was in type when it was laid, and this was the first time a Code had been laid on the Table before it was introduced.

MR. W. H. SMITH said, it was perfectly within the power of the right hon. Gentleman to arrange with the printers that the Papers should be ready for distribution.

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—GENERAL GRAHAM'S FORCE—THE ZEREBAS.

COLONEL DAWNAY asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention has been called to the following statement of the Special Correspondent of *The Daily Telegraph* at Suakin, dated March 22nd:—

"General Graham expected the first zereba to be built five miles away, and the second at a distance of eight miles, but General M'Neil, finding it impossible to advance, in consequence of the camels breaking down, and no fresh ones being available, stopped about six miles from Suakin;"

and, whether the above-mentioned camels were those supplied from the Delta, accustomed to abundance of green food and water, and which have been condemned as notoriously unfit for the Suakin-Berber desert?

MR. BRAND, in reply, said, there was no official confirmation of the statement. He could not say whether the camels referred to were Egyptian or Indian, nor was he aware that the Delta camels had been condemned as unfit for the desert. They had, however, done good service there.

EGYPT—THE ARMY OF OCCUPATION.

MR. M'COAN asked the Secretary of State for War, What is the present annual cost of the Army of Occupation in Egypt, exclusive of the force employed in the Soudan?

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER said, the total ordinary annual expenditure was £492,238, and the extra charges were £250,000.

TRAWLING (SCOTLAND)—LEGISLATION.

LORD ELCHO asked the Lord Advocate, Whether the Government could introduce their Bill dealing with the Trawling Question before Easter?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR): The draft of a Bill dealing with the recommendation of the Trawling Commission has been prepared, and has been printed for more than a week.

Communications with the Fishery Board for Scotland have been proceeding with regard to it; and it is also necessary that in settling its terms more than one of the Departments in London should be consulted. I am afraid that, under these circumstances, it will be impossible to introduce the Bill before Easter; but I think I can promise that it will be introduced immediately after the Easter Recess.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS—COUNTY BOUNDARIES (WARWICKSHIRE), &c.

MR. SAMPSON LLOYD asked the President of the Local Government Board, If the Government are prepared to deal, in reference to Parliamentary Representation, with the isolated and detached parts of Warwickshire, Worcestershire, Gloucestershire, and Oxfordshire, included in the first column to Schedule (M) of statute 2 and 3 Will. 4, c. 64, and not attached by that Act to the county in which they are locally situate, by referring the anomalous position of those parts to a Committee to report as to the Parliamentary Division to which these isolated and detached parts of counties should be attached, with a view to the recommendations of such Committee being embodied in a supplemental Bill to be introduced this Session; and, whether the Government propose to rectify the anomalies referred to in any other way?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: The case to which the hon. Member alludes, although a very inconvenient one, is far from being the only case of the kind. The matter has been under consideration; but so many difficult points have arisen that it was considered desirable to leave it until a Local Government Bill should be introduced. But if the local Members have any scheme to submit, I shall be very glad to consider it. As, however, the local Members are all on one side of the House, it would be only fair that they should consult some of the local leaders of the Liberal Party.

TRAMWAYS AND PUBLIC COMPANIES (IRELAND) ACT, 1883—THE PROPOSED CONNEMARA RAILWAY.

COLONEL NOLAN asked the First Lord of the Treasury, If his attention has been drawn to the failure of the Tramways Act to meet the want of Railway communication in Connemara; if the Connemara district agreed, through the Grand Jury of the county of Galway, to guarantee a Railroad through that district, the baronies affected guaranteeing three per cent.; the Government, under the Tramways Act, to guarantee two more per cent.; if, after this guarantee through the recognized county authorities, the Irish Privy Council declared that the proposed Railway was not only most valuable for Connemara, but was of national if not Imperial importance, but still that they, the Privy Council, would refuse the application on the ground that the baronies affected were too poor to afford the guarantee; and, if, after this statement on the part of the Privy Council, the Government would by a special grant, or otherwise, do something to develop this large and isolated district which the Privy Council has declared requires a railroad, and which has done its best to avail itself of the Act, but which has been pronounced by the highest Government authority in Ireland to be too poor to develop its resources without extraneous assistance?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gladstone) has asked me to answer this Question. The facts are substantially as stated. I believe that the Privy Council also suggested that the case was one in which the entire county Galway should be asked to contribute. As I understand, when this was put down the Grand Jury refused the application. The failure of this scheme and certain other schemes has not escaped the notice of the Government; but while they greatly regret it, it is impossible for the Government to contemplate making a special grant in an individual case. The question of the sufficiency of the existing means must be decided after a further period of the working of the Act.

FRANCE AND CHINA—HOSTILITIES—CONTRABAND OF WAR—RICE.

MR. W. H. SMITH asked the First Lord of the Treasury, What precedents exist which would authorise the treatment of grain as contraband of war under neutral flags; and, seeing that a

large proportion of the food consumed by the inhabitants of Great Britain is imported from abroad, to inquire whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to acquiesce in the declaration of the Government ef France that shipments of rice, destined for Chinese ports north of Canton, will be prohibited and treated as contraband of war?

MR. GLADSTONE: In regard to the first part of this Question, I may say that it was only placed on the Paper this morning.

MR. W. H. SMITH: Last night.

MR. GLADSTONE: Well, I only saw it this morning. I have not examined into the history of the interesting, no doubt, but rather complicated and extended question as to precedents with regard to grain as a contraband of war; and I think it right to tell the right hon. Gentleman that I am not disposed to examine into it, for I doubt very much whether it would be advantageous. With regard to the second and principal part of the Question, the answer is that the French have held, in the course of their war with China, that the shipment of rice destined generally to Chinese ports north of Canton would be treated as contraband of war. Her Majesty's Government have thought it their duty to protest against that declaration. The Correspondence on the subject will be laid before Parliament at the earliest convenient moment.

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—ADVANCE OF THE RUSSIANS.

MR. ONSLOW asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether it is the fact that General Alikhanoff, at the time when the Russian advance on Zulfica and Pul-i-khatun was made, attempted also to get into Penjdeh by a coup de main, but the Afghans turned out in considerable force, and the Russians retired?

MR. GLADSTONE: I am not aware of what can have induced the hon. Member to put this Question on the Paper, or of the reason he has for supposing that, as the Question seems to imply, General Alikhanoff has advanced and attempted to get into Penjdeh. I presume he has some ground for putting such a Question; but if he has any such ground we have no such information. The facts as reported to us are these. It is not the truth that General Alikhanoff attempted to get into Penjdeh by a *coup de main*. The nearest point to Penjdeh to which he has advanced is a point at the junction of the Khushk and Murghab rivers, about eight miles, as I understand, from Penjdeh; and at that point, eight miles from Penjdeh, he has established a post of Turcomans and Cossacks.

MR. ONSLOW: I would ask the Prime Minister whether he does not consider that the Russians, having advanced to within eight miles of Penjdeh, that it is a case in which they are threatening and have threatened Penjdeh; and that if it had not been for the advance of the Afghans the Russians would have been at Penjdeh at the present time? I would also ask whether the Government intend making a statement on the subject?

MR. GLADSTONE: The Question originally put by the hon. Member is whether General Alikhanoff attempted to get into Penjdeh by a *coup de main*. I cannot say that the advance of a Russian post to within eight miles of Penjdeh corresponds at all with the implication in that Question. Whether this advance may imply a threat upon Penjdeh or not is a Question that it would require more minute knowledge of the *locale* than I possess to answer, especially without Notice. I know that on Monday there will be a Question put to me, but as to the answer I shall be able to give to that Question I am not at present in a position to say; but I have no reason to suppose that there is any intention on the part of the Government to make a statement as to the relations between England and Russia in regard to Afghanistan.

EGYPT (FINANCE, &c.)—THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENT.

MR. M'COAN asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether it is yet too late to obtain from the Guaranteeing Powers, by exchange of notes or otherwise, some recorded expression of their understanding that the Convention about to be submitted to the House does not create or impart any right of International interference with the administration of Egypt?

MR. GLADSTONE: This is not a question of time, or whether it is or is

not too late to do what the hon. Gentleman suggests. But I will answer the Question in the observations I shall shortly have to make to the House.

EGYPT (FINANCE, &c.)—THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENT—THE SUEZ CANAL.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the First Lord of the Treasury, By what means Parliament can be seized of the decisions of the Conference of the Suez Canal before ratification by Her Majesty's Government, so as to prevent the adoption of any provision which may affect the value of the shares, the dividends on which will form part of the ordinary revenues of the United Kingdom?

Mr. GLADSTONE: With regard to this subject, I partly answered this Question, I think, already, by stating that we should take very good care that Parliament shall be informed of our views on all material points bearing on the Suez Canal before the meeting of the Representatives of the Powers, which is to conclude, I hope, what has been begun. The hon. Gentleman will have observed that considerable progress has already been made in that matter, because not only has there been the despatch of Lord Granville for more than two years in the hands of Parliament, which does contain the views of the British Government on almost every material point, but likewise that despatch has been adopted by the joint and deliberate action of the Powers as the basis of the new arrangement. There will, therefore, be very little except matter of detail which will remain to be dealt with. There is, however, a point of detail which is of importance, and on which the Government will take good care that the House will be speedily informed. With regard to what is to happen at the time when the meeting of the Representatives of the Powers takes place, I can only answer my hon. Friend that we shall act upon our responsibility with all possible care, and with considerable confidence derived from the fact that a full statement of our views has been so long before Parliament, and that no exception, so far as I know, has been generally taken to our views. Sometimes it happens, after the conclusion of a Convention, that its ratification is reserved on special grounds. I am not yet able to say whether this arrangement will take the form of a Convention, or whether, if it does so, it will be proper to reserve the ratification.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: I would like to ask the right hon. Gentleman, with respect to his answer, whether it is not a fact that a Yellow Book has been published in France in which the French Government have laid it down that they do not accept the points laid down in Lord Granville's Circular as the basis of their action, and that they do not intend to be limited by it?

Mr. GLADSTONE: My reference, Sir, was not to anything that has been published in France, but to the documents before us—the Declaration and the Convention signed by the French Government.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I beg to give Notice that I shall put a Question on this point to the Prime Minister to-morrow, in order that we may ascertain whether the House will or will not have a full opportunity of considering and deliberating upon the arrangement arrived at?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I can give an answer to that Question quite readily now. As I have said, our views will be fully made known before we meet. Until the Representatives of the Powers come to compare their views together, you cannot absolutely say what new light may be thrown upon the question, or what concessions may be made by the one to the other. It will depend upon the question how far any addition to our own views, or any modification of them, would be material, whether it is necessary to take any special measures for assuring ourselves of the state of mind of Parliament and of the country upon the subject; and I do not think it would be possible for me to answer the Question of the right hon. Baronet until we are in a position to pass a fair judgment.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: The right hon. Gentleman does not clearly understand what I mean. With regard to this Convention which is to be made on the subject of the Suez Canal, we are referred to the Circular of Lord Granville of two years ago; but the House has never discussed that Circular. We were, in fact, deprived of an opportunity of discussing it in the course of last summer. What I want to know is whether

the House is to be taken as accepting the bases of the arrangement with regard to the Suez Canal without any discussion, or whether we are to have an opportunity of discussing those bases before the Convention is actually made?

MR. GLADSTONE: I should think that manifestly hon. Members opposite will have an opportunity in the debate of to-night, if they think fit, to raise any question upon these bases. The right hon. Gentleman says he was deprived of the opportunity of discussing Lord Granville's Circular last Session. I am not aware in what manner he was deprived. It was certainly not by the action of Her Majesty's Government. [*A laugh.*] The right hon. Gentleman smiles; but I think he will affirm the correctness of what I say. I am not quite sure whether some representation was not made to him in this House.

MR. GORST: I wish to ask the Prime Minister a Question of which I have given him private Notice, Whether the Convention with regard to the finances of Egypt has yet been signed by the Turkish Plenipotentiary?

MR. GLADSTONE: I shall refer to that subject in the course of a few minutes, when I make a statement to the House on the subject of Egyptian finance.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: With regard to the observation of the right hon. Gentleman that it was not by the action of the Government that the House was deprived of the opportunity of discussing those provisions, I wish to ask him whether he is aware that on the occasion referred to the mass of the Liberal Party voted against the Government at the instance of the Government Whips?

MR. GLADSTONE: The hon. Member asks me whether the mass of the Liberal Party, on a certain occasion, voted against the Leaders of that Party? That is an accident which I have known to happen on more than one occasion.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I wish to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he expects to bring forward the Financial Statement; and also whether a Vote of Credit will be submitted to the House before that Statement?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (MR. CHILDERS): I hope to make the Financial Statement on the first Thursday after the Thursday on which the House meets—namely, the 16th of April. Our present intention is to lay on the Table the Vote of Credit before that time, but not to take a vote upon it.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (REDISTRIBUTION) BILL.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS: I wish to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can inform the House if it is his intention to take the Redistribution Bill before Easter?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I am very anxious to go on with the Bill before Easter; but so many representations have been made by hon. Members who have Amendments on the Schedules that Monday would not be a convenient day that I shall postpone it till Friday fortnight.

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN).

MR. GUY DAWNAY: I beg to give Notice that I shall move, on the earliest opportunity—

"That, in the opinion of this House, the slaughter of men, women, and children on the shores of the Red Sea now taking place by the orders of Her Majesty's Government without any definite object is a disgrace to civilization."

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: I wish to ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he has received any information as to the truth of the statement that women and children of the Soudanese are fighting against the British troops at present; and whether it is true that 34 bodies of women have been picked up among the slain?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: We have received no information to that effect from General Graham.

MR. O'KELLY: Will the noble Lord undertake to ask him for the information?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: No, Sir; I cannot undertake to ask for information in regard to every statement which may be made in the Press by correspondents.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT: Has the noble Lord received any information from General Graham with

regard to the actions which have taken place near Suakin?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: We have received a very short telegram to-day from General Graham, and I shall read it to the House—

"Suakin, March 26, 1885, 2.20 P.M., Zariba.—Just arrived with large convoy. Attacked by enemy about two miles from here. Enemy charged head of square, and were repulsed with considerable loss. Our casualties, three wounded. I have not lost a single camel load. Several slight cases of sunstroke; men otherwise healthy. Marines suffer most. Am bringing in Scots Guards."

That is all the information we have to-day.

MR. ONSLOW: Certain comments having been made in the newspapers regarding the behaviour of the Indian troops near Suakin, I wish to ask the noble Lord whether the Indian troops in the recent engagements have not fought as well as could possibly be expected of them?

[No reply.]

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE QUEEN'S MESSAGE—EMBODIMENT OF THE MILITIA.

MR. RITCHIE asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, in view of the Message from the Crown on the subject of calling out the Reserves, it was the intention of the Government to embody any more battalions of Militia than those already embodied?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I believe that my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, when he brought up the Message, stated that Monday would be the day when Her Majesty's Message would be taken into consideration; and I think it would be more convenient to go into the subject then.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

EGYPTIAN LOAN.

COMMITTEE.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

MR. GLADSTONE, in rising to move—

"That Her Majesty be authorized to guarantee the payment of an annuity of three hundred and fifteen thousand pounds sterling for the purpose of a loan, to be raised by the Government of Egypt, in pursuance of the Convention signed at London on the eighteenth day of March 1885, between Her Majesty and the Governments of Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, and Turkey; and that provision be made out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, or the growing produce thereof, for the issue of such sums of money from time to time, as may be required, to pay any sums which may at any time be required to fulfil the guarantee of Her Majesty in respect of such annuity, conformably to the tenour of Her Majesty's engagement as specified in the said Convention,"

said: The first duty which I have marked out for myself in addressing the Committee has reference to the subject of the Question put by the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst). A point of form, immaterial in itself, has arisen in this case with regard to which Her Majesty's Government, acting in concurrence with the Ambassadors of the Powers, have determined that it is not in their judgment one of substance, and need not interfere with the progress of this question in Parliament. I will indicate its character in the simplest and most direct manner by stating the slight amendment which I propose to make in the Resolution now before the House. If hon. Members look at the sixth line of the Resolution, they will see that, as it stands, it runs to the effect that it is in pursuance of a Convention signed at London on the 18th of March, 1885, between Her Majesty's Government and the Governments of Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, and Turkey. In lieu of that form of expression I propose to amend it by describing the Convention as concluded between Her Majesty and the Governments of Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, and with the authority of Turkey. The House will be aware that Turkey bears a different relation to this country as regards this subject to that of the other Great Powers of Europe. They are guaranteeing Powers, and they intervene in the matter with reference to their interests in the guarantee, and under various laws affecting Egypt as already established. Turkey intervenes not in relation to any interest in the business of guaranteeing, but as a Sovereign Power of the country. Those who have paid attention to this subject will, doubtless, be under the impression—and they could not be otherwise than under the impression—that the signature of Turkey would be appended together with those of the other guaranteeing

Powers. We were under that impression ourselves until yesterday, and of that there is evidence to be found in a note at the bottom of page 3 of the Declaration, and in the Convention it is again to be found, to the effect that the Declaration had not yet been signed by the Turkish Ambassador, and that his powers had not arrived. I need not say, of course, that that note was not founded on any assumption of ours, but upon a statement made from the highest source, and I believe it expressed the belief and the full expectation of the Ambassador himself at the time. But since then, and as far as our knowledge is concerned, yesterday there arose a question whether the concurrence of Turkey should be conveyed by a signature similar to the other signatures of the guaranteeing Powers, or by sanction given by a Firman of the Sultan. We have in our possession the strongest assurance that the authority to proceed has been given by the determination of the Sultan to issue a Firman upon the subject. In consequence of this doubt—it appears to have proceeded from some want of clearness in the telegraphic communications with Constantinople on the part of the Ambassadors—Lord Granville has to-day seen the Turkish Ambassador, and we have also thought it right to communicate with the Ambassadors of the six Great Powers; and the position of the question is, I believe, determined, at least so far as the guiding of our action is concerned, in the following Memorandum, which Lord Granville sends to me, and which I have his authority to read:—

"I asked the Turkish Ambassador and Hassan Fehmy Pasha this afternoon whether I was rightly informed that they were authorized formally to declare that the Sultan consents to the proposed loan and will sanction it by a Firman. Their Excellencies replied that they hoped within 48 hours to be instructed to sign the declaration—that is, to maintain the form of proceeding here exactly as it is—but that in any case they gave the assurance which I have stated regarding the consent of the Sultan to the loan. The Ambassadors of the other Powers and I myself took note of this assurance, and declared that we accepted it."

That, I apprehend, there is no doubt at all, is to be considered as an official document. [Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: To-day?] Yes. I may add that I should have thought it right immediately at the close of yesterday's Sitting to have given this information to the House; but Musurus Pasha gave his opinion that he felt there was no difficulty about the substance of the matter, and therefore I thought it right under the circumstances then not to trouble the House, but to reserve my explanation until I proposed the Resolution to-day. The House, then, will see that there is no substantial alteration proposed in the Resolution, that the expectation of the Turkish Ambassador is that the form which had been anticipated will be preserved, but that in any case the sanction and authority of the Sultan to the loan has already been given, and that the Firman has been granted. That being so, I will spare the House, as I am bound to spare them, any repetition of the statement made by my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer on Wednesday week. Of course, that statement was made on behalf of the Government. It contained a clear and full, though not a very lengthened, statement of the effect of the Convention and Declaration, and I think it quite enough now to refer to that statement without going any further. There is, however, one portion of that statement which was not developed at the time, and which has not been developed since by the Questions put in this House, on which I should say a few words, and that is the nature and extent of the liabilities of Egypt in the month of April last, with respect to which the House is not yet fully informed. Two questions, I apprehend, are before me on this occasion. My first duty is to show that there is a real necessity for an arrangement of this kind, and my second duty is to show that besides being necessary it is also a safe arrangement. With regard to its necessity, that will, I think, be shown by the figures which have already been partially given, and by others which I will more completely give on the present occasion. The House ought to understand that the necessities of Egypt have been supplied to a very considerable extent during these recent occurrences by banking advances. Those I describe under that phrase to distinguish them from the regular recurring charges of the State; but there were banking advances outstanding to the extent of £1,367,000. The whole of these advances become due on the 1st of April. They have been renewed from time to time, but they were renewed

while we were negotiating, or taking measures having reference to negotiation, either here or in Egypt, or in correspondence with the Powers. Under these circumstances, as the matter was in progress, these banking advances had been renewed. Now the matter is no longer in progress, and, so far as negotiations are concerned, it has reached its full completion. The proposal, with the sanction and assent of the Powers, is now in our hands; and we apply to the House to give its authority for the purpose of guaranteeing the loan. I have no right to declare—I will not even say I have a right to expect—certainly I have no right to announce—that the banking advances would again be renewed if the House shows a disinclination to accede to the application now made. These banking advances form part of the current liabilities of Egypt, and they become due on April 1, and would form a portion of the sum for which Egypt would be in deficiency, and for which Egypt would be a bankrupt State, unless provision be made for the purpose of raising the money as is now proposed. Now, to that £1,367,000 we are to add the excess of normal charges for the month of April over the Income and Revenue of the month of April. I need not enter into the details of the charges; they are partly official charges, and partly connected with the payment of liabilities for the tribute or for debt. But the excess of these normal charges over the accruing means is £309,000, according to our latest report; and that, added to the banking advances, makes a liability of £1,676,000, which Egypt has not the means to satisfy unless and until the arrangement which is now before the House shall be proceeded with. Now, Sir, before I go to the question of the safety of this loan, I will say one word on the subject of the Suez Canal. I do not intend to enter into any detailed explanations on that subject. While I admit that there may be differences of opinion among us in regard to it, I am not aware what those differences are, and I am content to rest for the present on the statement contained in the despatch of Lord Granville of January 3, 1883, and upon the rather considerable sanction and authority which that despatch has obtained—not an authority overbearing the opinion of the House of Commons, but still an authority of considerable weight from the reference which is made to it in the recent Declaration. In part 3 of the Declaration, in the first paragraph, these expressions are used—

"Whereas the Powers have agreed to recognize the urgent necessity for negotiating with the object of sanctioning, by a Conventional Act, the establishment of a definite regulation guaranteeing, at all times, and for all Powers, the freedom of the Suez Canal: It has been agreed between the seven Governments above named that a Commission, composed of Delegates named by the said Governments shall meet at Paris on the 30th of March, to prepare and draw up this Act, taking for its basis the Circular of the Government of Her Britannic Majesty of the 3rd January, 1883."—[Egypt. No. 6 (1885), p. 9.]

Perhaps I may as well say that, although the first meeting takes place on so early a day as the 30th of March, I make no doubt that is to be considered simply as an introductory meeting, and undoubtedly it will imply nothing adverse to the consideration of the Powers, inasmuch as there is no necessity, although it is highly desirable that the matter should be put forward; yet there is no urgency of the same kind in relation to the arrangement as to the Suez Canal as there is in regard to the temporary arrangement in respect to the finances of Egypt. Now, the real difficulties of the case, for those who think that they exist, turn, I think, entirely upon the fears that are entertained of what is known as an International Control. I cannot say that I derive very much light as to the nature of the objections taken from the Motion of the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Bruce); but I think this question is a question of some breadth as well as of deep interest, and I shall not run much risk of misapprehending the mind of hon. Gentlemen, in whatever part of the House they may sit, if I say that I conceive there is no doubt that these fears of International Control must stand in connection with one of two subjects—either they must stand in connection with the Commission which may or may not sit, but which, in a certain contingency, will sit at the close of two years, or else these fears arise out of or stand in connection with the guarantee which the House is invited to give for the loan. With respect to International Control, it is quite unnecessary, I think, that I should re-state the views of the Government. The desire of the Government has been, I conceive,

all along to respect, to recognize, and to cherish to the best of their ability, except where stern necessity prevented them, that autonomy which, by the law of Europe and by the law of Turkey, has been guaranteed to the Province of Egypt. And, therefore, it is neither International Control nor any control properly so-called — nor any control signifying by control a Power dependent upon another—that has had much favour in our eyes. But quite apart from that, quite apart from our desire to respect the just interests of Egypt, and to give Egypt as far as we can those habits of administration on which its future happiness must depend, we have always admitted to the House that International Control is a thing in our view not to be heard of or entertained. We have deplored the Dual Control, and have considered it the root of the mischiefs that have since befallen Egypt. In discussions on the subject I have always admitted the integrity of the motives which led to the Dual Control. I believe there are many reasons, either plausible or more or less serious, which can be alleged in excuse for the adoption of a measure which has proved to be so unfortunate, and to which I, at any rate, may safely say that from the first, and long before it was ever adopted, had declared publicly my strong and insurmountable opposition. Therefore, let it be perfectly understood—I am endeavouring to measure the occasion about which your fears arise—let it be perfectly understood that we are quite agreed with you in allowing that if International Control can be shown to spring out of the present arrangement, that is an objection which I do not know is sufficient to overcome the necessity of the case; but undoubtedly it is sufficient utterly to condemn the proposal of the Government. First, then, as regards fears connected with the Commission. This Commission is a possibility. It will be a reality should the Convention be sanctioned. It will be a reality if the unfavourable contingency of Egypt's failing to re-establish the equilibrium of its finance. I think I need not now enter upon a consideration of the tendency of that Commission to open the door to International Control, not only because it is postponed for two years and depends upon a new state of circumstances, but because it must depend on the powers given to that Commission, and any powers which can lead to the exercise of International Control through the medium of that Commission must necessarily be the object of negotiation and of concord among the Powers of Europe. Therefore, I put aside the question of the danger of International Control through future contingent arrangements in connection with the Commission, because those arrangements are not yet made, and there will be an opportunity of taking care, if ever they come to be made, that they are safe and prudent arrangements. Therefore, the real fears in the minds of Gentlemen arise from the guarantee of the loan; and the fears connected with that guarantee have reference undoubtedly both to the intermediate period of two years and to the time which may follow while the guarantee subsists. Now, is there any ground for those fears? That is a question which I hope the House will fairly and impartially determine. Let me first describe what I take to be the general position of Egypt during these two years that are to be granted to the Khedive for the purpose of ascertaining whether a more permanent tax on the dividends of the bondholders is or is not possible. The Commission is to be postponed. The evident intention of that postponement, I apprehend, is that the action of the Egyptian Government should during those two years be a free action—I mean free from the exercise of compulsion. When Gentlemen speak of interference in the government of Egypt, let it be borne in mind that we have no determinate or legal right of interference. There are, however, rights which are indeterminate, that are frequently as real as those which are more defined, and there are moral rights which are as strong as those which have taken legal form. Our position is this—that, in the first place, we have a military situation, with the various necessities that grew out of it. We have, in the second place, I think I may say without offence, a function, some may say enjoyed by us, but I would rather say incumbent on us—the function of the natural advisers. In the present circumstances, and especially during these two years and until some more permanent arrangement can be made by general consent, we are the natural advisers of the Egyptian Government for the time.

That is the only sense in which, as I understand, we are justified in interfering in the affairs of Egypt. Now, these facts stand upon the general and free recognition of Europe. Nobody grudges us the performance of our duty—so defined. [*Ironical laughter and cheers.*] I hail that cheer with some satisfaction, because if nobody grudges us the performance of that duty it seems to follow by inevitable consequence, if it be not indeed part of an identical proposition, that other persons are not particularly anxious for a share in it. For if they were anxious for a share in it they would then grudge us this exclusive privilege. Not grudging it, it seems to follow that they do not desire it. Well, now, in our opinion this function of advising Egypt would be subject to every kind of underground opposition and embarrassment were we to exercise it in a sense hostile to the general sentiment of Europe. We have, with infinite pains, I may fairly say, and with a gradual surmounting of great and many difficulties, arrived at a point in which, as we think, we have obtained that community of aim and purpose which is embodied in the present Convention, and which constitutes the only condition in the nature of things upon which we can, in a satisfactory manner, exercise the influence properly attaching to our position in Egypt, and act as the proper financial advisers of the Khedive in the period which has been marked out by the Powers. For what is now the case? Had we been there in opposition to them, without any community of purpose or desire, we should have been liable both to formal and to informal obstacles and opposition of every sort. We have now a common purpose with Europe. We have now a common desire with Europe. Interference with the exercise of the discharge of our duty would be an interference with the fulfilment of their own desire and purpose, and they with us are cordially united in a sincere anxiety—first of all, to ascertain, and secondly to rectify, the condition of Egyptian finance. So far, therefore, I say upon the face of the case that does not bear the aspect of an unsound position. Now, I come more particularly to examine those questions about guarantees and what guarantees imply. An hon. Member below the Gangway asked me to-day whether it was too late to insert in the arrangement some provision barring the interference of other Powers? The question is—Why should there be such a provision? Is there a reason for it? If there is a reason, what is it? It is admitted that no right of interference grows out of any expression used in the Convention or in the Declaration. There is not a syllable that looks like it. Our interference cannot be justified by reference to the Convention and Declaration. We derive from them no title whatever for interference. Our position, as I have stated, is one growing out of the circumstances of Egypt. Neither can any Power derive any right of interference from any expression contained in the Declaration and Convention. Then, if this right of intervention is not founded upon any express words of the Declaration or the Convention, upon what is it founded? It is a general rule of International Law that when any State or Power accepts pecuniary aid, either in the form of cash or of liability, from another State, that other State thereby tacitly and effectually acquires the right of intervention in its affairs? I think that is a fair statement of the issue. If it does not rest upon express declaration in the particular case, does it rest upon either general law or general usage? Most confidently do I affirm that it does not rest either upon the one or the other. No such doctrine is to be found in general law, and any such doctrine is utterly confuted by general usage. How shall I refer to the evidence upon that subject? We have had large experience in this happy country in the practice of giving aid in money to other States. No country in the world is so rich in the means of examining this question from the light afforded by its own experience, for we have given aid right and left, in small sums and in large. We have given it in one way and in another. We have given it for objects of war, and we have given it for objects of peace; and it is very odd indeed if we cannot arrive at a conclusion upon this subject. I might go back to the subsidies of Mr. Pitt, and even beyond; but I spare the House further researches into political antiquity. I never heard that any of the subsidies of Mr. Pitt, which were enormous in their amount, though in certain cases there were stipulations for particular things to be done

at the moment, were connected with the remotest idea or presumption of interference in the concerns of the State to which the subsidies were given. I admit that there is a difference in the case of subsidies, because you may say that is a gift of money once and for all. But our experience is not limited to subsidies at all. It comes up in every imaginable form, and I take first the case of the loans to Spain. The loans to Spain in the Peninsular War were enormous. Certain very limited payments have been made in respect of them; but the House would be alarmed if it had the occasion, as I have had at certain times, to look into the state of the case. The figures are sufficiently alarming. I do not say now what contention may be raised by Spain upon them, nor do I make any sort of charge against Spain. But this I say—that with all these loans, which were of vast extent, no right of interference in the internal affairs of Spain, great or small, direct or indirect, ever for a moment was connected, and no allegation that such a right of interference would grow up was made. Then I take a transaction in which I was myself responsibly concerned. That was the loan to Sardinia during the Crimean War. We never claimed any right of interference with Sardinia, which at that time was not part of the great Kingdom of United Italy, but was a comparatively insignificant, third-rate State in the Northern portion of that country, with respect to which, if interference had been thought of, it would have been much more easy to assert it. I go on from loans to guarantees. We have guaranteed loans again, and again, and again on the part of our Colonies. We have guaranteed the largest amounts in the case of Canada. Did the guarantee of those loans affect in the slightest degree the title of the Colony to self-government? Would it have been possible for us for one moment to alter in the slightest particular our relations with Canada and the administration of Colonial affairs in consequence of those guarantees? Such an attempt would have been ridiculous, and a violation which would have recoiled upon ourselves. But there are other cases. There was the case of the Turkish loan of 1855. We guaranteed that loan, and the dividends upon it were not always forthcoming at the proper time; but yet we never founded upon that, nor did France, any title to interfere in the affairs of Turkey. There is only one other case which occurs to my recollection at the present time, of which I will venture to give the House a rather fuller exposition, because Gentlemen might think at first sight that they could make use of it to found an opposite argument. That is the case of the Greek loan. They know, on the one hand, there has been a guarantee of a loan by a portion of the European Powers—France, Russia, and Great Britain—and they know, also, there has been interference in the affairs of Greece. Therefore, let us see in what way these two undoubted facts stand related to one another. The guarantee of the Greek loan has nothing whatever to do with the interference in the affairs of Greece. [*Opposition cries of* "Oh!"] That is the state of knowledge in which Gentlemen opposite come down to the House to discuss this question. Have these Gentlemen looked at one of the documents in the case? They receive with scorn my statement that the two things are totally unconnected. But is there one who has looked at the two sides of the case? The case stands thus:—On the 7th of May, 1832, there was a Treaty framed between England, France, Russia, and Bavaria; and in one of the Articles of that Treaty there was a covenant that England, Russia, and France should guarantee a Greek loan. That guarantee was an important part, and for Greece a necessary part, or believed to be necessary, for the arrangements then made. But, so far from founding any interference upon the guarantee, the guarantee was a subordinate arrangement in the Treaty for interference. What was the main object of that Treaty? The main object of that Treaty was to give a King to Greece. Now, undoubtedly, if ever there was to be interference in relation to the guaranteed loan of Greece, we have here offered the best opportunity for it. I do not deny for a moment that in cases where the conditions of a loan are not fulfilled a limited right of interference arises. There is no doubt about that whatever; but I am now arguing the question whether a general right of interference arises. I do not doubt that, if Egypt does not pay, the guaranteeing Powers have a right to in-

terfere; but I think I can show this—that even when there has been that right, and apparently the broadest occasion for the exercise of that right, no interference at all has taken place. In the case of Greece we were dealing with a Kingdom totally unable to pay the interest of the loan. The Treaty provided that the loan should be the first charge upon the Revenue, and that nothing should be applied to any purposes of Government until the annual dividends on the loan had been defrayed. And it went further to provide—which looks a little like interference—that the Diplomatic Agents of the three countries should watch over the payment of the dividends of the loan. These dividends could not be paid, and were not paid. The Representatives watched over the matter as well as they could, from time to time sending the extremely limited allowances which the country could afford. But although the country could not fulfil the provisions of the loan, there was not the slightest attempt to interfere in the affairs of Greece on account of that loan. What was the basis of interference in the affairs of Greece, and what was the object of the Treaty of 1832? The purpose of the Treaty was a much more important affair even than the guarantee; it was the choice of a Sovereign; and on what ground did the Powers justify their choice of a Sovereign for Greece? They justified it by this recital—that they were exercising the power conveyed to them by the Greek nation, not arising out of their guarantee, but a specific power arising out of a specific mission, an authentic and formal conveyance to them of the power to choose a Sovereign for Greece. I have now gone through every case which tends to throw light upon this question. I have declared that I can find no principle or construction of law that tends to support this interference except with reference to the specific conditions of the loan itself, which I do not deny for a moment—no principle of law that tends to support any general doctrine or right of interference. There has been a number of cases in connection with which there has been no such interference, and some of them have been cases in which the title to limited interference was perfectly clear and indisputable, and yet even in that limited interference there was no right to interfere with the real and absolute autonomy of the countries or States affected. In the matters affecting Greece, besides the guaranteeing Powers, other Powers have interfered; for instance, in the settlement of the disputes between Greece and Turkey. The matters were not taken into the hands of the guaranteeing Powers as if they were invested by any exclusive and indefeasible right; but they were settled by the intervention of the Great Powers at large. It is really very difficult to carry an argument further than that unless something in the nature of a shadowy and positive presumption has been set up to show that, in some way or other, out of those guarantees there arises a general right of interference. Then there is the question whether Egypt will be able to fulfil her pecuniary obligations. These pecuniary obligations will take precedence of any other. They will rank before all the obligations of her present creditors; and, notoriously, even in the midst of war and difficulty, the Revenue of Egypt is more than sufficient to cover its administrative expenses. The only doubt is whether it is able to bear the entire charge of its Debt. Here is a charge which is to take precedence of the whole claims of that Debt; and, therefore, the notion of any defalcation in the payment of the £315,000 is one which may be fairly and safely set aside. I believe I am right in the doctrine I have laid down with regard to the pecuniary guarantee, and in holding that in every case an International engagement which affects the internal affairs of a particular country must be construed strictly in its terms, and does not and cannot convey the slightest title to any intervention in its affairs beyond what those terms absolutely and indubitably convey. If that doctrine is sound I fall back upon the general proposition I have laid down. If it is unsound, and if it is in the power of countries to found rights of interference in the affairs of a particular State or Province on an International engagement beyond what its terms convey, then let me tell you that you are too late in raising this question, because the rights of International interference in Egypt are already established by a multitude of European instances. The doctrine is perfectly sound, and no attempt at interference even in Egypt has ever been founded upon any of these International engagements be-

yond the letter of the engagement itself. I may mention some of them. There is the Treaty between the Powers of England, Austria, Russia, and Turkey, of 1840, which extended the Capitulations to Egypt. There is the Instrument establishing the Courts of Justice in Egypt in 1874; there is the Law of Liquidation of 1880; and there are the recent commercial arrangements in Egypt, which, perhaps, are the latest of all the arrangements which have been made, and which have consecrated any right of interference, so far as the letter and provisions of the document are concerned, but which have never been admitted to be the basis of any general right of interference beyond what the provisions convey. There is also the Slave Trade Convention with England of the 4th of August, 1877, and there are various others which I might quote; but I think those to which I have already referred are quite sufficient for the purposes of illustration. Then the question is, as far as I understand it, whether, it being admitted that there are no words which have been used on which a right of interference can be founded, that still it is contended that it would be right to introduce words for the purpose of barring interference. I respectfully differ from that opinion. In my opinion, it would be foolish and mischievous in many ways to introduce these words. In the first place, I should like to ask the House to consider what shape they would give to a proposal of that kind, how the interference is to be barred, and what kind of interference is to be barred? Is it interference of a coercive character that is to be barred, or is it interference by advice that is to be barred? And who is to be barred? As I understand the contention of Gentlemen who say there ought to be a clause prohibiting interference, it is that there ought to be inserted in the Convention, or in some collateral or consequential document, a declaration that the other Powers may not interfere in the affairs of Egypt, but that England may. Is that seriously contended? I have great doubt whether it can be seriously contended. Can you describe or define what you would wish to shut out? Could you carry your barring or prohibitive words to the extent of preventing any Power from submitting a recommendation to Egypt if they see cause? But, suppose you did, and that is about the furthest you could go, what would you gain by it? Nothing but this—that instead of a responsible recommendation, instead of a recommendation in the face of day, instead of a recommendation made with your knowledge so that you could call the makers of it to account if they transgressed the legitimate functions of their position—instead of that you would be liable to underground indirect recommendations by secret and irresponsible agents, and you would find yourself thwarted at every turn in the discharge of an important duty by those whom you could not call to account, but whom you put in motion originally by your own unreasonable and excessive jealousy. Sir, it would not be possible to frame such a provision in terms that would be satisfactory even to the framer. But I do not stop there. In my opinion, if you did frame it, you would inflict positive mischief upon the country that was the immediate object of it, and likewise a positive mischief with regard to the generally established law of usage, because if you frame a provision of that kind you would overset entirely the true contention upon the law of usage which has heretofore existed, which, as I have shown, justified no interference whatever, except on the infraction of the terms of the guarantee. If you go beyond that, and say that this guarantee shall not contain any right to do something or other, which something or other you find it hardly possible to describe, you give sanction to a new general doctrine of the most mischievous character—namely, that if there were not a prohibition the Powers would be bound to interfere, and you would set the cleverest lawyers in motion to try if they could find a means—and in most things when they do set about it they do find a means—of driving a coach and four through your provisions. Besides, you would establish a general doctrine contrary to that which now prevails, and by the defects that would be found in your prohibitive words you would give a direct sanction to the very mischief you intended to escape. I have now nearly concluded what I have to say on this subject. I think we have obtained every security for the harmonious and effective discharge of our difficult and important duties in Egypt, and for working

in harmony with those other Powers of Europe who, though they may not be as powerful in Egypt as we are, yet are powerful enough, if it be their interest and desire, to give very great trouble, and powerful enough in combination, when fortified by the legal rights they enjoy, under a variety of arrangements, effectually to thwart us, and to involve us in the utmost difficulty and embarrassment. Now, in this state of affairs the Government, for the first time, has obtained a position in which they may fearlessly say that these Great Powers are at one, that the interests of the Powers are one. ["No, no!"] I say that the interest of these Powers are one for the purposes of this Convention. We are not vendors of a quack medicine; we do not say that we have got a pill of some particular description that will cure all human maladies; we do not say that all the Powers have been amalgamated in one by the exercise of our magical faculties. But what we say is this, and the proposition is a limited and feasible one—that the finance of Egypt is now about to be put upon its legs, if I may say so, for a given time by an arrangement to which all the Powers are parties, and that arrangement is brought about by the assumption of pecuniary liability on the part of each and every one of them. In that pecuniary liability they have a common interest with us, and it can only be escaped from by carrying through the finances of Egypt on a satisfactory footing; and, therefore, they are directly interested to sustain us in every arrangement made by us with tolerable prudence and integrity, for the sake of improving and establishing the condition of Egyptian finance. That is the only security which the nature of the case admits. Nothing that mere jealousy can devise will effect the object. Of course, I am not going to urge that argument for the purpose of saying that if the legal doctrine of guarantee were the opposite of that I have described we should overlook such a state of facts. I must therefore say that we have pursued a right and proper course by avoiding the hopeless task—in my opinion, the most dangerous and perilous task—of endeavouring to make provisions which not only are not required, but which are themselves fraught with extreme danger, for the purpose of avoiding an interference which we have not the slightest reason to expect, and which, exercised in an unfriendly spirit, would be as much and as justly injurious to the purpose and interests and influence of the Power exercising that influence as to ourselves. I think, therefore, in these circumstances, I have said enough to show that our judgment has something to claim in its behalf in the arrangement we have made and in the arrangement which you substitute for it; and I do not envy the office and function of the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Bruce) or any other Gentleman who had to devise that substitute, and not only to devise it, for his ingenuity would be enough for that, but to bring the whole Powers of Europe and the Sultan of Turkey into harmony with his views. Such an office as that I would readily leave to anyone who is disposed to undertake it, rather than charge myself with a duty which I believe to be, under the circumstances of the case, absolutely impossible of satisfactory execution. I submit then, Sir, in the first place, that this agreement is necessary; in the second place, that it is safe, and I put the Motion with the slight Amendment I have made in your hands, and leave it to the fair and serious consideration of the British House of Commons.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That Her Majesty be authorised to guarantee the payment of an annuity of three hundred and fifteen thousand pounds sterling for the purpose of a loan, to be raised by the Government of Egypt, in pursuance of the Convention signed at London on the eighteenth day of March 1885, between Her Majesty and the Governments of Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Italy, and Russia, with the authority of Turkey; and that provision be made out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, or the growing produce thereof, for the issue of such sums of money from time to time, as may be required, to pay any sums which may at any time be required to fulfil the guarantee of Her Majesty in respect of such annuity, conformably to the tenor of Her Majesty's engagement as specified in the said Convention."—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

MR. T. C. BRUCE, in rising to move, as an Amendment, to leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to insert the words—

"The proposals for adjusting the finances of Egypt contained in the draft Convention of March 18th, and the collateral arrangement, indicated in the Papers presented to Parliament, for regulating, without any previous communication to Parliament, the International position

of the Suez Canal are unsatisfactory, and do not warrant the agreement into which the Government have provisionally entered,"

said, he would only make one remark with reference to what fell from the right hon. Gentleman a few moments ago. He had always in that House expressed his respect for the right hon. Gentleman and the great position he held; but he should feel that the right hon. Gentleman's observations on this occasion would be even more pertinent if he did not remember what happened some time ago. In July last he endeavoured to bring before the House the principle which underlay the arrangement; and the supporters of the right hon. Gentleman, not the right hon. Gentleman himself, prevented him from having the opportunity of doing so. He confessed that they were now in some difficulty—and that was a difficulty he foresaw and endeavoured to prevent—when they were to meet an arrangement concluded with the Powers of Europe before the House of Commons had an opportunity of discussing it. What he felt on this matter and on the negotiations that had been carried on was that we had created and strengthened the intervention of Foreign Powers in Egypt, which he believed would be disastrous to Egypt and disastrous to the interests of England. We were at one time simply on equal terms with the European Powers—that was to say, we represented certain capitalists who had invested money in that country. If we were in that position now the case would be different. But a great many things had happened since then. We had virtually taken possession of Egypt, and put it under our control. We had made ourselves responsible, not only for the interests of England there, but for the interests of Egypt itself, and we held a position entirely different from that of any other Power, which, in his opinion, we were bound in justice to Egypt to defend, and that point had not been sufficiently considered in the negotiations which had taken place. He wished to go back to the Law of Liquidation of 1880. That Law of Liquidation was a compromise between Egypt and her creditors. It secured certain terms to the creditors, and provided that certain lands should be charged with the payment of the Debt to the exclusion of everything else. The Law of Liquidation, in addition, included certain subsidiary conditions, such as that the Government should contract no new loan, and none of the surplus funds of the ceded Provinces should go to the Government, but be all devoted to a Sinking Fund for the Debt. Certain conditions were also attached to the management of the railways, which greatly hampered the development of the railway system. All these conditions were guaranteed by the right given to the International Tribunals to pursue the Government legally in the event of an infraction of any one of them. These rules and regulations were, no doubt, of pecuniary advantage to the creditors, but were laid down because the Egyptian Government of that day was in the hands of persons whom it was impossible to trust, and who, if full liberty were allowed them, would have involved the country in the greatest possible difficulties. These rules, however, prevented the Egyptian Government from restoring its fortunes, and were absolutely unsuited to that Government now. When England, having at all events some reputation for financial honesty, took over the administration of Egypt—as she had in reality done, for the present Egyptian Government was merely a form she was entitled—nay, bound—to free the Egyptian Government from the trammels which prevented them from using their revenues in the way which the interests of the country required. In the days when that ought to have been done the German Government were perfectly ready to allow Her Majesty's Government to do all that they might please, and the French Government might have been induced to concur without much difficulty, as they had submitted to the abolition of the Dual Control. The position of the Egyptian Government was that of a Company who carried on a large commercial establishment after closing their capital fund. As a matter of fact, there always had been a surplus in connection with the ceded Provinces; but owing to the conditions of the Law of Liquidation that surplus had not been made available for administrative purposes; it had been applied to a repayment which had been of no use to the bondholders, but which might have been of use to Egypt if it had not been for that fallacy by which some persons proceed to pay debts

with one hand when they were borrowing with the other. So clear was this that when the Representatives of the Foreign Governments were assembled here last year they unanimously agreed that the surplus of the Debt ought to be applied to the Government of the country, and a similar recommendation was afterwards made by Lord Northbrook. The act, instead of being avowed by the English Government as it ought to have been, was represented as the act of the Egyptian Government, and was received with that horror which people would naturally show at the application of an Oriental Government to be allowed to diminish its liabilities. The Egyptian Government accordingly received some admirable lectures on the propriety of respecting Treaties and preserving commercial honesty, which, coming as they did from such Powers as Russia, struck him as being rather absurd. That these lectures were addressed to Egypt was due to the fact that we had never frankly admitted the liabilities which we had incurred. The Law of Liquidation was followed by a revolution, and a conquest by putting down the revolution; and, effecting the conquest, we had placed ourselves in a position very different from that which we were in before, and we could not escape from our responsibilities, however much we might wish to do so. He wished now to come to the circumstances connected with these negotiations. In November of last year England made certain proposals to the other Powers. The French Government delayed six weeks before answering them; but Her Majesty's Government showed much more activity, because their reply was sent in four days, and that reply amounted to a concession on all the material points. There was a curious illustration of the way in which this business had been conducted. The English Government were anxious to raise money for paying the Alexandria indemnities and other purposes. Other Governments were as much or more interested in the payment of the indemnities than England; yet when Her Majesty's Government brought forward their scheme in August or September, 1884, they found that the French Government were determined to reject everything which they proposed. Two things had to be borne in mind by a Government negotiating with Foreign Powers with regard to Egypt—namely, their political and financial interests. France at one time had large political interests in Egypt; but, entirely through her own fault, she had lost her claim to special consideration. When the Dual Control led to the necessity for a display of force, and the necessity of imposing upon the Egyptians a yoke which they seemed to have thrown over, the French withdrew, and declined to take any part in carrying out their implied obligations. All the efforts of the French Government since had been devoted, not to the settlement of the financial question, which was a very small one, but to replace themselves in their former political position. During the continuance of the Dual Control, it was notorious that they intrigued against the Controllers, and did their best to render that system of administration ineffective, for their own advantage. Since then they had adopted a system of intrigue against our officers in Egypt, and had striven to prevent us from carrying out those reforms which we alone could carry out, and on which the future of Egypt depended. It was rather remarkable to see what the objections of the French Government to our proposals were. The differences between the English and the French proposals mainly consisted in this—one of the English proposals was to simplify the Government of Egypt by doing away with the separate administration of the Daira. That was objected to by the French Government, because it would have diminished the number of French functionaries. The other main point was with reference to the sum to be deducted from the bondholders. The proposal of Her Majesty's Government indicated a sum of £374,000, which would be derived by the reduction of one-half per cent from the rate of interest. The French proposed, in lieu of that, to substitute a charge of 5 per cent upon the coupons, which would bring in £208,000; but they attached a condition to that, by which they stipulated that all the surplus of the Egyptian Revenue was to be repaid to the bondholders, and that if any diminution was to be made from the receipts of the bondholders after two years it could only be done after the institution of an International Commission, which would, practically, entirely supersede the Go-

vernment of Egypt. So that all these negotiations resulted only in obtaining a deduction of £200,000 in the bondholders' claims for two years, to be repaid by surpluses; and if that were continued, the government of Egypt would be handed over to an International Commission, in which this country, after all its sacrifices, were only to have one vote among seven. Then came the question of the guarantee of the loan, which was immediately before the House. He would consider for one moment what it all meant. The Prime Minister had said, with perfect truth, that no financial risk was incurred in the guarantee. Why, then, was it a joint guarantee? There was no financial advantage in having the guarantee of the Powers, for they all knew that, as a financial operation, a loan guaranteed by England was quite as good, if not better, than one guaranteed by all the Powers. It certainly was giving no help to Egyptian finance to make this loan on a joint guarantee, and the only object of the Powers in insisting on it was, undoubtedly, that they hoped to gain an equal position with this country in Egypt. Under these circumstances, considering the extent to which these Powers had already interfered in Egypt, who would not believe that the guarantee of this loan would give them greater power to interfere in the future? And as the loan was to be managed by the Commissioners of the Debt and placed on the same footing as other loans, it gave the same power of interference to those who guaranteed it as they already possessed under the Law of Liquidation. The guarantee of the Powers being, therefore, an unnecessary contribution to the loan, it was a political, and not a financial, operation. To come to the Suez Canal question. The right hon. Gentleman had alluded to Lord Granville's despatch of May 3. He was not going to dispute the propriety of Lord Granville's despatches. As a base, he believed them admirable; but they wanted a superstructure, and they wanted to know what it was to be. The Suez Canal was a very remarkable institution. It was made with Egyptian money, and was supposed to be an international institution; but it was really a French Company, and if such a superstructure could be built on the Firman of Said Pasha, he would be sorry to say what could not be built on the despatch of Lord Granville. M. Waddington had urged that the Commission on the Canal should sit in Paris, because it was a French Company. Lord Granville, as was his habit, announced very properly that, though a French Company, it was mainly supported by English money. Then, as was also his habit, he immediately gave way. They had seen something of the doings of the Government with the Suez Canal, so he would not go back on that; but, considering the enormous magnitude of the interest of this country in the Canal, he thought they had a right, when they were informed that an arrangement was to be made with reference to the Suez Canal which was not to be communicated to Parliament, to show some jealousy. Considering that we had undoubtedly perfect security for the loan, he regretted very much that we should not take the whole of it, instead of leaving it to others to come in. The whole of this financial arrangement was based upon a system adopted before in Egypt, which he did not think had proved very satisfactory. They took the Revenue and Expenditure of the country and inferred that the future Revenue and Expenditure would be the same. But they had the statement of Sir Evelyn Baring that the estimate of the Revenue of Egypt was a fluctuating and uncertain one, as it must be in a country where the Revenue was principally derived from land. The whole of this proposal was based on that, and the amount of the loan gave a surplus of about £1,500,000 independent of charges already paid; and that was all they had to go and come upon, as the rest of the Revenue was appropriated to meet the different charges of administration. There was no provision for military expenditure, except £200,000, the whole expense of garrisoning Egypt; because the expense of the Soudan would fall on this country, which would only have one vote in seven in the disposal of its finances. He could not believe that system could produce anything like a permanent result, and they would find themselves again and again unable to carry on the administration of the country without returning year after year to those Powers who had no interest in its success, and who were extremely glad that this country should take all the re-

sponsibility of any action they might direct. The position this country stood in was that for all the real difficulties in Egypt it remained practically responsible. We could do nothing, however, with the finances of the country. We could neither borrow nor use the credit of the country without the consent of the Powers; and we, who had spent millions of money and thousands of lives, and who were, he was afraid, going to spend many thousands of lives more, were left in Egypt merely as one of the half-dozen Powers who, at some time or other, had lent money to Egypt —and we had no power or position beyond that. The Prime Minister had spoken about the immediate bankruptcy of the Egyptian Government. He thought that bankruptcy was of rather a constructive kind. He would bow to the authority of the Prime Minister on all matters of finance; but as to the finance of Oriental countries, he thought he had seen more than the right hon. Gentleman. He had been necessarily familiar for many years with the finance of Oriental countries, and he did not think he ever knew one of them so far from bankruptcy as Egypt. He thought that if those gentlemen who had advanced £1,500,000 to the Egyptian Government found that this arrangement was not carried out there would be no great difficulty in obtaining a continuance of their advances; because they knew that some other arrangement equally satisfactory to them would be made. He could not but think that if we took the position which we ought to take, if we made them clearly understand that we were the people who governed Egypt, there would be no difficulty in getting away from these little threads with which the Lilliputians were at this moment tying us. He thought that the concessions we were making were not required by the state of the case, and that they would render the condition and circumstances of Egypt more difficult and more painful than before. When England bombarded Alexandria and put down the rebellion in Egypt, it undertook the task and the duty of placing Egypt and its people in a position of freedom and prosperity. But by this Agreement the people of Egypt would be still further bound by the financial Powers of Europe. England was thus placing them, not in a better but in a worse position; and was promising them not a future but a revival of the past. That was not the duty which we owed to Egypt. Neither the methods in which the arrangement had been conducted, nor the results which it would produce, were in conformity with the sacrifices which this country had made, and which even under this arrangement it would still be called upon to make, because it must be remembered the Agreement did not provide anything for war expenditure. He hoped, under these circumstances, whatever difficulties there might be, those difficulties would be met as this country had met a great many difficulties before, and that we should not neglect the duty which we owed to ourselves and the Egyptian people by consenting to the proposed arrangement.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That," to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the proposals for adjusting the finances of Egypt contained in the Convention of March 18th, and the collateral arrangement, indicated in the Papers presented to Parliament, for regulating, without any previous communication to Parliament, the international position of the Suez Canal are unsatisfactory, and do not warrant the agreement into which the Government have provisionally entered," — (*Mr. Thomas Bruce,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he had listened most attentively to the speech of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Bruce), and if any man ever made out a case his hon. Friend had done so. In his (Sir Walter B. Barttelot's) opinion the Prime Minister's speech was the weakest speech that had ever been delivered upon a great occasion by the First Minister of the Crown. The right hon. Gentleman avoided every issue which ought to have been raised on such an occasion in that House. He did not, for instance, tell them the reasons which had now made the Government adopt the French proposals—those proposals which they had said it was impossible to accept last year. The right hon. Gentleman and the Chancellor of the Exchequer strongly maintained that the proposals they had made at the Conference were the only

proposals which could be submitted to the House. Now, all those proposals had been set aside by the Government simply to obtain the friendship of a nation which had shown lately, by every means in its power, that it had not the interests of this country at heart. His hon. Friend had shown most clearly that the French had been intriguing ever since we had been in occupation in Egypt. Indeed, the French, by sailing away when Alexandria was bombarded, declared that the Dual Control was at an end, and that the sole power and authority, especially after Tel-el-Kebir, was left in the hands of Her Majesty's Government. How had our Government fulfilled the trust that was then confided in them? Never, in the history of any Government, had so many mistakes been made as had been made by Her Majesty's Government in dealing with the concerns of Egypt. Never before had there been a Party sitting behind the Treasury Bench so unwilling to support the voice of the Government as that which sat there at that moment. It was useless and idle for Ministers to ignore the fact that the opponents of the Amendment who would support them in this division were diametrically opposed to their views. ["No!"] He knew whence that solitary "No" proceeded; but he repeated his assertion on the authority of many who were going to vote for the Government. Had the Government policy been approved of there would have sat behind the Treasury Bench a far greater phalanx than that which listened to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. He thought the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, a day or two ago, was even more delusive than that of the Prime Minister that night in regard to International Control. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said there was not in the Agreement anything which would allow of an International Control. But, upon the Papers being studied, there appeared to be nothing to show that, in certain eventualities, an International Control might not be set up. The Prime Minister that night had signally failed to show why it was that the European Powers were so excessively anxious to have something to do with this Loan. The truth was that the Powers expected that by entering into this Agreement they would have as good a right to interfere in the internal affairs of Egypt as this country. Never in the history of this country had the interests of England been more thoroughly sacrificed than by the present Government in the present Arrangement. Her Majesty's Government seemed to forget, but the country would not forget, all the sacrifices they had made, all the English blood that had been shed, and all the treasure that had been spent for the sake of Egypt; but the result of the present Convention would be that England, after all its sacrifices, would find itself with no greater authority in Egypt than any one of those Powers which would guarantee this Loan. The Prime Minister had pressed the House of Commons to give an answer at once in this matter. He (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) could not forget that it took the Prime Minister three months to decide whether the Expedition to rescue General Gordon should proceed from Suakin to Berber, or from Cairo to Khartoum; and he could not forget the delay shown by the French Government in giving an answer to the proposal of this country. It was most humiliating to read the Papers and find our Ambassador, week by week, and day by day, and almost hour by hour, pressing M. Ferry for an answer. When we suppressed the rebellion in Egypt, we alone were in a position to dictate terms with regard to the finances of the country. Had we proposed fair and reasonable terms, as we ought to have done, they would have been accepted by all the Powers of Europe. But the one thing which the Government seemed to desire was to get out of this difficulty. The Prime Minister, from first to last, had hated this Egyptian Question. From beginning to end of it he had not grappled with it. He had not looked from day to day what steps it would be necessary to take; and the position in which he was now placed was the consequence of the action which he had taken. The consequence had been that a Dual Control had been going on in Egypt, and a pretence that the Khedive's Government was a real and absolute Government. The right hon. Gentleman knew as well as could be that the Government of this country was the only absolute ruler in Egypt, and that the Khedive was simply kept in power by means of English bayonets, and by the authority of the British Government. Never had this country been placed in a more difficult position.

Sir Walter B. Barttelot

The House of Commons was, in fact, ordered to give an answer to this question at once. He did not consider it to be either complimentary or respectful to the House of Commons that it should be called on thus suddenly to give an answer to this question. The financiers who had found the money for Egypt in the past would have no difficulty, knowing, as they did, the condition of affairs, in continuing the supplies of money, supposing that this Agreement was not passed. Of that he had no hope, seeing how the Party opposite voted against their own opinions; but, at the same time, he maintained that, in the interests of this country, it would be a wise and prudent course if this Agreement should not be ratified by the House of Commons. Upon the whole Egyptian Question he felt most strongly. We went to Egypt for a particular purpose—the protection of the Suez Canal. Though lightly touched upon by the Prime Minister, that was of vital importance. It was of vital importance that we should never at any time, or by any means, be excluded from the Suez Canal; but that we should at all times go through with our ships—mercantile or men-of-war. Were we, the greatest Naval Power, to allow ourselves to be deprived of our strength at this particular time? Were we certain that no other country, in the event of war, would not stop the traffic of the Canal to our great detriment? He believed that by bringing forward this Agreement they were adopting a course which was detrimental to the best interests of the country; and believing, as he did, that that would be the result of their action, he should most certainly vote against the proposal of the Government.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL, who was precluded by the Forms of the House from moving the following Amendment standing in his name, to add to Mr. Gladstone's Motion—

"But this House wishes it to be understood that in accepting the Convention it comes under no obligation, direct or implied, either to make good any deficit (apart from the annuity guaranteed) which may occur in the financial administration of Egypt as settled by the Annexes to the Declaration of 17th March 1885, or to afford Military protection to Egypt at the expense of the taxpayers of this Country during the two years for which the Powers accept the distribution of the Revenues made by Annex 2; or for any other period, except as Parliament may from time to time determine,"

said, that he did not approve of the financial arrangement. He disapproved it; but, at the same time, he should vote for it, as the less evil of the two. He thought he was not liable to the imputation of being called a Party man. He believed that if the interests of the country required that they should turn out the Government, or that they should negative this Convention, he should be ready to vote against it; but he admitted, although disapproving the Convention, that the affair had gone so far that a great deal of confusion would arise were the House to negative it; therefore he intended to support the Government. His principal reason for disapproving the Arrangement was because he believed that it placed another heavy burden on Egypt. The Chancellor of the Exchequer assumed that bankruptcy was a terrible evil for Egypt, and said they must avoid it. If that was the case, then he (Sir George Campbell) was free to admit that the right hon. Gentleman had made the best arrangement that was possible—he could not say to avoid, but to stave off for a time that bankruptcy. He thought, however, that bankruptcy was the best thing that could possibly happen to Egypt. He had never been able to see why Egypt should not go into that comfortable and easy kind of bankruptcy which much greater Powers had gone into. The greatest Powers of Europe had said—"It is not convenient for us to pay our debts at the present moment; we must postpone them to a future time;" and England had adopted that course herself upon a time. He thought that the Prime Minister, in the course of his speech, did not pay so much attention as he ought to have done to the difference of other countries with the case of Egypt. It had to be remembered that the Law of Liquidation in Egypt made a difference. Under that law more than half of the gross revenues were assigned to the creditors of Egypt. Unfortunately, too, this country had agreed to continue the International Tribunals for seven years more, by which the Government was enslaved. Those Tribunals were, indeed, an effective International Control over Egypt, and he desired to get rid of them. He suggested to the House a means by which Egypt might become bankrupt with ease and comfort.

American railways, for instance, were works of immense importance to that country. When any one of them became bankrupt, it was put into the hands of receivers, and the railway went on as before. In this case, however, the up-keep of the railway was the first charge on the revenues, and the creditors formed the second charge, the latter of whom got as much as the balance would admit. That was the kind of bankruptcy which he should like to see in regard to Egypt. Under this Convention for settling the finances of Egypt the matter was entirely different. We had undertaken to run the concern at our own risk. The up-keep of the country was to be the second charge on the revenues, while the creditors of the country were to constitute the first charge. That, he maintained, was not a satisfactory state of things. Under this arrangement there was an elaborate provision for disposing of the surplus revenue; but nothing whatever was said about a deficit. That seemed to him to be a farcical arrangement. They had the greatest reason to fear that there might be next year, as in the case of past years, a considerable deficit. One of the most radical defects of the Convention seemed to him to be its want of sufficient provision for the military defence of Egypt. It could not be defended upon the present expenditure allowed for military purposes. Notwithstanding what had been already said, he believed that the 6,500 British Forces were costing £1,300,000, and even if they got rid of the Soudan, 6,500 men would not, he thought, suffice to defend Egypt with hordes of lawless tribes at its borders, and they would have to increase that number, and to expend £2,000,000 or £3,000,000 per annum, to maintain the military defences of Egypt. Therefore, he had put on the Paper an Amendment, which, however, owing to the Forms of the House, he was unable to move. Although he must accept this Convention, he should not in his heart of hearts believe in it. It appeared that they would be practically bound by the Convention to stay in Egypt and to run a bankrupt concern at a certain loss for two years, and probably also for a third year, while an inquiry was taking place, and until a definitive result was arrived at. But he hoped before the debate ended that the Government would tell them that they would not be bound, as he feared they would be, by those onerous engagements. The position of the Powers was this—that under the Law of Liquidation and the establishment of the International Tribunals they had an enormous control over Egypt; and as long as the Powers got their money, and as long as the Law of Liquidation was maintained, and the Guaranteed, the Unified, the Privileged, and some other Debts were punctually repaid, the Powers, he thought, would not want to interfere. But the moment we got into other difficulties International Control would arise. We, as a sort of receiver, were proposing to contract to run the bankrupt concern for a certain time; and if we wanted to avoid International Control we must make good any deficit that might arise, and impose on our own taxpayers an enormously heavy burden to protect Egypt and her finances by an army of soldiers. He should be very happy indeed to suppose that the Prime Minister was right in thinking that we were advancing to the day when Egypt would be independent, and when we could quit that country; but he feared that that day would not come very soon while those foreign loans rested on that unfortunate people. He wanted Egypt to be independent and to have a fair chance; but he also wished this country to be independent, and not to be entangled with those heavy obligations involving a great loss of life and a great expenditure of treasure.

MR. MACFARLANE said, that this kind of discussion on Egypt occurred once a month—once a lunar month—for it was 27 days precisely since the last occasion on which it was before them. He doubted the patriotism of those Gentlemen who said that that Convention gave the Powers a Control which they did not have before, and which Her Majesty's Government contended that it did not give them. In considering how he should vote on the question now under discussion, he came to the conclusion that if he wanted to vote only for malice and revenge upon the Conservative Party he would give them his vote in the impending division; because he could not conceive of a greater misfortune to that Party than that they should be obliged to take over the management of that question *de novo* before the

Powers of Europe. Did they think, under present circumstances, they would obtain better terms? He did not say the terms were what this country would like; but they could not always get what they liked, as they had to deal with other Powers nearly as great as themselves. Were the Conservative Party, if it came into power next week, prepared to defy the Powers of Europe? [Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA: Yes; they are.] His hon. Friend said they were; but he hoped they were not quite so mad. There was a period when the question might, perhaps, have been solved by our taking virtual possession of Egypt; but that time had passed. Egypt might have declared herself bankrupt to defeat the foreign bondholders and Shylocks; but the point now to be considered was whether that Convention was a reasonable solution of the present difficulty. If the Government were open to such censure as this Motion implied, it would have been the duty of the responsible Leaders of the Opposition to move this Amendment. He desired to protest against the unpatriotic conduct of those who made this Motion. The position of affairs was such that there was no alternative to passing the Convention except a very much worse one; and, that being so, he would support the Government in this matter.

MR. MONK said, that while he did not look upon the terms of the Agreement as altogether satisfactory, there was no counter-proposition before the House, so that he had no hesitation in supporting the Government. The hon. Member for Portsmouth had made out a very lame case in support of his Amendment. For his own part, he objected to that portion of the Amendment which condemned the collateral arrangement for regulating the International position of the Suez Canal. He took the strongest exception also to the words in the Amendment that "there had been no previous communication to Parliament" in respect of the Canal; and pointed out that they had had now for over two years the letter of Lord Granville of January 23, 1883, laying down eight bases for the neutralization of the Suez Canal, and the matter had over and over again received the attention of all the Great Powers. He believed the whole world was agreed upon those bases; and both during the Franco-German and Russo-Turkish Wars vessels of the opposing Powers met in the Canal and saluted each other. That part of the Amendment, he contended, had no weight whatever. Unnecessary delay had arisen in consequence of the unreasonable conduct of France in this matter, and, in part, also through the action of Germany. One remarkable feature in the published Correspondence was the unveiled hostility of Prince Bismarck towards England. After stating that he did not consider Egyptian questions to have much interest for Germany, he went on to say that—

"The conduct of the British Government in Colonial matters had made Germany less desirous of assisting England in the Egyptian Question."

The Great Powers, with one exception, had shown no desire to aid Her Majesty's Government. The manifest desire of M. Ferry was to re-establish French control. For his part, he preferred the original proposals of November 29; but, under the circumstances, he thought that the proposals of the House were of a nature to commend themselves to Parliament and to the country; and unless there was some better means than had yet been presented to them of meeting the payment of the indemnities and the other liabilities of the Egyptian Government, he hoped the House would give its cordial support to the proposal of Her Majesty's Government.

MR. ELTON maintained that we had a distinct and superior position in Egypt to that of any other Power. The Prime Minister's ingenious and elaborate argument as to whether or not there was any right of interference arising out of the International Guarantee was an excellent exercise of logic, but quite irrelevant to the point at issue. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that it was absolutely necessary that this Convention should be carried out; and he had attempted to put compulsion upon Parliament in a way they were not accustomed to. The Prime Minister would not say that the bankers would not renew the Loan; but anyone acquainted with the circumstances and the facts of the case must see that the bankers would be most happy to renew it. With regard to the tribute due to the Sultan, it was quite true that the liability to pay that tribute constituted an organic part of the constitution of Egypt; and if there was any

default in April next in regard to the tribute, there would be a breach of the Firman establishing the hereditary Khediviate. He was of opinion that if, without any collusion or unfair dealing of any kind, the Firman were broken up, it would be a good thing for this country; as he thought that England could manage Egypt under the Suzerainty of the Porte better than it was managed at the present time. He had no doubt that this tribute could be paid in April, and that there were many persons who would be willing to advance the sum. The question that presented itself to his mind was whether Egypt was in a state of bankruptcy or not. He was not a financier, but he had a right to form an opinion on that point out of the Blue Books; and he thought, as far as Lord Northbrook's Report was concerned, no state of bankruptcy existed. He found, for example, that £500,000 was charged for projected architectural improvements at Alexandria, and £450,000 was deducted for improvements in the collection of the Land Tax. Why such an item as the latter should come into the accounts at all it was impossible to say; because if the proposed improvements were effected, the improvements would very soon bring back the amount expended in obtaining them. Lord Northbrook, moreover, said nothing in explanation of his reasons for not proposing that the amount should be raised in the ordinary way. Lord Northbrook had loaded his demand for a loan to the extent of more than £2,000,000 in excess of what was necessary. After going through all Lord Northbrook's figures in relation to the Suez Canal, he found there remained a balance of £49,000, of which he could make him a present towards finding the funds necessary for the improved collection of the Land Tax. There was not that case of Egyptian bankruptcy which the noble Lord represented. No doubt there might be a slightly involved condition of affairs, and he did not think that the Government had managed the country at all well; but he was of opinion that, with care, it might be made a going concern. He denied, however, that the figures before them showed that Egypt was in a bankrupt condition.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, it was clear, from the speech of the Prime Minister that evening, and his former declarations, that he did not consider this Convention desirable in itself; but advocated it on the ground that its adoption in the existing state of things was the lesser of two evils. But whose fault was it that they should have to adopt the lesser evil? The Government had been at the head of affairs for the last four years, and to tell us that we ought now to choose the lesser evil was hardly to be expected from a statesman. The fact was the original fault was this—that the Prime Minister, when he came into power, did not break with and reverse the policy of his Predecessors, and do that which his speeches in Mid-Lothian led people to expect. There were two great heresies in our policy with regard to Egypt—one political, and the other financial. The political heresy was that we insisted on putting up a Khedive and maintaining him in power against the wishes of his subjects. The result was, that we were absolutely hated in Egypt; and wherever we were not hated, we were regarded with contempt. The financial heresy was this—that we always insisted, in our treatment of Egyptian finance, that the payment of interest upon the Debt should come first, and the expenses of administration come second. That was contrary to the primary laws of finance, which so distinguished a financial authority as the right hon. Gentleman himself would certainly acknowledge. The result had been overtaxation, that we had put off every species of reform, and that there was a deficit. The true security of a public debt was the excess of revenue over the cost of administration. [Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Duly economized.] There should be due economy certainly; but it was not for a foreign country to step in and insist upon this due economy, because that would be mixing itself up with the affairs of another country. The risk that a lender incurred would be that the revenue might not be sufficient to pay the debt, and that the administration might not be conducted economically. In either case the lender had no right to come to his own country and ask it to interfere. High interest meant bad security. The view that he had put forward was that which was entertained by Viscount Palmerston and other English statesmen. All that could be fairly claimed for the bondholders

was, that if there were an excess of revenue it should go to them. He was surprised on looking at the Convention that it recognized the position of the Powers of Europe with regard to Egypt. The Debt was guaranteed by the Powers. We offered a guarantee of ourselves; but the Powers said—"We insist in joining in the guarantee." Why did they insist? Obviously, because they wished to place themselves in precisely the same position as we were in with regard to Egypt. The right hon. Gentleman said that this guarantee gave no special right of interference; that we had guaranteed the Debt of Turkey, Greece, and our Colonies, and yet we did not claim to interfere. But in Egypt a special Law of Liquidation was passed, and the Powers claimed the right to interfere with its affairs because Egypt could not pay the bondholders. Germany and France claimed that right, in order that the interest of the bondholders should be secure. It followed, therefore, that if Egypt was not in a position to pay the interest of the bondholders, the Powers might interfere still more. The Prime Minister said that our right in Egypt was not precisely legal, but was a moral and indeterminate right. That was exactly the right of the Powers; it was a moral and indeterminate right. But that was not all. It was agreed by the Convention that in case Egypt should not be able to resume full payment of the Debt in two years, there should be an International Commission of Inquiry. The Prime Minister had taken a sanguine view of the future. He said that wonders were about to happen in Egypt, and that at the end of two years this interference would not be necessary. We had, however, been in Egypt four years, and the state of its finances was now worse than when we went there. It was reasonable to suppose that in the next two years what had occurred there was likely to occur again. Why, Ministers and the Powers anticipated this, because they had expressly said that Egypt might be allowed to have a floating Debt of £1,000,000? Why? Because they knew that in the best circumstances Egypt would not be able to meet the expenses put upon it? It was a country in which there were bad years as well as good; and therefore it might be taken as a reasonable probability that the financial investigation sanctioned by the Convention would take place in two years. Then there was another point. Why were we to be called on to pay large amounts on account of Egypt? We were advancing money for irrigation works and other purposes. If we were going to annex the country for the sake of our Possessions in India, it would be intelligible; but the Government said we were going to leave it at the end of two years. We were going to do the dirty work of Europe; and at the end of two years, after showing ourselves to have been good caretakers, and paying all this money, we were to clear out and leave Europe to reap the benefit. We were maintaining a garrison in Egypt the cost of which was about £700,000 per annum. The cost of these troops, whose duties were purely administrative, and who were really acting as gendarmerie, ought surely to be defrayed out of Egyptian funds. It was said in some quarters that we were about to sacrifice our interests in the Suez Canal? That was a mistake. Gentlemen who made that assertion feared that in time of war the Canal might be closed against our vessels. Fear of that kind, however, was quite causeless; for the authorities at the War Office and Admiralty concurred in saying that in case of war we should not use the Canal at all, the route by the Cape being preferable, as it would be impossible to convoy merchandize along the Mediterranean. He was in favour of the neutralization of Egypt, or its conversion into a sort of Belgium. France would be so glad to see us leave Egypt that she would readily pledge herself not to go there if we pledged ourselves not to return. They had been told that the Resolution before the Committee was really a Vote of Confidence. Of confidence in whom? Certainly not in Her Majesty's Ministers, for the Agreement before the Committee was the French Agreement. They were, therefore, called upon to propose a Vote of Confidence in the French Government; and if the vote was carried England would have to do what she had protested against on two occasions, and would supply the executive for carrying out the French scheme, unremunerated by any benefit derived from it. But an adverse vote might put right hon. Gentlemen opposite into

Office, and their management of affairs would be worse, if possible, than that of the Government. Their view would be that we should remain in Egypt for ever; and as Europe had now decided that we must not take Egypt, the policy of the Opposition might result in an European war. Not liking, therefore, to give a vote either to the Government or the Opposition, he should abstain from taking any part in the division.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS said, he did not desire to give a silent vote on this important subject. The Convention was another phase in the Egyptian question which at the present time was so greatly distressing the friends of the Government throughout the country. It was the natural sequence of the original blunder of interfering at all in the internal affairs of Egypt. He felt inclined to agree with a good deal that had fallen from the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Bruce); but, looking at the Amendment itself which he had moved, it did not disclose any alternate policy to that of the Government, and therefore he and those who sat below the Ministerial Gangway were placed in a very difficult position. He felt sure that the Government had done all they could to secure as favourable terms as possible for the people of Egypt; but the Money Markets of Europe had, as on many previous occasions, affected the policy of Europe. There appeared to be but one pleasant feature about the Convention, and that was the assertion that foreigners in Egypt were in future to be taxed. He was not sure, however, that that would be carried out to any considerable extent, for there again there would be the same influence to encounter. No one could enter into conversation with foreigners of whatever nationality in Egypt without feeling that they were there to exploit and spoil the country. As to the reduction of 5 per cent on the coupon, that really did not amount to much; for if, after two years, as the result of good management, there was a surplus in the finances of Egypt, it would be devoted, not to Egyptian purposes, but would be handed over to the bondholders to repay them for this reduction. Egypt, in fact, was like an estate sequestrated for the benefit of creditors, and we were put in possession as a sort of bailiff, to get what we could to meet the demands of bondholders and speculators. We should never have attempted to do such a thing with a powerful nation. The International Guarantee was a new weapon put into the hands of the financial Powers of Europe, and he feared that it would, like the Dual Control, be a financial control first, and a political control afterwards, for whoever controlled the finances of Egypt would control her political affairs. The £4,000,000 indemnity for the bombardment of Alexandria ought to be paid by this country, for England had been throughout on the wrong side. He acknowledged that if the Opposition were in power and had their will in Egypt they would be consistent in annexing the country. This was a proper thing to do from their point of view; but he disbelieved its expediency, and refused to assist in the accomplishment of it. The better this Convention was understood in the country the greater became its unpopularity. At the same time, however, Radical Members were in a difficult position; it was a case of frying-pan *versus* fire, of the whip instead of the scorpion, and of Lord Salisbury instead of the Prime Minister. No doubt there was a great deal of difficulty about the subject; but one was driven to the conclusion that the Prime Minister was the safer of the two. He was surprised to see in the meetings which had taken place throughout the country how much there remained of fear of the foreign policy of Lord Salisbury, even after this lapse of time. He had read that in America there was a religious community, in which there was a minister, unattached, whom they called "a satisfying minister," because whenever the congregation was dissatisfied with their regular minister they sent for him. The congregation, however, became so frightened at his doctrine, and so displeased with everything he did, that they straight away became satisfied with their own minister and never complained any more. This was just the position of the Liberal Party in England; while they were dissatisfied with every phase of this Egyptian business they were afraid of "a satisfying Ministry." They might be said to be between the Devil and the deep sea, and had to choose as to which was the least of two evils. He, therefore, intended to vote for the Government. [*Ironical cheers.*] Hon. Mem-

bers were no doubt right in cheering. They were forced into this position; it was a choice of evils; and if the Government were wise they would, while it was yet time, make a complete retirement from their position in Egypt. There was this justification, however, for the course which he hoped the Radical Party would take in this matter. The Government had shown an intense desire to make a Convention of a much better character than any that had been previously made. It had been their desire to be unselfish, as far as England was concerned, in their dealings with Egypt, and they were the only Government in Europe which kept its eye on the Fellaheen of Egypt with a desire to do them good.

MR. ONSLOW said, he thought the House and the country would be very much amused at the conflicting reasons which the hon. Gentleman below the Gangway had given for voting with the Government on this occasion. Why did the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken think it right to support the Government? He acknowledged that he was between the Devil and the deep blue sea, though what his difficulty was he did not make clearly apparent. He seemed to have an inherent dread of Lord Salisbury. This was always said by the Liberal Party; but he really believed that it was only a pretext for their constituents, and that, in reality, they had a far greater dread of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government. It was not for him (Mr. Onslow) to defend the noble Marquess; but, at all events, he thought that a very large body of persons, not only inside the House of Commons but outside of it, were prepared to confide in Lord Salisbury in preference to the Prime Minister. It had been said that the whole of this business was owing to the Dual Control, and to the action which the previous Government had taken in this affair. It might be all very well to throw the burden of the charge on a previous Government; but he wished to call the attention of the House to a despatch from Lord Granville to Sir Edward Malet on the subject of the Dual Control. On the 4th of November, 1881, Lord Granville said in a despatch that it could not be too clearly understood that England desired no partizan Ministry in Egypt; that in the opinion of the Government a partizan Ministry was neither calculated to be of service to the country nor to Ministers; and that it could only tend to alienate the population from the true allegiance to their Sovereign. This was exactly the position now of the Government in Egypt. We were at the present time advising the Khedive of Egypt, and the whole foundation of Egyptian Government depended upon England. It was, therefore, idle for the Prime Minister and his supporters to come forward and say that the present state of affairs was solely due to the Dual Control, framed at the instigation of the late Government, when in the last part of this same despatch Her Majesty's Government thoroughly approved of the arrangement. Many of them believed that when the first shot was fired at Alexandria Egypt ought to have been ours. The Government ought to have recognized that when once the bombardment of Alexandria began it was their duty, not only in the interest of the people of Egypt but also of this country, to have proclaimed a protectorate over the country. They would have had the support of Germany in that policy, and France would have been the only Power that would have objected, and even her objections would have been only temporary. For the Dual Control of England and France they had substituted another kind of dual control—namely, that of the Khedive and of Sir Evelyn Baring, which could never work satisfactorily. The Government of Egypt at present was only maintained by British bayonets, and once those bayonets were removed a worse revolution even than that of Arabi would ensue. Egypt would never be governed by an Egyptian; it must always be under the control of some European Power, and that Power must be England. As the Prime Minister had said, we were the natural advisers of Egypt. But we were also the moral and legal advisers of that country. It was idle, therefore, for the Prime Minister to say that for the next two years the Egyptian Government would be able to do as they liked. As long as we were in their country everything of importance must be regulated by the guiding hand of England, even during the next two years. We were in Egypt from the force of circumstances, and it was impossible that we could

leave the country, or that we should ever be able to do so. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of the former subsidies to various Foreign Powers, but there was no analogy between those cases and that of the proposed Loan to Egypt; and the Multiple Control they were now constituting, nominally for financial matters only, would involve them in great difficulties with the other Powers before the end of three years. After five years of the rule of the present Ministry they were told that Egypt was in a state of bankruptcy. It was puerile for the Government to blame their Predecessors for a condition of affairs due entirely to their own weak vacillation and shrinking from responsibility. The finances of Egypt would show no recuperative force under the present system of administration, but must proceed from bad to worse. The Opposition might be asked what was their policy, and how would they remedy that state of matters in Egypt? It would be difficult to remedy it; but he could not help thinking that if the Government were of one mind there would be found some means of making Egypt a prosperous country. So far as he could see, the only way for Her Majesty's Government to get out of the difficulty in which they were placed was by frankly admitting that they had made a mistake, by undoing all that they had done, and unsaying all that they had said, by letting all Europe know that their past policy having failed, they would adopt for the future a firmer and a better policy. Unless they took a strong and a resolute line the administration of Egypt at the end of two years would be taken out of their control, and their road to India would be in the hands of other Powers.

MR. ALBERT GREY said, he must congratulate the hon. Member for Guildford (Mr. Onslow) on having taking up 20 or 25 minutes of the time of the Committee without approaching in a single sentence the real question under consideration. The hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) had argued that our policy in Egypt should be directed by the necessity of our interest, and our interest alone, without any regard to those obligations which we had, by our past policy, incurred. For himself, he believed that the policy of duty and the policy of interest were one, and that a nation could not afford, any more than an individual, to regulate its action and its policy by purely selfish considerations without any regard to the requirements of duty. The hon. Member for Northampton had advocated intervention in Egypt in 1882, on the ground that it was absolutely necessary to maintain a supreme and paramount influence over the Suez Canal, and that it was impossible to maintain that influence unless we had a paramount influence in Cairo; and he referred to that Jingo episode in the political life of the hon. Member in order to remind the Committee that many of those who now talked so lightly about scuttling immediately out of Egypt were responsible and deliberate parties to the policy of intervention. Having, in pursuance of the policy of the hon. Member for Northampton, interfered; having thrust an alien rule upon the backs of a reluctant people; having turned Egypt topsey-turvey; having, in the name of English interests, poured out Egyptian blood like water; having upset her institutions and checked the growth of national aspirations; having carried our hesitating but interfering finger into every department of Egyptian administration, he maintained we could not, without incurring lasting dishonour, leave Egypt to stew in the juice which we ourselves had cooked. We were bound by strong moral obligations, consequent on our own acts, to do our utmost to protect the poor Fellaheen from grinding tyranny and oppression. To accept the propositions of the hon. Member for Northampton would be to deliver Egypt at once over to the Multiple Control; and the whole object of the Multiple Control would be to secure not the happiness of the Fellaheen, but the full payment of the interest on the Egyptian securities. Let them recognize that the abandonment of Egypt to the Multiple Control meant, in addition to other grave and serious objections, a rule in the interest of the bondholder, and bondholder alone. It was the duty of England to endeavour to secure that if Egypt was to be governed in the interest of the bondholders it should be governed, as far as possible, in the interest of the Fellaheen as well. International obligations made it absolutely necessary that the interest on the Egyptian securities should be paid; and England stepped in and said that if the Egyptian obliga-

tions required that, English honour also required that the well-being of the Egyptian Fellaheen should be looked after. ["No, no!"] [Mr. JESSE COLLINGS: That was a secondary matter.] The establishment of a stable Government, which would leave the Fellaheen in a state of security and prosperity, was of primary importance. For his own part, he believed there was no other way of securing the Fellaheen good government than by the Khedive undertaking to carry on the Government of Egypt strictly according to the advice and under the guidance of Her Majesty's Government. The only way to avert the Multiple Control was to secure the full payment of Egyptian securities, and the only means of accomplishing that was by establishing in Egypt a strong and vigorous Administration, which would be able to hold the balance even, and to carry out great public works so urgently wanted for increasing the productive power of the country and ensuring the greater happiness and prosperity of the Egyptian people. To set up a Government of that character was not the work of a moment; it was the work of time. Prince Bismarck had suggested that we should be the leaseholders of the Sultan in Egypt. Why should not that suggestion be adopted? Why should we not stand to Europe in the position of tenants, the duration of whose lease would depend on the time it might take to repay the £9,000,000, the interest of which we were about to guarantee? He was aware that Gentlemen opposite interpreted the Agreement to mean the certain establishment of the Multiple Control. That was not his opinion. He understood the Agreement to mean this—that so long as the interests on the Egyptian securities continued to be fully paid, Europe would not interfere with English administration in Egypt; but as soon as they were not fully paid, then immediately the Multiple Control would be set up. In short, by the Agreement we were in the position of tenants of Europe in Egypt. The rent we had to pay was the interest on Egyptian securities. We were to have a 5 per cent reduction on that rent for two years, and afterwards we should have to pay the full rent. At the end of two years, if we were unable to pay the full rent our European landlords would interfere; but if the full rent was forthcoming, whether out of Egyptian or English Revenues, we should be allowed to continue in our tenancy in Egypt without any interference on their part. So when it was said this Agreement lets in the Multiple Control, he answered—"That depends on the English people. If they decide that it would be better to pay the sum which Egyptian Revenues cannot afford out of English Revenues in order to keep out the Multiple Control they can do it." That they would do it he could not doubt. When they looked back upon the profuse expenditure of blood and treasure in Egypt they could say, at all events we have abolished the Dual Control, and thus averted the great probability of a war with France in which we would have lost 100 times more blood and treasure. If the people were ready to condone great sacrifices because they had brought about the abolition of the Dual Control, surely they would be ready to incur small sacrifices to avert the far more formidable danger of the Multiple Control. He (Mr. Albert Grey) believed, when it was fairly put before them, that the people of England would be willing to avert the Multiple Control by the payment of English money if the Egyptian Revenues were not sufficient. As, then, they had the power of paying the Egyptian securities, and so keeping out the Multiple Control, let them accept the Agreement. There might be much in the Agreement which was not palatable to them—much which might give them, as Members of Parliament, legitimate cause for complaint, because of the way in which it had been brought before the House; but this country was admittedly in the middle of a grave crisis, and he would, therefore, say—"Inasmuch as there is nothing in the Agreement which sets up the Multiple Control, if England secures the full payment of the interest on Egyptian bonds, accept that which you cannot refuse, except by incurring grave and unknown dangers."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said, that the Government would, no doubt, receive the announcement of the last speaker, that he would vote for them, with great satisfaction; but it was a question whether they would regard the speech itself with equal satisfaction. The hon. Member approved of this Convention because it would do what the Government did not wish to do—namely,

because it would keep us in Egypt for an indefinite period. The hon. Member differed from the Opposition in his views of this Convention; though he objected, as they did, to the Multiple Control. He appeared to think that the only danger we ran arose from that part of the Agreement which made a Commission necessary at the end of two years if the 5 per cent reductions had to be continued. But that was only one of the objections of the Opposition; their chief objection was to the joint guarantee, upon which the hon. Member had not touched at all. The five years during which the present Government had controlled the Empire had been rich in every species of failure and disaster, and it was difficult to say in what kind of administrative action their conduct had been most disastrous. On the whole, he was inclined to think they had failed most lamentably and grievously in their diplomacy. When he recollected the ludicrous fiasco of the Suez Canal, the abortive Conference they summoned in London last year, and the melancholy Agreement which they were now asked to vote, he was justified in saying that, on the whole, their diplomatic failures eclipsed their legislative and their military failures, and a stronger thing it was impossible to say. The speech of the Prime Minister this evening was the only one which attempted a serious defence of the Government proposal. It was a curious and interesting fact that in 1855 he was the most strenuous opponent of the Anglo-French guarantee of the Turkish Loan, which was now cited as a precedent for the proposal before the Committee. The right hon. Gentleman opposed that guarantee in three speeches of great length. In one of them he said—

"I trust, that as this loan is the first, so it will be the last of the sort to which this House will, under any circumstances and on any considerations, give its assent."

A little later on he said—

"It is not the worst of a guarantee that if Turkey does not pay we shall have to pay for her—I had almost said that is the best of it. The worst of this guarantee is, that all the guaranteeing Powers acquire a political hold upon Turkey, and if it were possible to put so dangerous a proposition into one form more dangerous than another, my right hon. Friend has succeeded in discovering exactly that which is the most dangerous."—(3 *Hansard*, [139] 1475.)

That was what the Prime Minister said in 1855, and yet this was the precedent quoted in favour of the proposal now before the Committee. The Prime Minister had said that no power was given by the Convention to interfere in the affairs of Egypt, and he had quoted a large number of precedents to prove that position. Yet every one of those precedents was before him in 1855, and they were actually quoted by him in the very speeches from which he had just quoted to the House a trenchant and conclusive condemnation of his present policy. The right hon. Gentleman rested his case upon the fact that no technical right of interference was given by the Agreement; but was it a technical provision alone which could give that right? On what was our right of interference in Egypt now founded? Was it on Protocols, on Parchments, or Treaties? The Prime Minister had said our right of interference was a right arising absolutely from the absolute necessities of the situation. If that were so, what became of the argument that no technical right was given by the Agreement? By the admitted facts of the case there might be rights, legitimate and absolute, not founded on any technical plea, but arising out of the force and logic of circumstances. It was quite true that in the case of Turkey and in the other cases no interference of the kind apprehended had occurred. But none of the countries were, in the slightest degree, in a position similar to that of Egypt. Every one knew that the Foreign Powers—and France especially—had been jealous of each other's influence in Egypt, and anxious to increase their own. What parallel was there between the case of Egypt and the cases in which nobody desired to interfere? If, as the Prime Minister contended, this Convention merely gave the European Powers the right of being called upon to pay somebody else's debts, why were they all so anxious to become parties to it? It would be more than infantile innocence to suppose that the Powers who had risked European complications of the gravest kind, had broken up a Conference, and risked Egyptian bankruptcy, had done all those things with no object in view. What, in the opinion of the Prime Minister, was that object? Until there was an answer to that question, until the diplomatic acumen of the Government enabled them to

fathom that problem, it would be open to the Opposition to suspect that, whatever view the Government might take of this Instrument, a different view was taken by Foreign Governments. If ever there was a deficiency they would not be slow to put forward claims which it suited the Government now to deride. Let them not forget the difference between the motives of the European Powers and those of this country. Europe was interested chiefly in paying the bondholders; England was influenced chiefly by the desire to preserve the route to India, to improve the position of Egypt, and to stimulate its internal prosperity and its external commerce. Our interests in that country were not financial, they were commercial; and the commercial interests of England were coincident with the interests of the Fellaheen. It might suit other Powers to grind down the unhappy people, but it would not suit us; our interests were best served by bringing back prosperity to the Nile. The Members of the Government who were most earnest in pressing this Convention upon us were those who, in times past, expended most energy in telling us how England was already sinking under the weight of Empire, and in asserting that we could not afford to add one scruple to the burden under which we were tottering. Their practice squared very strangely with their theory. They did not, indeed, add to the Empire, but they added to its obligations; and they seemed to think it was perfectly consistent with their principles to throw the greatest burdens upon our resources, provided only that no profit whatever was reaped by this country from the transaction. Of this remarkable principle of action our Egyptian policy in general, and the policy of this Convention in particular, supplied an admirable example. Egypt was as great a responsibility as if it belonged to us, and as small a gain as if it belonged to the French. After the speeches delivered that night by the hon. Member for Ipswich (Mr. Jesse Collings), and his hon. Friend the Member for South Northumberland (Mr. Albert Grey), who represented two independent sections of the Radical Party, he had small hope that the Committee would reject the proposal of the Government; but he was certain that if they did not reject it, many Members on that side of the House, and many Members sitting on the opposite Bench, would live to regret the decision they had come to.

MR. M'COAN said, he had carefully endeavoured to form an honest judgment on this Convention, and the result was utterly and without reservation condemnatory of the bargain it embodied. How legitimate, therefore, was his satisfaction when he heard the ablest possible apologist of the measure make the speech which the Prime Minister had delivered that night. That speech was the weakest he had ever heard the right hon. Gentleman deliver in that House, and to his own mind utterly failed to justify the action of the Government in consenting to such a compact. The result of the Convention would be to set up a Multiple Control, with the certainty of consequences which, much as he had been opposed to it hitherto, now more than half converted him to the policy of "rescue and retire." The present bargain was a practical reversal of the decision announced by Lord Granville at the Conference last year, and an acceptance *en bloc* of the French scheme then proposed. The Prime Minister alleged that International Law gave to a lender no right of interfering with the borrowing State. That might be so; but he failed to see the relevancy of the axiom to the case of Egypt. That country stood in a peculiar and, indeed, unique position in its relations to Europe. If there was no latent desire on the part of the European Powers to interfere in Egyptian affairs, why did they volunteer a joint and perfectly needless responsibility for the proposed Loan? Their guarantee was of about as much value as would be the endorsement of half-a-dozen insolvent grocers on a bill of Rothschilds. He felt humiliated beyond measure in consequence of the position they were now holding in Egypt. They had abdicated a position in that country of great influence, which had been obtained at the cost of millions of money and of thousands of English lives. He feared, however, there was nothing left for them but to accept the position. In the future, if this Convention were agreed to, they would simply be bailiffs for the bondholders, on no higher level of right or influence than any one of the other parties to this Convention—a measure of surrender against which he, for one, could not but protest. His own vote that night would

not be a free one, nor would it be given on the apparent issue before the House. The real one was now again the same issue that had been raised upon the Vote of Censure with regard to the Egyptian policy of the Government. The Prime Minister had that night again said that hon. Members would be free to vote as they thought fit; but that if the Government were placed in a minority they would go out. That was putting a pistol to their heads, and leaving no choice to Members on that side of the House who owned to Party allegiance at all. If his vote, therefore, should be given for the Government, it would not be because he approved of this Convention, or of the action of the Government in regard to it, but because he shrank from helping to turn them out at a great national crisis; and he believed that was also the feeling of the great majority of those who, like himself, would vote not for the Convention, but for the Government.

MR. BOURKE: Sir Arthur Otway, it is not a matter of difficulty for any Member sitting on this side of the House to rise to address the Committee after the speech we have just heard, for a speech more condemnatory of the Convention could not have been made from this side of the House than that which has just been delivered by the hon. Member opposite. The hon. Member, however, has left the Committee in ignorance upon the important point as to how he is going to vote. At the same time, it is perfectly clear, no matter what their views are, or what arguments may be used against the Convention, or what damaging statements may be made, no matter how it is proved that the Convention must be injurious to England, and to Egypt also, the votes of hon. Gentlemen opposite will not be decided upon the merits of the case, but simply upon the issue whether, in their opinion, it is desirable that Her Majesty's Government should or should not be turned out of Office. I leave hon. Members to justify their action to their constituents when they appear before them in a very short time. It certainly appears to me that the boasted freedom of Parliament is altogether a farce. The Prime Minister to-night, in a speech of great ingenuity and ability, founded his support of this Convention on two things—one was the ground of its necessity, and the other was upon its safety. Upon the first portion of the case the argument of the right hon. Gentleman was discreetly brief, because the argument of necessity rested entirely upon the fact that in April next Egypt would owe £1,600,000, which she could not pay unless this loan were raised. A weaker defence of the policy of the Government was never put forward, because everyone knows, from the condition of Egyptian financial affairs, that it would be perfectly possible to stave off this difficulty for the next few months if this £1,600,000 were not paid by Egypt. It would be perfectly competent for bankers to advance sufficient money to enable the Egyptian Government to put off its difficulties. Anybody who has had the slightest experience of Egyptian affairs knows perfectly well that during the past few years the bankers have had to come forward and help that Government in its temporary difficulties; and it is perfectly possible there was no reason why they should not do the same thing at the present moment. And if they do that, we know from the Papers that the Egyptian Government will be perfectly well able to carry on the government of the country for some months. The Prime Minister alarmed the House very much the other day by pointing out the deplorable consequences which would arise from the bankruptcy of the Egyptian Government. I can only say that I think all that argument on the part of the right hon. Gentleman was unworthy of his great name; and if he bases the approval of the Convention on the plea of necessity, I think he has entirely failed to show that there is any foundation whatever for the plea. With regard to the question of safety — the second point of the right hon. Gentleman—the Prime Minister went at elaborate length into the question whether it was a safe arrangement or not. The right hon. Gentleman divided that question in his speech into two parts — namely, the Commission of Inquiry, and a guaranteed loan, resulting in International Control. The right hon. Gentleman said that International Control was absolutely out of the question; he agrees with us that International Control would be a most unfortunate thing for Egypt; and the question, therefore, is, whether the appointment of a Commission of Inquiry will have the effect of handing over the affairs of Egypt to

an International Control? It is one of the greatest peculiarities of the Papers which have been presented, that almost every statement in them goes to refute the arguments of the Government at the present moment rather than to support them. Instead of supporting the arguments put forward by the right hon. Gentleman, the Papers conclusively show that his contention is wholly contrary to them. Take, for instance, the question of the Commission of Inquiry. Many months ago the Earl of Dufferin said it would be altogether impossible that any Power should be allowed to interfere between England and the Egypt which she has created. But if this Commission of Inquiry is agreed to, and the Commission of Inquiry is to be appointed, all the Powers of Europe who are to take part in it will be able to intervene between England and the Egypt which we are now creating. Even Earl Granville himself, in the Papers, has given the most conclusive reasons against the appointment of such a Commission of Inquiry. In his despatch of the 21st of January last Earl Granville said—

"As regards the proposal for a Commission of Inquiry, there appear to Her Majesty's Government to be reasons of great weight against it. Besides the anomalous constitution of the Board, consisting of seven diplomatists (for Turkey could not be refused admission to it) and of six members of the Caisse, who are *ex officio* representatives only of the bondholders, there are the following strong objections to it under present circumstances. The most recent information we have received shows that the Egyptian Government have been seriously occupied in reducing their expenditure, and have succeeded in doing much in that direction. When their revenue is increased by the power of taxing foreigners and the richer natives; and by the restoration of commercial prosperity, owing to the payment of the indemnities, and the renewal of confidence, it may be that no permanent sacrifice will be required of the bondholders. The prospect of this result would be greatly diminished by a proceeding which could not fail to impair the authority of the Egyptian Government and interfere with the effective financial reform which is now in progress. It would militate against the interests of the Egyptian people, and of those who have claims upon them. Should, however, such a permanent sacrifice appear to us, after the experience of the next two years, to be required, it would then become a fair matter of consideration whether, before that sacrifice is imposed on the bondholders, an International Commission, similar to that which was held before the Law of Liquidation was passed, should be appointed."—[Egypt. No. 4 (1885), 110-11.]

Nothing could be stronger than the opinion of Earl Granville against the suggestion of a Commission of Inquiry. The Earl of Northbrook seems to have entertained precisely the same opinion, and to have thought that the time for all inquiry had passed. Goodness knows we have had enough of inquiry. We have had inquiries of all kinds, from the time of Mr. Cave's Commission down to that of the Earl of Northbrook. Therefore, the Earl of Northbrook very properly considered that the time for inquiry had passed, and that the time for action had arrived. He stated definitely what he thought ought to be done—that the taxes should be reduced, the export tax abolished, that foreigners should be taxed, and that various other reforms should take place in the administration. If an International Inquiry is to take place, or if the prospect of an International Inquiry is to be held out, then all reform would be suspended; because it is impossible for the authorities to set themselves to work upon reforms if they are to have the prospect before them of an International Inquiry within two years. That would not only upset all reforms, but would throw the whole Egyptian administration into a state of confusion. It may be said that this Commission of Inquiry is a just proposal, in consequence of the proceedings in connection with the Law of Liquidation in 1879. But I am sure the Government must admit that there is no parallel whatever between the Egypt of to-day and the Egypt of 1879. In 1879 the Law of Liquidation was proposed, in the first place, by the Egyptian Government, because at that time the country was in a state of hopeless bankruptcy. Every Department of the State was in disorder and confusion; the taxes were levied in the most arbitrary and cruel manner; recruiting was a most terrible tax upon the people; and irrigation, which, after all, is one of the most important points in connection with Egyptian administration, was in such a condition that it was of very little use to the country, and the money extracted from the unfortunate Fellaheen was expended without their receiving any benefit from the taxation to which they were compelled to contribute. The state of things now is quite different—so we are told by Her Majesty's Government—and I have no doubt that, to a great extent, it is true; for I have no doubt

that, notwithstanding the shortcomings of Her Majesty's Government, it is perfectly impossible for British officers to be in Egypt, taking part in the administration of Egyptian affairs, without admitting the necessity of reforms in the administration of that country. Therefore, it is idle to suppose there will be any legitimate reason for this Commission of Inquiry two years hence. Since 1879 a great many things have happened in Egypt, and she is in a very different position from that in which she was then. England is now entitled to say to the Powers—"After what we have done, or after what we are doing—after our goodwill has been shown towards the Egyptian Administration, and our wish manifested to introduce administrative reforms, and to bring about a financial equilibrium—after all these things it is perfectly intolerable that you — the Powers of Europe—who have made no sacrifices for Egypt, but have stood quietly by, should now come in and demand an inquiry into everything we have done, and into the administration which has practically been under our control for the last five years." I do not believe that any Power in Europe, except ourselves, would for a moment listen to such a proposition as that under similar circumstances. There is one point with regard to this subject which I think is a little obscure upon the Papers, and that is whether this Commission of Inquiry should take place under any circumstances. Certainly, under the Convention and under the Agreement, it would appear that if a continuance of the reduction of interest is to take place, then the Commission of Inquiry is to go on. Now, I should like to be perfectly certain whether the converse is also to be the case—that is, if by any means the bondholders should obtain their interest in full after the end of two years, will this Commission of Inquiry then be avoided? The right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government seemed to imply not, because his expression was —"It will be a reality—that is, the Commission of Inquiry will be a reality —if Egypt fails to establish an equilibrium;" but that is a very different thing from what appears in the Papers, and it is a matter which might become of very great importance, because at the end of two years it might be worth the while of England to say to the Powers—"Well, all you stipulated for was that the full interest should be paid to the bondholders, and that the Commission of Inquiry should only take place under the circumstance of that not being done. Whether or not the finances of Egypt are capable of paying full interest we avoid the Commission of Inquiry, and are ready to take upon ourselves the burden of paying this £200,000." After all, that is a very small sum; and I certainly think it would be well worth the while of England to pay £200,000 to avoid the Commission of Inquiry. If the Government say now that that is the meaning of the Convention, I think it would be a very great advantage; because it is the prospect of this Inquiry that is looked upon as so dangerous that I think there is hardly anyone in England who would not be willing to pay the £200,000 to avoid it. Certainly, no one in England desires that it should take place. Passing from the Commission of Inquiry, the right hon. Gentleman came next to the question of the joint guarantee. The right hon. Gentleman, with great fertility of illustration, spoke of the number of guarantees this country has from time to time embarked in. His strong point was that the guarantee of a loan did not in practice become the cause of International interference, and he instanced the cases of Spain, Greece, and Turkey. On that point I do not suppose there will be much contention. There can be no doubt that the principle has been laid down again and again with respect to foreign loans, and the same thing applies to guaranteed loans —that if the loan is in default there is a discretionary power to resort to any means possible to enforce payment. It is only a question, however, of discretion. The cases of Spain, Greece, and Turkey, alluded to by the right hon. Gentleman, were quite different from the present one. In those cases, all the Powers who had joined in the guarantee had no desire for interference, but were anxious to maintain the Governments concerned; whereas here the case is very different with regard to the guarantee, because I cannot see that, with the exception of England, there is any desire on the part of any of the guaranteeing Powers to maintain the Government of Egypt. But there is, in reality, no analogy whatever between the instances

alluded to by the right hon. Gentleman and the present. The great difference, as the House will see, is that in those countries there was no Law of Liquidation, no *Caisse de la Dette*, and no International Tribunals. With these three Instruments — International Tribunals, *Caisse de la Dette*, and the Law of Liquidation, it is possible for any guaranteeing Power to bring such a force and influence to bear as to make Egypt bankrupt. Supposing, for instance, that hereafter Egypt was not so prosperous as we hope she will be, it might be that it would become a question for the Egyptian Government whether it was fair to the English taxpayer to go on paying the Sinking Fund of this loan. It would be perfectly possible for any of the guaranteeing Powers to come forward and say to England—"You must go on paying the Sinking Fund of this loan;" and they might, without the least notice or the slightest hesitation, at once institute proceedings, and force Egypt into paying what they demanded. That shows, with regard to this joint guarantee, that there is a danger and a power of interference arising out of the existing arrangements in Egypt which did not exist in regard to any other country in the world. The right hon. Gentleman said that it was not the right of a Power to interfere beyond the letter of its engagements. For my own part, I think that that is really an argument which might be of some importance in a Court of Law; but I do not think it is one which would have the slightest effect upon any of the Powers which are going to join in this guarantee. The very instant that it would be for the advantage of any of the guaranteeing Powers to interfere in the affairs of Egypt, I am quite certain they would be ready to do so, and would make the fact of joining in this guarantee a *locus standi* for their interference. How do the Government propose to meet the objections which have been made to the joint guarantee? The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposes to retreat under the shelter of a proviso that there is to be no International interference. He said, when he first announced this joint guarantee to the House, that it was only to be in existence provided there was no International interference. We find, now, that the proviso has only existed in the brain of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. There is no proviso of the kind whatever, and the only thing upon which the right hon. Gentleman has then to fall back upon is the inference to be drawn from the Joint Guarantee of 1855. But there is no analogy whatever between the Guarantee of 1855 and the present. On that occasion we had a common object with France; we were embarked with France in pursuance of an object which both countries had equally at heart, and both countries were ready to make common sacrifices. A joint guarantee was necessary also, because it was extremely improbable that Turkey would ever be able to repay the loan, or pay the interest of it. In the present case there is no risk at all, and the only object the Powers can have in being anxious to join in this guarantee is an object which is not disclosed, but which we can all guess. I hope that the Chancellor of the Exchequer will explain to the House the reasons which have induced him to change his opinion with regard to the importance of this joint guarantee from the view which he expressed at the Conference. At the Conference the right hon. Gentleman used these words—

> "We could not expect or ask Parliament to agree to a joint control, nor have we reason to believe that all the Powers would agree to it."

Now, Sir, it would be extremely interesting to know what has taken place in the interval to change the opinion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I certainly cannot imagine that anything can have taken place which ought to have changed that opinion. On the contrary, I think that all the arguments which have been used by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, by Earl Granville, and also by the Earl of Northbrook against the joint guarantee have been very much fortified by what has since taken place. We have gone on making greater sacrifices in Egypt than we had made then, and we have got more and more, apparently, into connection with the Government of Egypt, and more and more masters of the Government of Egypt. Then I think that whatever reasons existed in the mind of the Chancellor of the Exchequer against this joint guarantee in July last ought to be much stronger now than they were at that time. The analogy between the Guarantee of 1855 and the present guarantee cannot be sustained for a moment.

In 1855 we had pledged our credit for an object we all considered one of importance to the interests of the nation, and now it is proposed to pledge the credit of England in order to enable other Powers to snatch from us what we had legitimately gained in Egypt. What the effect of this arrangement in Egypt will be, I think we may all pretty easily judge of and speculate upon; and although I do not often read newspaper extracts in the House, yet, considering the position of *The Times* Correspondent at Cairo, whose opinions upon Egyptian affairs have almost always come true during the last year and a-half, and who has warned the Government over and over again of all the dangers that they were incurring, I will read two or three paragraphs from the Cairo telegram in *The Times* of this morning. The writer says—

"As regards the financial accord itself, opinions have naturally differed. Foreigners, with few exceptions, have regarded it with triumph, as definitively precluding any probability of a successful arrangement by England, and as necessitating an eventual resort to the Powers, and so dealing a severe blow at English administrative prestige, not in Egypt only, but throughout the East. The English, and the intelligent natives generally, are equally hostile to the Treaty. They find it difficult to say whether it is more fatal to English or to Egyptian interests, though some few, wearied with our repeated failures, were anxious to purchase even two year's tranquillity at any cost. But the absence of any, even a formal, guarantee of non-intervention removes the last plank, and plunges them at once into a worse *inferno* than they have endured for the past two years."

The Correspondent then goes on to describe the exultation of the foreigners over this International Guarantee which Parliament is now called upon to sanction. Hon. Members must ask themselves now what it is that has induced the Powers to help Parliament to make such a proposal as that which we are now discussing? I contend that it is nothing but the miserable weakness of Her Majesty's Government. [Mr. GLADSTONE: Hear, hear!] The right hon. Gentleman, I am sure, does not agree with me; but all I can say is that if he will appeal to the feeling of Europe or to any of the diplomatists of Europe whether they would not say this—"We sanctioned your going to Egypt; we endured what you were doing there for some time. We did not approve of your action, but we did not arrest your progress. After the way you have conducted Egyptian affairs, however, it is impossible for us to any longer to avoid interference." It is perfectly plain, from the Papers which have been presented to the House, that one of the most deplorable circumstances connected with the financial affairs of Egypt arises from one of the most palpable blunders ever committed by a statesman, and that is the advice given by Her Majesty's Government to Egypt which resulted in the suspension of the Sinking Fund in September last. [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER made an observation which did not reach the Gallery.] Perhaps the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his speech will answer the question whether the moment that was done the immediate result was not a demand on the part of Russia and Germany to have two Representatives admitted on the *Caisse* to represent their Government?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): If the right hon. Gentleman wishes me to answer that question I am quite ready to do so?

MR. BOURKE: As the right hon. Gentleman will have an opportunity later on, perhaps he had better answer it then. I have no desire to detain the Committee; but there is a passage in one of the despatches from M. de Giers pointing out the reason why the two Powers had asked to be represented on the *Caisse*. M. de Giers said—it will be found at page 93 of the Papers—in a despatch to the Russian Ambassador here—

"The infringement of the financial arrangements, which took place on the 18th of September of this year, without meeting with the resistance on which we should have thought that we could count from the present members of the Commission, naturally modified our views."

An hon. MEMBER: That is not what he said.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS: Read the next paragraph.

MR. BOURKE: That is exactly what he stated. I hope there will be no mistake about this matter. If I am not accurate I am very much mistaken indeed. All I say is that the infringement of the financial arrangements which took place in September was the reason why Germany and Russia asked to be represented on the *Caisse*. M. de Giers went on to say—

"As the renewal of such irregularities"—the irregularity being the suspension of the Sinking Fund—"was not impossible in the future, we naturally attached a greater importance to the necessity of giving the Commission, by the addition of Russian and German Delegates, the character and authority required for the protection of the rights and interests, based upon international agreements, the maintenance of which we, for our part, could not abandon to the care of others."—[*Ibid.*, p. 93.]

After that I think I am entitled to say that the suspension of the Sinking Fund led to the unfortunate demand of the Powers. I should be sorry if, by any imperfection of speech, I have led the right hon. Gentleman to imagine that it was something else I referred to. I hope that I am now quite understood?

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes; quite understood.

MR. BOURKE: I mention the matter, because I think we have now a plain issue before us, and I hope the Chancellor of the Exchequer will be able to give a satisfactory explanation. I am much obliged to the Committee for having listened to me with so much patience. I believe that this arrangement is financially imprudent, and politically dangerous and unwise; and my opinion is that all the dangers which we have predicted for it will ensue. So far from producing harmony among the Powers, I look forward to it as being a source of very great irritation between England and the rest of the Powers for the next two years.

MR. ACKERS said, he should not have risen to address the Committee on that occasion if it were not for the fact that his constituents were exceedingly anxious that as they had been the last to pronounce an opinion upon the action of Her Majesty's Government he, as their Representative, should say a few words upon the important question now under discussion. He had the honour to represent a constituency (West Gloucester) which was no small one, and which, although a county constituency, was not purely agricultural, seeing that it included within its limits nearly all the leading merchants and traders of the great City of Bristol, who lived outside that city and formed part of the constituency of West Gloucestershire. The division had also a very large mining population, a considerable portion of whom had votes, and a large industrial population outside Bristol, many of whom were county voters. It was, therefore, as the Committee would see, a very representative constituency, and might be said to reflect the varied opinions entertained in England at the present time. It was a very large constituency, numbering something like 178,000, and having a larger number of electors than some of the present constituencies had inhabitants, including women and children, which sent to that House devoted adherents to Her Majesty's Government. In addressing a few words to the Committee, he would crave the indulgence of hon. Members if, as a new Member, he said anything that was not strictly in accordance with the Rules of the House; but he felt satisfied that if he transgressed the hon. Gentleman in the Chair would call him to Order. He had no desire to transgress, and he would, therefore, ask for the indulgence of the Committee during the short time he proposed to occupy its attention. The constituency he had the honour to represent had for more than 30 years returned at least one Liberal Member to the House. At the last General Election two Liberals were returned, the lowest of whom had a majority of more than 500 over his Conservative opponent; but now that Her Majesty's Government had been in Office for five years things had so altered that he was standing there not only as a Conservative Member for that constituency, but as one who had been returned, and he had great pleasure in saying so, by the votes of Liberals as well as Conservatives — Liberals who used to work and vote for Liberal candidates, and who so worked and voted at the last General Election, but who had been so moved by the conduct of affairs by Her Majesty's Government that they considered it their duty to come forward now and speak out with no uncertain voice. At the same time, he did not think that Her Majesty's Government were likely to listen to that voice. Fortunately, the days of the present Parliament were dying out—its existence was fast ebbing away, and in a very short time the constituencies of the country would have to decide what policy should be pursued in the future. He was quite aware that for the moment the Government were masters of the situation, and that they were able, as had been stated by the hon. Member for Wicklow (Mr. M'Coan), who spoke

below the Gangway on the other side of the House, to secure a majority for any measure they might bring forward, even if it did not represent the views of the majority of the Liberal Party. That was a statement which was made openly on the other side of the House; and hon. Members knew very well that it was true, both from the votes which were recorded in the House and from what was said outside. As to the particular questions now before the Committee, he would ask why, if an International Control, or anything like an International Control, was so wholly out of the question last year, it was accepted by Her Majesty's Government at the present moment, or why they should be doing that which, in the opinion of a large number of the Members of that House, and he believed in the opinion of the majority of the House, would directly tend towards bringing about that International Control which was asserted by the Government to be impossible to accept last year? The Government alleged as a reason for their action that all the other Great Powers of Europe insisted upon an International Control. But he read in the Papers presented to the House that the Government of Italy did not see any reason for its acceptance, and were ready and willing to assist us in a much better way out of the difficulty. In regard to Russia, the remarks which had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for King's Lynn (Mr. Bourke) formed a very strong argument indeed. There was, however, another point in regard to Russia—namely, that the Russian Ambassador distinctly told them that Russia did not care for the financial aspect of the question as much as the other Powers did. If that were true, and Russia did not care for the financial aspect of the question, what was it that she did care for? What she wanted was to have the power, if she chose to use it, of thwarting this country in Egypt, and to have the opportunity, if she could obtain it, of checking our influence in matters that were essential to us in reference to the route to India. The words of the Russian Ambassador, although they were admitted to be used without specific instructions, were that Russia was less concerned than some other Powers, and particularly France, in the merely financial question. He would ask hon. Members to notice the way in which Her Majesty's Government had been treated in this matter. If he might say so without offence, the Government had been treated by the Government of France in a much more disrespectful manner than they would have been treated if they had been a stronger Government. He said, deliberately, that Her Majesty's Government was not a strong Government, and he made that assertion for this reason. No Government, however able the individual Members of it might be, could be a strong Government if it was divided against itself, and the present Government was notoriously divided against itself. Judging from the public utterances of Members of Her Majesty's Ministry, there were greater differences of opinion between right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench than there were between many of their supporters and the Conservatives on that side of the House. The Government were not united as a whole, and they knew that in this particular instance no less than five Members had left the Government because they disapproved of its policy; and those five Members, he ventured to say, represented the feeling of the country at large much more largely than the remaining Members of the Government did. He did not say, for one moment, that Her Majesty's Government, when it took Office, did not fully represent the majority at the last General Election; but five years of Office had brought about a great change; just as the five years that went before made a great change in the fortunes of the Conservative Ministry, so also in the five years which had since elapsed a great change had taken place in the feeling of the country with regard to the present Government. There had been more than one utterance by a Member of Her Majesty's Government which had been apologetically spoken of as an individual utterance, and not the utterance of the Government as a whole. If that were the case, if not absolutely un-Constitutional, the position of matters was extremely dangerous, because it was highly desirable that when a Member of the Government went down into the country to enlighten the people as to what the policy of the Government was he should speak the mind of the Government. What had been the

result of this double mind of the Government? It was that the country had suffered humiliation abroad, and humiliation at home. England's word ought to be her bond, as it had always been in the past, and as the country would insist that it should be in the future. They wanted every nation in the world to feel that when England once said a thing she meant what she said, and intended to carry it out. Coming to the pith of what he desired to say, he would ask that the Liberal Members—the National Liberal Members, of whom, happily, there were so many, although their votes in that House were not always in accordance with the views they entertained, especially when it came to be a question whether or not they should turn out Her Majesty's Government—he trusted that the National Liberal Members would in matters of national policy join the Conservative Party, and form one nation for the common good. [*A laugh.*] Hon. Gentlemen opposite might laugh, and he was as yet young in that House; but he knew what was said outside the House—namely, that Party was preferred before patriotism; and if they had but the Ballot inside the House of Commons as it existed outside, the voice of the House would be very different. At present the votes recorded in the House were not the free expression of the opinion of the House. He, for one, would heartily welcome that free expression of opinion; and he would say again, whether the assertion caused laughter in that House or not, that he should be as delighted to welcome the support of National Liberals in a national policy as he had been to welcome the support of Liberals at his election. Far beyond any desire to see the Conservative Party in power was his wish to see both sides of the House taking up a great national position in regard to questions of national policy. What was to become of the country if men holding national views were not to stand together? It was all very well to say that Her Majesty's Government were in a majority at the present moment, and that they controlled the House and the country by that majority. That was quite true, unfortunately; but their majority was made up in a way which they could not hope to preserve in a future Parliament. He strongly appealed to the patriotism of hon. Members to join together, before the present Parliament dissolved, in order that they might act together as a nation, and not as a Party. He knew that it was very difficult to set aside Party considerations, or to give up Party names; and he knew further that there was a strong desire—which he fully sympathized with—in the minds of hon. Members on the Liberal side to remain connected with the Party they had so long been associated with. But they on the Conservative side had also their glorious traditions. He would ask neither side to give up those traditions; all he asked was that they should be united, and become one great united Conservative Liberal, or Liberal Conservative body—he cared not which—and if they went to the country on that issue they would be able to place in power, not a Party, but a nation. If that course had been pursued, they would not have had this Convention before them now. If that were the case they would have that strong Government in Office which he wished to see, able to speak to the Powers of Europe, with no menacing voice, but with a full knowledge of what their power was, determined to do that which they considered best in Egypt, where their interests were mainly concerned, not only for this country, but for Egypt herself. He might, perhaps, *en passant*, be allowed to say that he entirely repudiated the notion of the hon. Member for Ipswich (Mr. Jesse Collings) that the question of the Fellaheen was a secondary matter.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS begged the hon. Gentleman's pardon; he had said quite the contrary.

Mr. ACKERS said, he was delighted to hear it.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS remarked, that what he had said was that the question of the Fellaheen ought not to be a secondary matter; but that, unfortunately, it was.

Mr. ACKERS said, he was afraid that that was the gist of his (Mr. Ackers's) objection to Her Majesty's Government—namely, that they did not carry out what ought to be, but only what was convenient for the time being. They appeared to have no statesmanlike policy. A statesman would look ahead, and see not only what was best for the time, but what was best for the future

also. ["Oh!"] He knew that he was only addressing the Committee by its own indulgence; but he was also aware that if he spoke as he ought not to speak the Chairman would call him to Order. He would only repeat, in conclusion, that outside the House—for it was of very little consequence now what occurred inside of it, in a moribund Parliament—what the country really cared for was that there should be a strong Government in Office with a sound policy—with a foreign policy dictated not by fits and starts, but by settled and continued convictions, so that those who were their allies might know that in the future they could again rely upon the word of England. He would suggest that there were certain principles that were not beneath the consideration of the country, and which he hoped were not beneath the consideration of that House, upon which they might build up a great National Party and policy — a policy able to command the sympathies of the nation and the attention and respect of Europe. He would suggest that Liberals and Conservatives might join in such a programme as this—Undoubted and undiluted loyalty to the Throne and Constitution; a determination, equally undoubted and undiluted, to retain the absolute integrity of the British Empire both near and far; an earnest desire to bind the Colonies closely together with the Mother Country in one vast Empire for their security and peace and in the interests of trade; civil and religious liberty in the fullest and freest sense; and, he would add also, religious education in the public elementary schools. [*A laugh.*] He was sorry, but not surprised, that that programme should have been received with laughter by some hon. Members opposite. If a programme such as this were agreed upon and carried out—if it were made plain to the meanest intelligence that no one unable to subscribe to such a programme would ever have the remotest chance of a seat on the Treasury Bench—disloyalty would soon shrink into its *bonâ fide* and insignificant proportions. He could only hope that the Government would consider the question with a view of ascertaining what the opinion of the country was; for he ventured to think that in the present negotiations they were more inclined to pay attention to the views of Foreign Governments than to the wishes of the people of England.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I think I am in the recollection of the Committee when I say that last Monday we had a lively, though rather short, debate as to whether or not Her Majesty's Government had presented the Parliamentary Papers bearing upon the question before the Committee, at a date sufficiently early to allow of their contents being mastered by hon. Members opposite previous to the debate which was to commence to-day, or at the latest on Monday next. The great anxiety which hon. Members opposite displayed on that occasion was, perhaps, in one sense, justified, for it appears that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for King's Lynn (Mr. Bourke), at all events, has not yet had sufficient time to make or renew his acquaintance with the Blue Books of last Session. I think that had the right hon. Gentleman had time to do so, he would not have made the rather remarkable assertion which he made just now in regard to the claim of Russia and Germany to be represented on the *Caisse*. I believe I am not misrepresenting the right hon. Gentleman when I say that the assertion which fell from his lips was that it was in consequence of the action of the Egyptian Government—acting as they did with the support, or, at any rate, with the knowledge, of Her Majesty's Government—in suspending the Sinking Fund which occasioned that demand to be made by the Governments of Russia and Germany. Now, what are the plain facts? The demand of Russia and Germany to be represented on the *Caisse* preceded by some two months the proposal for the suspension of the Sinking Fund. The date of the suspension of the Sinking Fund was, if I remember rightly, the 13th of September last; but the request of Russia and Germany to be represented on the *Caisse* was made during the sitting of the London Conference in July last. If the right hon. Gentleman will refer to page 25 of "Egypt, No. 30," he will find that at the sitting on the 29th of July the Russian Plenipotentiary expressed himself in these terms—

"Russia is not represented on the Commission of the Public Debt in Egypt, but she expressly reserved her rights when this Commission was instituted. There is now a question

of extending the functions of the Commission. In view, therefore, of the interests which Russia has to protect in Egypt, I am instructed to ask for the admission of a Russian Delegate on the Commission. This participation, besides, is in accordance with the principle of internationality and joint control adopted with regard to Egyptian affairs."

To which Count Münster added—

"That, taking into consideration the importance which the *Caisse* would have in future, it would be of advantage to Germany to be represented if a Russian Commissioner were admitted."

It was from this proceeding that the demand from Russia and Germany to be represented on the *Caisse* originated. The right hon. Gentleman, at the commencement of his observations, attempted to controvert the statement of the Prime Minister in regard to what in reality are the vital points in this matter—namely, the necessity, and also the safety, of the present arrangement; and he said he considered that, in regard to the necessity of the steps taken, no weaker statement could possibly have been made, and that he did not recollect any weaker statement having fallen from the lips of the Prime Minister. The right hon. Gentleman then proceeded to do what was, perhaps, rather rash. He attempted to prove the observations he had made, and said that he thought the statement of the Prime Minister that no less a sum than £1,600,000 had to be obtained, in some way or other, to meet the most pressing necessities of the Egyptian Government before the end of next month was not really, after all, so grave a matter. If such are the financial ideas of the right hon. Gentleman, I sincerely hope that the financial affairs of this country may never fall into his hands; and all I can say is, that if he thinks the credit of a Government already seriously in debt does not constitute a case of the utmost urgency, his ideas of sound finance are not, on the whole, what I should have expected to hear from a Gentleman who in any way belongs to the Party which was once led by Sir Robert Peel. However, was the statement of the Prime Minister in regard to the necessity of the case based merely on the fact that the Egyptian Government, in the month of April next, had to obtain this large sum of £1,600,000? No, Sir; it was not. The Prime Minister alluded also to the general financial position of the Egyptian Government, and any Member of the Committee who has made himself acquainted with the financial history of Egypt during the last two years must be aware that the financial situation of that country at the present time, created, as it has been, by the grave events of the last few years, is of a most serious and pressing character. It is not my wish, at this late hour, to enter at any length into financial details. That task would, no doubt, be better discharged by my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who will speak with an authority I do not possess at a later stage of the debate. But, speaking generally, the financial situation of Egypt during the last few years has been this—that for some years after the Law of Liquidation there was a period of continued financial prosperity. The Revenue of the country exceeded the Expenditure, and there were surpluses each year which, under the arrangement made by the Law of Liquidation, were devoted to the payment of debt. There was every reason to believe that, had it not been for the military movement which, unfortunately, sprang up in the early part of the year 1882, that condition of things would have continued. But what happened in 1882? The military movement, at the head of which was Arabi Pasha, so disturbed the prosperity of the country and disorganized its financial arrangements, that the surpluses were changed into deficits; and this condition of things continued during 1882, 1883, 1884, and practically continues at the present time. But that is not all. There were not only accumulating deficits which sprang up from the military movement, but the special events connected with the movement which arose in the Soudan came in to throw fresh burdens on the already suffering shoulders of the Egyptian taxpayers. Therefore, Egyptian finance became most seriously disorganized; and it is a fact that so far back as the last days of the Dual Control, at the end of 1882, when Sir Auckland Colvin was the English Controller, he and his French Colleague expressed the opinion that to put the financial situation of Egypt into a satisfactory condition a sum of no less than £8,000,000 would have to be raised. That was as far back as the year 1882, and every hon. Member is aware that

since that time the situation has not improved. I am quoting from the Memorandum of Sir Auckland Colvin, which is in the possession of every Member of the House. Therefore, I cannot understand how the right hon. Gentleman, taking into consideration that there are old accumulated deficits and a large growing expenditure owing to the events in the Soudan, besides other expenditure of a special character—I cannot understand how the right hon. Gentleman can possibly doubt or deny for a single moment that the financial situation of Egypt is at the present time of a most urgent and pressing character, and that it was the bounden duty of the Egyptian Government and of Her Majesty's Government not to lose a single day or a single hour in doing all in their power to rectify this unsatisfactory condition of things. It is no exaggeration to say that upon the rectification of the present financial situation depends, to a very great extent, the recovery of Egypt's material prosperity. I would ask the leave of the Committee to call its attention to a few remarks made in an interesting Commercial Report by Consul Cookson, a man whose opinions are always received with the greatest respect. In his Commercial Report from Alexandria for 1883, Consul Cookson speaks as follows:—

"In spite of the universal feeling of uneasiness and insecurity which has been caused by the continued uncertainty of the political situation, it will be observed, upon studying the statistics of this Report, that the general trade and commerce of Egypt have in great measure recovered from the effects of the late war. The imports have been increased to a higher figure than in any other previous year. The position of the Fellaheen, too, in spite of, and partly in consequence of, the greater difficulty which they have had in borrowing money, has, on the whole, decidely improved, as it seems by the admitted fact that they are paying off a portion of their heavy debts to private money-lenders. They still seem to cherish lingering hopes of some revolution which will repudiate both public and private liabilities; but this feeling will, it is to be hoped, gradually die away. The political and financial position, however, is so menacing that private capital remains locked up, and no material development of the resources of the country or practical reform in its administration is possible without expenditure, which the present state of the Revenue renders impossible."

What is the fair deduction from that? The fair deduction is that you must rectify, reform, and improve the financial situation before you can expect the material prosperity of that country really to improve. Remember that was the condition of things which existed in 1880 and 1881, when there was a surplus, and not a deficit. But how could that state of things be arrived at except by enabling the Egyptian Government by a fresh loan to pay off the debt which had been incurred, in a great measure, owing to the operations in the Soudan, and to the payment of the large sums due in consequence of the Alexandrian indemnities. So much, therefore, in reply to the right hon. Gentleman in regard to the necessity of the situation; but then he went on to controvert what had fallen from the Prime Minister in regard to the safety of the present arrangement. Here, following the lead which was, to a certain extent, given in the speeches made earlier in the evening, the right hon. Gentleman enlarged upon the dangers of the so-called International Control, which he asserted must infallibly spring out of the arrangement now before the Committee. The right hon. Gentleman asked why it was, if the Powers did not desire to exercise an International Control, that they desired to have an International Guarantee? It seems to me that it was not unreasonable or unnatural to believe that the sentiment of equality which exists among great nations—a desire not to appear to be left out from arrangements which are being made in regard to events of European importance—is one which naturally would weigh, and no doubt has weighed, to a great extent, with the Powers in making such a demand. I hold myself that this arrangement, bringing together as it does all the Powers in a friendly guarantee, is an arrangement which it is not well to describe in the tones of almost panic terror which have been used in regard to it this evening. I see no necessity for suspecting dark designs and evil intentions on the part of the Great Powers who have expressed a wish to be parties to an International Guarantee. The Powers, if they desire to interfere with the affairs of Egypt, as the hon. Member for Hertford (Mr. A. J. Balfour) has practically admitted, do not require an International Guarantee in order to enable them to do so. The hon. Member has said, and said with great truth, that the position of this country—and what is true of this country is true

of any other Great Power—that the position of this country in regard to Egypt, and its right to interfere with Egypt, depend not upon this International Guarantee, but upon the circumstances of the time and place. That is perfectly true; and he was in reality using, to a great extent, the same argument as that which had been used at an earlier period of the evening by the Prime Minister. The Capitulations, the International Tribunals, the Law of Liquidation, the circumstances under which the different Firmans have been granted, the title of the present Khedive to his Throne—these are what give to the Powers a right to intervene. The power to interfere existed before the International Guarantee, and would exist, whether the accord is brought about or whether it is not. The hon. Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Bruce), who opened the debate on the other side of the House, no doubt speaks with great authority upon questions of Oriental finance. The methods of Oriental finance as he admitted when he spoke of Oriental States, which are generally on the verge of bankruptcy, are, no doubt, very different from the methods of European States; and it is certain that if the Government desire to do anything serious to improve the financial position of Egypt, they must do so by rooting out of the country, and out of the administration of the country, ideas which, from want of a better expression, I will call ideas of Oriental finance, and substituting for them the sounder financial ideas which exist in countries such as this and other European countries. Although the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Bruce) began his speech by a reference, of which I will make no complaint, to his position as an Oriental financier, he very rapidly departed from the position of an Oriental financier, or any other kind of financier, and became a politician. He made a most elaborate attack on the Government for having missed all their opportunities. He said that the right and the duty of the Government, the moment a shot was fired at Alexandria, were practically to have taken possession of Egypt. I do not think I am in the least misrepresenting the argument of the hon. Member when I describe it from the beginning to the end as a plea for annexation and for the violation of all public law. It was an argument in favour of force, and of the application by this country of the right of the strong arm to the affairs of Egypt. It seems to me that there are two points of view from which the speech of the hon. Member may be considered. First of all, let me assume that it was at some period or another between the time when those events began—which I take to be the year 1876, when the *Caisse* first came into existence—and the present time; let me assume that, according to the hon. Member, at some time or another between those periods, it was the duty of the Government, whenever it recognized a favourable moment, to have seized the opportunity of exercising force—the might of the strong hand—wherever they thought it probable that they would succeed, and thereby to have established the sole and undivided influence and authority of England in Egypt. Let me assume that to be the case, and then let me ask who it was that lost the opportunity? When was the opportunity most favourable for the assertion of English power in Egypt, and for ousting the power and influence of any other country? I have often seen that question discussed, and it has always been put in the following manner:—"Why, after the war between France and Germany, when the power of France was at the lowest ebb, did you not take advantage of the situation to oust French influence in Egypt, because French influence there at that moment would have perished before you, and the minimum of exertion would have been required to enable you to accomplish that great end?" But when was that opportunity given to an English Government? Why, Sir, it was in the period when Her Majesty's late Advisers were in power; and, therefore, if the opportunity was lost, it was lost during the years 1874-5, and the following years, before there was a revival of French power and influence, and before France had recovered from the terrible blows, under which she so long reeled, that were inflicted upon her during the Franco-German War. Now, I have no hesitation in saying that had the late Government adopted that course, they would have been adopting a most dangerous, as well as a very wrong, course. But, nevertheless, if ever there was an opportunity given for adopting with success that high-handed course,

then was the time, and then was the opportunity lost. No doubt, it would have been entering on a perilous policy, because the recovery of a great country like France was only a question of time; and if she had felt that in her hour of weakness advantage had been taken to smite her in a tender part, she would have taken the first opportunity afterwards of paying off the score with interest. Therefore, I should say that the late Government did wisely in not doing anything of the kind; but when they had the opportunity and neglected it, surely it does not lie in their mouth to blame their Successors because, under circumstances much less favourable, they did not adopt the course from which their Predecessors had deliberately abstained. It is absolutely necessary for the case of the Government that I should consider what happened during the last two years of the tenure of Office of Her Majesty's late Government and the early years of Her Majesty's present Government. Her Majesty's late Advisers consented to the establishment in the *Caisse* of a Body with power to veto all loans; and they also gave a veto to the Porte on the issue of loans, because the last Firman under which the present Khedive held his title restored to the Porte the privilege which the penultimate Firman had taken away—namely, the right of giving its consent to any loan which might be issued by the Khedive and the Government of Egypt. And, lastly, the Second Control put an end, in the time of the late Government, to the privileged position which in the earlier Control, and during the short period of Nubar Pasha's first Ministry, had been held by the English Adviser and by the English Minister in Egypt. That is a point which I think is worth dwelling upon, because it is an answer to a great deal of the criticism which is so freely launched at Her Majesty's Government by right hon. Gentlemen opposite. It would be no exaggeration to compare the relative positions of the Englishman and Frenchman, in the First Control, with those of the Secretary of State and of an Auditor. When that arrangement disappeared, there was substituted for it by the Marquess of Salisbury one under which the privileged position of the Englishman, as compared with the Frenchman, was taken away; and both Sir Rivers Wilson and M. de Blignières had the right of attending the Council of Ministers and exercising certain privileges of advice and control upon an exactly equal footing. The net result of the whole arrangement was that after the termination of a controversy of four years the privileged position of the Englishman had disappeared. That being so, how does it lie in the mouths of right hon. Gentlemen opposite to taunt us with being those who had not sufficiently borne in mind the necessity of upholding the interests of this country in Egypt? Those, Sir, were quiet times when they made that arrangement; but, although they were quiet times, right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite handed over to France—not under pressure of the great difficulties which the present Government has had to deal with—the rights of which they were in possession at starting. Again, the powers and rights of the *Caisse* have all along been a most serious matter. Any person who has read the proceedings of the Conference of last year will be fully aware that one of the principal differences of opinion which existed between Her Majesty's Plenipotentiaries and those of France had reference to the claim of France constantly made, in one shape or another, for the extension of the power and privileges of the *Caisse;* but it was always felt that the constitution of the *Caisse* already gave to European Governments, if not the right, at least a potential right, through those gentlemen who sat upon the *Caisse*, of exercising a very decided influence upon whatever decision it might be the wish of the Egyptian Government to take with regard to the arrangement of the finances of the country, and that it would be very dangerous to extend it. That, Sir, shows how very gravely hampered Her Majesty's Government and the Egyptian Government were by this arrangement, for which, as I said just now, they are in no manner responsible. Therefore, the position at the time when the Conference of last year broke up was that, owing to financial difficulties, which I have just described to the Committee, the borrowing powers which the Egyptian Government had under the Law of Liquidation were entirely exhausted; that a large Floating Debt was accumulated—a Debt owing to the indemnities, to the deficits

arising from the war in the Soudan, to the military necessities, and other causes; and the Powers had the advantage, through the *Caisse*, of practically enforcing their own views in regard to whatever decision the Egyptian Government might wish to take respecting the raising of a loan to meet the financial difficulties which I have described. The only weapon which was in the hands of the Egyptian Government, and of Her Majesty's Government, in so far as they advised the Egyptian Government, was that they might have raised, if they thought fit, the very formidable and difficult question about the composition of the *Caisse*—a question which it would not, perhaps, have been desirable to raise, and upon which I do not wish to express any opinion—namely, how far the *Caisse* was a body on which the Governments, or any particular nationality had the right of being represented. It was, no doubt, true that the Decree of 1876, which is well known to right hon. Gentlemen opposite, only specified that foreigners should be upon the *Caisse*. It did not specify that foreigners of any particular nationality except that of England should be upon the *Caisse;* and, therefore, it would have been open to Her Majesty's Government possibly to raise this point, if the Egyptian Government were hard pressed, as to how far the present composition of the *Caisse* was to be maintained. But that would have been a very difficult question to raise, and one which no one would have thought it wise to raise, except under the pressure of extreme necessity. Therefore, the whole position came to this—it was one in which a compromise was necessary; it was a matter for negotiation; it was not a matter for the assertion of extreme rights. Throughout these debates I have observed with astonishment that right hon. Gentlemen opposite have spoken as if the only countries concerned in this question were Egypt and England. They seemed to imagine that Egypt was a sort of *tabula rasa* on which England could impress whatever character she wished. But that is not the position. England has rights, no doubt, arising from those circumstances of time and place to which the hon. Member for Hertford (Mr. A. J. Balfour) alluded; but England is not the only country which has an historical position with regard to Egypt; and it would have been impossible—and the conduct of the late Government is a proof of it—for this country to assert the right to act in Egypt according to its own sweet will. I venture to say that if the late Government had continued in power to the present day they would not have put forward the view expressed by the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Bruce) in this debate, that England ought to have acted with a strong and outstretched arm, and without regard to the rights and privileges of other countries. Sir, Her Majesty's Government had rationally only four courses open to them in regard to Egypt. They might, no doubt, by the course of events, have allowed Egypt to drift into bankruptcy. ["Hear, hear!"] An hon. Gentleman says "Hear, hear!" but that is a course which a reasonable man would hardly wish to be pursued. I am aware that it has found one or two solitary supporters; but the very fact of their standing alone affords a strong presumption against the correctness of the view they take. Then this country might have lent £9,000,000 or £10,000,000 to the Egyptian Government. But was that a course which this House would have approved? Was it one which would have recommended itself to the financial experience of business men in this country—that we should have plunged into so great an operation? Sir, I venture to doubt it. Then, no doubt, there was this course open to us—that we should pay off the whole amount, and thereby sweep away the Law of Liquidation, which alone gives the right to other Powers to intervene. But then, again, we should have had to come to the House of Commons for its consent; and I should like to ask the opinion of the right hon. Baronet the Member for East Gloucestershire (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), or any other hon. Gentleman opposite, whether he thinks that the Government ought to have come forward to pay off the whole of the Egyptian Debt, and taken over the control of the country, for that is what was placed before us to-night by the hon. Member for Portsmouth, when he said that the true policy for the Government to pursue was the policy of taking over the government of Egypt. His speech was a plea in favour of armed intervention preceded by financial intervention. I say that the posi-

tion of the hon. Member for Portsmouth, although I dissent from it, is one which can be understood and supported by argument, and which is a fair one to meet. But there is no half-way house in this matter; you must either adopt the policy of the hon. Member for Portsmouth, or you must adopt the last of the four alternatives to which I have alluded—namely, the policy of compromise which has been adopted by Her Majesty's Government. We have been told in the course of this debate that we have surrendered entirely to France, and that we have nothing to show for our diplomacy. I deny that proposition. The policy adopted at the Conference of last year is practically developed in the Blue Books now before Parliament; and I say that in that Conference we asked for one most important thing which we could not obtain, and which we have now obtained—namely, that the bondholders should make some contribution to the necessities of Egypt. It is true that the sum obtained now by the tax of 5 per cent on the coupons is less than we should have obtained by the tax proposed last year; nevertheless we have obtained that consent on the part of the bondholders which was last year refused. In addition to this, we have successfully resisted the claim put forward by France last year for an immediate investigation of the subject of Egyptian finance, and the extension in connection with that investigation or otherwise of the powers of the *Caisse*, the subject on which, as I have pointed out, the Conference of last year broke up. Therefore, we do not come before this House without anything substantial to show. We have gained those two substantial points on which the Conference of last year turned; and if we are told, as we have been told by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Bourke), that he can produce passages in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Earl Granville said they could not agree, and did not think the House of Commons would agree, to a Joint Guarantee, my reply is that those statements were made when it was believed that no concession would be obtained upon those other points upon which I have shown that concession has been obtained. And, further, if the right hon. Gentleman will refer to the passage he has quoted, he will see that there is an important qualification, because we had no reason to suppose that the other Powers had any wish to come into such an arrangement. I assert that the wish of the Powers to come into the Joint Guarantee was a wish of which there was no trace in their demands at the Conference of last year, and it was a wish posterior to those events to which the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bourke) just now alluded when he spoke of the Earl of Northbrook's Mission. Therefore, when the right hon. Gentleman alludes to those passages containing extracts, or summaries rather, of the speeches made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Earl Granville, he must bear in mind the qualifications I have just now made. He must also recollect that when he is quoting those words he is not quoting the actual words, but only a summary of them; he has no right to come forward and say—"Earl Granville rose in the Conference, or the Chancellor of the Exchequer rose in the Conference, and spoke as follows." If he will look at the Protocol of the Conference, he will find that, if what transpired in the Conference were reported verbatim, the Blue Book would have been swollen to a hundred times its present size. Therefore, without wishing to withdraw or qualify anything of what was said, it must be recollected that the words are summaries. No doubt in some cases the actual words of passages are given; but they must be read in connection with the general proceedings of the Conference.

MR. BOURKE: The paragraph I quoted was carefully read at the Conference by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and therefore, no doubt, had been prepared beforehand. The words I quoted were in "inverted commas."

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: No doubt, there are passages containing actual words; but those passages must be taken in connection with the general proceedings of the Conference, and not be treated as isolated passages, apart from the context. Sir, these are the principal points which, I think, have been raised in the debate—the necessity of the present steps, the safety of those steps, and whether this country ought or ought not to have assumed, or even now to assume, a far more vigorous and independent line

in Egypt than any which recommended itself to the late Government or to the present Government. But there is another aspect of this question which I think it my duty to lay before the Committee. This agreement has been made. If you reject it, if you adopt the Motion of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Bruce), what do you think the result will be? Will you be any nearer obtaining the policy which he advocates? Will you be any nearer obtaining what you wish if you agree with the hon. Gentleman? That is a point upon which I hope the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Gloucestershire (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) will enlighten us. What is the policy which he thinks ought to be adopted? Is he in favour of that strong, I might almost say that violent policy, which was advocated by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Portsmouth? Do you think that the rejection of these proposals will benefit Egypt? You know perfectly well it will not. You know perfectly well, upon the authority of such men as Mr. Cookson, whose Report I have read, that the material prosperity of Egypt, which is the same thing as the prosperity of the Fellaheen, depends upon the settlement of the financial situation, and that if we delay that settlement we shall plunge the Fellaheen into the misery from which they were slowly emerging. Do you think you will safeguard British interests by rejecting this arrangement? No; you will not. You will, certainly, place this country in a difficult position in the face of the Great Powers. Do you think—and this, I suppose, is an argument I ought to address to the hon. Gentleman the Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere), and to the hon. Gentleman the Member for Ipswich (Mr. Jesse Collings), rather than to right hon. Gentlemen opposite—do you think you will injure the bondholders? because that I believe to be the great object of my hon. Friends. No; I do not think you will. The bondholder, who under the Law of Liquidation has a priority, will continue to insist upon having his pound of flesh. As you will not benefit the Fellaheen, as you will not benefit this country, as you will not injure the bondholders, I ask you what do you think you will obtain by the rejection of this arrangement? I wish now to say a few words on the other subject which is touched upon in the Resolution of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Bruce). In his speech he dwelt but little upon it, although it is a most material part of the Resolution he has placed on the Table of the House. He has asked us to condemn not merely the International Arrangement with regard to Egyptian finance, but also to express disapproval of the arrangements contemplated with regard to the Suez Canal; and the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) declared, in accents of terror, that we had sacrificed the position of this country in the Suez Canal. What he actually meant by the position of this country in the Suez Canal I was not able to make out, because he did not attempt a single word of explanation. My hon. Friend the Member for Gloucester (Mr. Monk) went into detail on this subject. As I understand, he did not condemn this arrangement, and I need not remind the Committee that he speaks with great authority upon this question, being himself a Suez Canal Director, and having held an important position in connection with the Chambers of Commerce of this country. Therefore, when I hear the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) declaring that we have sacrificed the position of England in the Suez Canal, and I find my hon. Friend the Member for Gloucester (Mr. Monk) saying we have not, I am inclined to think that the weight of authority is on this side of the House. [Mr. R. N. FOWLER: Oh, oh!] I am sorry to trouble the Committee at this late hour (12.50) with details; but they are necessary for the case of the Government. The position of this country in the Suez Canal is undoubtedly one of the very greatest importance; and if Her Majesty's Government had in any way neglected it, or if they were about to compromise or sacrifice it, or to show that they did not recognize it, no doubt they would be worthy of the severest condemnation. But, Sir, I think I can show to the Committee we have done none of these things. It is absolutely necessary that the position of the Suez Canal should be settled in a definite

manner. The word "neutralization" has been freely used in connection with this question. We are told that we are preparing and proposing an arrangement for the neutralization of the Suez Canal. I rather regret that that word has been imported into this debate; it is not used, so far as I know, in the Declaration and Convention that has been signed. What the Powers have agreed to is this—That they are to make a permanent arrangement with regard to the position of the Suez Canal—a permanent arrangement. I think those are the actual words, although I am quoting from memory. Now the expression "permanent arrangement" in itself shows the origin of what has been done. There is no doubt that at this moment the position of the Suez Canal, from the point of view of International Law, is one which is unsatisfactory, which is uncertain, and one not unattended with danger. There has been a great deal of writing and discussion on the subject of the Suez Canal from the point of view of International Law, and any person who has followed the discussions must be fully aware that it is one of those cases in which all the doctors disagree. Learned Professors have bombarded one another in the columns of rival reviews. Learned lawyers have written articles in magazines devoted to the legal aspects of the subject; but they are all agreed upon one thing, and that is, to disagree with one another. Only last year, or the year before last, I recollect a great controversy between the Chichele Professor of International Law at Oxford and the Deputy Professor of International Law at Cambridge on the question of the position of the Suez Canal. Sir, the position of the Suez Canal is a mixed one. Some people have written of it as if everything was to turn upon its being considered as a sort of arm of the sea, others have written upon it as if the whole case depended upon the fact that it is an artificial, as distinct from a natural channel, and others, again, have written as if the whole case depended upon its being a great International work, in which all the nations of Europe have an interest. Sir, it is perfectly true that the Suez Canal is or may be regarded, to a certain extent, as an arm of the sea; but that is not all. It is also true that the Suez Canal is an artificial channel; but that is not all. And it is true that the Suez Canal may be regarded as a great International work in what nearly all the nations of Europe, especially this country, have an interest; but that also is not all. The other day I was looking over an article written by Mr. Laurence, the Deputy Professor of International Law at Cambridge, a gentleman to whom I have previously referred. It struck me that the learned Professor put the case of the Suez Canal so fairly, that perhaps the Committee will pardon me if I ask them to consider the views put forward. Mr. Laurence said—

"A close examination of the case will recall the following points:—(1) The Suez Canal is a narrow strait between two open seas; (2) it is wholly within the territory of one Power; (3) it is an artificial channel; (4) it is so narrow that the use of it for purposes of active warfare closes it to commerce; (5) it was made and is worked by a commercial Company, under concessions from the Khedive, confirmed by the Sultan; (6) the Company has an undisputed right to levy tolls for profit on vessels using the Canal; (7) it had more or less an International character and constitution; (8) various Powers have from time to time entered into negotiations with it and with one another concerning the Canal; (9) legally the Sovereignty over the territory through which the Canal is cut is shared between the Khedive and the Sultan; but as a matter of fact the British Government exercises much more control over the former than his nominal Suzerain, England being in her turn restrained by the necessity of obtaining the assent of the European Concert for any very important steps she may wish to take. From one set of attributes we might argue that the Canal was, in law, a narrow strait between two open seas; from another, that it was an inland waterway, subject entirely to the authority of the local Sovereign; and from a third, that it was a great International work under the control of the leading Powers of Europe. At every turn it presents a conflict of analogies. In some respects it resembles the Solent, or the Little Belt, in others the Crinan Canal, in others the mouth of the Danube. It is anomalous, and everything about it is anomalous. None but itself can be its parallel. Never before in modern times has there been a Suez Canal; never a Canal Company so constituted and so privileged. Never has Sovereignty over so important a portion of the earth's surface been so strangely shared between a number of Powers. Never have stubborn facts been more at variance with diplomatic fictions. Never have the rights of a territorial Power been more lavishly granted away, or more cavalierly set aside."

Now, what is the deduction from that? That you cannot trust the ordinary doctrines of International Law recognized with regard to arms of the sea or territorial waters as a safeguard with regard

to the Suez Canal, and that it is absolutely necessary to draw up an International Convention putting all the questions, which may arise and some of which have arisen beyond any possibility of doubt, and also beyond the possibility of being a future source of danger to the peace of the world; for it is certain that as the Suez Canal goes on being used in an increased degree by the nations of Europe the probability of difficult questions arising will increase. I need not remind the Committee that in 1877 there was the famous despatch of the Earl of Derby, claiming for the Suez Canal an exceptional position with regard to the hostilities between Russia and Turkey. Then, again, during the Expedition of Lord Wolseley to Egypt which preceded the battle of Tel-el-Kebir, the Canal was to a very great extent the scene of military operations, and the commerce of the nations going through the Canal was for the time interfered with and interrupted. Grave objection was taken in some quarters to those proceedings; and it was argued not only by foreign jurists, but by English lawyers, that if we accept the position of the Suez Canal being an arm of the sea, the right which was exercised by the English Naval and Military Commanders to interfere with the commerce of neutrals passing through the Canal was a right which ought not to have been exercised. Therefore, Sir, it is clear that it is absolutely necessary, once and for all, to settle the International position of the Suez Canal. In that view we cannot trust to the ordinary analogies of International Law with regard to arms of the sea or territorial waters. The Suez Canal must be dealt with by special regulation, and that is what has now been agreed upon by the Great Powers, and which will be carried out. I can only now say, in conclusion, that on behalf of the Office I have the honour to represent in this House, I submit, with all deference, but also in a spirit of confidence, the arrangement that has been made with the Powers to the friendly consideration and the approval of this Committee, and afterwards of the House. I believe that if the House approves this arrangement, we then may feel that that period of great difficulty with regard to Egypt with which this House and this nation, and, indeed, the nations of Europe, have been labouring is beginning to draw to a close—that we may say we begin to see light. Far be it from me to say I believe that the affairs of Egypt will not for many a long day be a source of debate and discussion in this House; but I believe that if this arrangement is accepted by Parliament, it will in future be recognized as the beginning of a permanent and satisfactory settlement, and one that will be for the benefit of all parties concerned. I may venture to use the words of our great poet—

"But look! the dawn, in russet mantle clad,
Walks o'er the skirts of yon high Eastern hill."

I will not go on, because the next line, I believe—I am quoting from memory—says—

"Break we our watch,"

and I know it will be a very long time before we can cease to watch and think about Egyptian affairs. But, although for many a long day and many a long year the affairs of Egypt will continue to form matter of anxiety and discussion, I believe that by this arrangement we shall have taken a marked and material step towards the attainment of those three objects which have always been the aim of the Government—namely, the improvement of the condition of the population of Egypt, which in the past has suffered great injustice and grievous wrong; secondly, the recognition in full measure of all the International obligations which bind us and the other nations of Europe; and last, though not least, the maintenance of the *prestige* and reputation of this country.

MR. R. N. FOWLER said, that as the noble Lord (Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice) had alluded to him he wished to say that the noble Lord knew as well as he (Mr. R. N. Fowler) did that he (Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice) held the conscience of the hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Monk). Whatever the noble Lord recommended the hon. Member for Gloucester would support; and, therefore, he (Mr. R. N. Fowler) must disclaim the noble Lord's allusion.

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (REDISTRIBUTION) (*re-committed*) BILL.

(*Mr. Gladstone, The Marquess of Hartington, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Attorney General, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

[BILL 49.] COMMITTEE.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Committee be deferred till Monday next."

MR. WARTON asked what the Government meant by putting this Bill down for Monday next? It was distinctly promised to-day not to take the Bill until after the Easter Recess. It was a farce to put a Bill down when it was not to be taken.

MR. R. N. FOWLER said, that all the Amendments to the Bill were circulated to Members to-day. If there was any desire for economy in printing, why should the Amendments be sent out when there was no possibility of the Bill coming on?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, it was not considered probable that the Bill would be considered on Monday; but it was necessary to put it down for Monday in case the other arrangements fell through.

MR. WHITLEY remarked, that the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had distinctly stated that he would not take the Bill again until the 13th of April, and consequently many Members interested had gone down to the country.

Motion *agreed to.*

Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next.

ARMY (ANNUAL) BILL.—[BILL 104.]

(*The Marquess of Hartington, The Judge Advocate General, Sir Thomas Brassey.*)

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 4, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Amendment of s. 88. of 44 and 45 Vict. c. 58, as to the form of proclamation for continuing soldiers in Army service).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

COLONEL NOLAN asked whether by this clause it was intended to take any new power?

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN) explained that no new power was taken. The object of the clause was merely to assimilate the mode of proceeding under the 88th section of the Army Act with that under the 12th section of the Reserve Forces Act.

COLONEL NOLAN objected to assimilation, because it was generally found that when things were assimilated the facts were entirely changed. What he really wished to know was whether, under the present clause, the Secretary of State for War could keep a certain number of soldiers, entitled to be transferred to the Reserve, with the Colours, without keeping them all? At present the clause read in this way—

"It shall be lawful for Her Majesty by any such proclamation to order a Secretary of State from time to time to give, and when given to revoke or vary, such directions as may seem necessary or proper for causing all or any of the soldiers mentioned in the proclamation to continue in Army service."

He did not think that was the idea of a Reserve; it was certainly not the idea of any of the great Continental Reserves. The impression was that the whole number of men, practically the whole class, could be called out; but that it was impossible for the State to keep any individual soldier. Here, however, the authorities were taking power to keep Reserve soldiers in particular regiments, and he thought that was a very dangerous power. He did not think that men who entered the Reserve ever meant that that power should be given to the Government. He had not got any clear answer, as yet, from the Judge Advocate General whether the power he (Colonel Nolan) complained of was not given under this clause.

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN) said, the object of the clause was to empower the authorities to call out all the men, or such number of them as might be considered desirable.

COLONEL NOLAN said, it was not the belief of the soldier that the authorities could call out a portion of the men. Unless he was re-assured on this point he should move to leave out the words

"or any." It would then be impossible to call out a few of the men.

MR. HOPWOOD said, he thought his right hon. and learned Friend the Judge Advocate General should give them some full information as to the meaning of this clause. The hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel Nolan) was entitled to ask for an explanation, because he was under the impression that some new power was being taken. The right hon. and learned Gentleman ought to tell the Committee candidly what was the meaning of the clause—what was the present state of things, what was the mischief to be cured, what was the effect of these words.

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN) said, that if his hon. Friends would only compare the wording of Section 88 of the Army Act with the wording of Section 12 of the Reserve Forces Act, they would see at once what the object of the Amendment was. The powers given by the Reserve Forces Act were different to the powers given by the Army Act. By the present Bill it was proposed to put the two Acts upon the same footing.

COLONEL NOLAN said, it would be very dangerous to give the Government power to call out a portion and not the whole of the men. The question had not been argued at all by the Government; indeed, this was only another instance of the inconvenience of the way in which the Army Bill was passed. This Bill was treated in a very different way to any measure brought before the House. As the Bill was printed very differently to any other, a little latitude must be allowed to Members if they did not understand this clause. As he understood, there had been several Amendments introduced quietly into this Bill because Members did not take any notice of it. He would not divide the Committee; but he invited hon. Members to take up the Bill and see if they could, owing to the peculiar way in which it was printed, understand a single word of it.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON said, he had endeavoured to trace some of the changes made since the Army Act of 1879. He found that words were introduced in the way now proposed, and that owing to the way the Bill was printed it was most difficult to check the alteration. Small words which hon. Members did not follow had been introduced, and the result was that most important changes had been made.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Amendment of s. 171. of 44 & 45 Vict. c. 58, as to the exercise of powers vested in holder of military office).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

COLONEL NOLAN wished to point out to the Committee the slipshod way in which previous legislation upon Army matters had been carried out. Formerly, the House was very jealous of amending the Mutiny Act, because the whole position of the Standing Army depended upon that Act. This clause, however, showed the sort of power they were asked to continue and even to enlarge. Section 171, which it was now proposed to amend, provided that—

"Any power or jurisdiction given to, or any act or thing to be done by, to, or before any person holding any military office may be exercised by, or done by, to, or before any other person for the time being authorised in that behalf according to the custom of the Service."

He was quite satisfied that not half-a-dozen Members of the Committee had the slightest idea of what that meant, or what they were now asked to do. This section of the Act of 1881 gave enormous powers to the Army Authorities. They could cashier an officer if he did not send in a Report, and there was not a single officer who did not fail to do that occasionally. Indeed, it gave gigantic powers, and it was now proposed by the present Bill to permit those enormous powers to be delegated to other individuals. The Army Act gave tremendous and even frightful powers to a court martial; and not content with the powers already given, they were now going to delegate those powers a second time, for the clause now under consideration really involved a system of double delegation. The clause of the Army Act declared that any power or jurisdiction given to any person holding military office might be exercised by any person for the time being authorized according to the custom of the Service, and the effect of that provision was to give very large powers to the officers in the Army, and to delegate them to

other persons authorized by the "custom of the Service." The only safeguard was contained in the words "according to the custom of the Service," and that was the only restriction upon this most tremendous delegation of power. But it was now proposed in the present clause to add the following provision:—

"And whereas doubts have arisen as to the application of the said section in certain cases, and it is expedient to remove such doubts; Be it therefore enacted as follows:—In section one hundred and seventy-one of the Army Act, 1881, there shall be added at the end thereof the words 'or according to rules made under section seventy of this Act.'"

The meaning of this Amendment was that the powers already delegated to certain officers were in future to be delegated by such officers to other persons. They were not going to tie a court martial down to the "custom of the Service," but the Commander-in-Chief or the Military Authorities were in future to be able to make any new rule they liked, and then to hand over the whole power of administering it to somebody else. He was afraid that no one reading the clause in the Bill as it stood would be able to make out what the Government were driving at or what the whole thing was about. He must confess that personally he objected to the clause altogether, and unless he got a clear explanation from the Judge Advocate General as to what it meant, and why these extraordinary powers were to be delegated, he should certainly divide the Committee against the clause.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he did not entirely agree with the criticism of his hon. and gallant Friend. The clause, as it stood, in specifying that the power or jurisdiction might be exercised by any other person authorised according to the custom of the Service, was extremely vague and undetermined, and wherever the law was left vague and undetermined in matters of this kind difficulties would be sure to arise. By providing that something should be laid down in the shape of rules—something definite and determined—they would have something more clear to act upon, and he therefore thought it was desirable that this provision, which secured precision, should be introduced.

MR. HOPWOOD said, he was afraid that the matter was not rendered much more definite by the proposed clause than it was by the Act of 1881. The Army Act made use of the words "by the custom of the Service." That expression still remained, and, therefore, the vagueness insisted upon by the hon. Gentleman still existed; and added to that were the words—

"Or according to rules made under section seventy of this Act."

So that, instead of securing precision, they were only intensifying the mischief which was done by the Army Act. He was afraid that there was a constant endeavour on the part of the Military Authorities at the Horse Guards, or in command, to arrogate to themselves additional powers which could not be gauged by any precise or definite words in the Act. He would, therefore, ask his right hon. and learned Friend the Judge Advocate General in this case to be a little more frank, and if there was any necessity for these powers to let the Committee know the reason. What was the mischief that had arisen? What was the right hon. and learned Gentleman afraid of; and what was it that he desired to correct?

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (MR. OSBORNE MORGAN) said, that his hon. and learned Friend must know that cases constantly arose in which orders were required to be signed by a superior officer, where it was exceedingly inconvenient that there should not be some power under which such orders might be signed by other persons properly deputed to sign them. The Act of 1881 recognized the necessity for some such power of delegation, and the 171st section provided that the power should exist in cases where it was authorized by the custom of the Service. But under the clause, as it now stood in the Army Act, all kinds of questions arose as to what the custom of the Service was. For instance, the custom of the Service in this country was one thing, while the custom of the Service in India might be another; and it was to put an end to any sort of ambiguity that it was proposed to insert this clause. The result would be that some things which were now left to custom would be regulated by rules; but those rules were always laid before Parliament. He trusted that the hon. and gallant Member for Galway (Colonel Nolan) would not put the Committee to the trouble of a division. He could as-

sure the Committee that the object of the Government in framing the Bill was simply to remove the doubt and ambiguity which now existed, and it was hoped that by this clause they would be removed.

MR. MOLLOY asked if the rules dealt with by the clause were in existence and were printed?

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN): No; but they will be laid on the Table when framed.

MR. MOLLOY: When?

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN): As speedily as possible.

MR. WARTON said, he was inclined to think they ought not to pass this clause. It was certainly desirable that they should see what the rules were before they delegated the power of putting them in force to anybody. He was afraid that the object of drawing up the clause in its present shape was to prevent adverse criticism upon it; and he must say that the right hon. and learned Gentleman in charge of the Bill was pressing it through the House in a cumbrous and roundabout way. If he understood the right hon. and learned Gentleman rightly, some inconvenience had arisen under the 171st section of the Army Act, and a doubt now prevailed as to what the custom of the Service was, and, therefore, according to the view of the right hon. and learned Gentleman, it was expedient that they should tack on to the custom of the Service all kinds of rules which might be made under Section 70 of the Act. Now, it seemed to him (Mr. Warton), putting altogether aside any question as to the desirability of the change, that if the object of the right hon. and learned Gentleman was to give to precedents already established in the Army the force of regulations "according to the custom of the Service," that was all very well; but if it was necessary to give effect to any new rules or changes, it was desirable that the Committee should first understand what those new rules or changes would be. It was quite evident that, as the Act now stood, all rules in accordance with the custom of the Service were provided for, and that a general power of action was reserved under the custom of the Service. But what they were now asked to do was to give the force and sanction of law to rules that were not now in accordance with the custom of the Service. He would ask the Committee to refer to the Act itself. It was exceedingly difficult to understand the effect of the proposed Amendment without looking back to several sections. Section 70 related to the convening and constitution of courts martial; to the mode of proceeding adopted in trials by court martial; in confirmation of the sentence of a court martial; the manner in which the sentence of a court martial was to be carried into effect; together with the forms and orders of a court martial involving penal servitude or imprisonment. It would, therefore, be seen that various matters had to be prescribed. In getting rid of the Mutiny Act, and substituting the Army Act, they had gone through a considerable number of provisions in order to frame a comprehensive and carefully-considered measure, and yet every year they found it necessary to vary the Act by making alterations and amendments. The effect of the present clause would be to make all those matters which were the most important that could possibly arise in connection with the discipline of the Army, subject to rules which might hereafter be made from time to time. What security had they as to the satisfactory character of those rules? The only security they had for their being brought to the knowledge of Parliament at all was that they were to be contained in a Proclamation issued while Parliament was sitting, or, if Parliament was not sitting, as soon after as practicable. He thought it was a scandalous defect that important rules, having the full force of law, which were required to be laid before Parliament, should not be laid upon the Table of the House and printed in advance, so that hon. Members might have a full opportunity of considering them before they assumed the force of law. So long as the present unsystematic and slovenly method was pursued, there would not be the slightest security that Parliament would ever be really made acquainted with Papers laid upon the Table of the House while Parliament was sitting; and, of course, with regard to Papers presented when Parliament was not sitting, there could not be any security that they would ever receive discusssion at all. He would

always raise his voice against so vicious a principle. He was afraid that Government Departments were too lazy to see that what ought to be done really was done, and he feared that there would be hereafter the same indifference displayed as heretofore, and that rules would be passed vitally affecting the interests of the Army without being laid upon the Table of the House when Parliament was sitting. This was a most important matter, because it involved questions in which the lives and liberties of their soldiers were at stake. He thought the Government could not be too careful how they amended the existing law, and certainly the Committee would do well to pause before consenting to the introduction into the Army Act of such loose and slipshod words as "according to rules made under such and such an Act." He should be glad to learn whether the right hon. and learned Gentleman in charge of the Bill had any idea of the extent and effect of the custom of the Service? The right hon. and learned Gentleman either had or he had not. If he had, let him consolidate those customs, and give to them, if they were reasonable, the force of law; but if he did not know what they were, it would be better, in the interests of the soldier, to leave the matter as it stood, rather than aggravate it by adding words that were still more vague and indefinite.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON confessed that he could not understand the object of the Amendment. In 1879, after a long discussion, the House gave Her Majesty discretion to frame rules, if those rules were signed by the Secretary of State for War, or one of the Secretaries of State, and on being so signed they were to have all the force of an Act of Parliament. It was then provided in the 1st clause of the Act that anything done, or power given, or jurisdiction conferred by any Act to any person holding a military position, or to any other person exercising power in connection with the Service, should have the force of law. Was it necessary then to say that rules might be made for conducting the Military Service when Parliament had already provided that there should be power to make rules, if those rules were signed by the Secretary of State? He could not understand what further authority was necessary for making such rules. The power was given in 1879, and was re-enacted in 1881, so that it had already the full force of law, and he did not see why it was necessary to add any further provision upon the matter.

COLONEL NOLAN wished to say a word by way of explanation. The hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) seemed to think that it was only a soldier who would suffer under this clause; but he would remind the Committee that in troublous times, such as those which occurred in the Reign of James II., a civilian might be brought under military law, and be legally murdered. In such times martial law might be proclaimed, and that would bring all classes of persons within the power and authority of the military courts whether they happened to be soldiers or civilians. As the law now stood certain powers were conferred upon courts martial; but it was now proposed to delegate those powers even in cases of life and death. With a great deal of trouble they had constituted courts martial after a certain fashion, and they had insisted that officers of a certain rank should sit upon them. They had provided that no person should sit upon a court martial who did not hold a responsible position in Her Majesty's Service. By the amendment already in the Army Act, they had given power to delegate this authority "according to the custom of the Service," and in that way they might intrust a subaltern and two non-commissioned officers with the power of sentencing a man to death. That was bad enough under military law; but as the law now stood they were bound to follow the custom of the Service, and they could only follow precedents already established by the military courts. If, however, they passed the present clause to amend the 171st section of the Army Act, they might have martial law in the country with a subaltern presiding over a court martial with far less responsibility than any senior officer now possessed. The Legislature had already changed the whole power and jurisdiction of the officers of the Army, and had substituted the authority of a subaltern by an amendment already in the Act; but he believed that that amendment had slipped in unnoticed and without its real effect being understood. It was now sought to get rid of the only safeguard left—namely, the custom of the

Service. His own opinion was that the custom of the Service did provide a very important safeguard, because no officer acting upon a court martial would be safe in going against the custom of the Service. They were now, however, going to draw up entirely new Military Articles. No doubt the Judge Advocate General would not be prepared to endorse any provision that was positively bad; but he was undoubtedly extending the power of delegation much further, and was allowing any Military Authority either in England or Ireland still further to amend the existing rules and regulations, and whatever rules were framed hereafter nobody would be responsible for them. The House of Commons would have given power to somebody else to draw up rules, and the Military Authorities who had heretofore exercised the right of establishing precedents might now delegate their powers to other officers all over the Empire, and the consequence might be that the most atrocious acts might be perpetrated with impunity. He looked upon the clause as involving a very important and dangerous concession; and he was afraid, that at the present moment, the Government were delegating responsibility in a most insidious manner.

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN) said, his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Warton) asked where this power was given. It was given by Section 171, which the Bill sought to amend by authorizing rules which would allow the power to be delegated in cases where it was found desirable to do so. It was now the practice for the Chief of the Staff to act in certain cases for his commanding officer; but doubt had arisen as to whether "the custom of the Service" extended to some of those cases, and the question had presented itself as to whether that doubt should be removed. As to the fear expressed by the hon. Member that the rules might defeat the Act, if he looked at Section 70, he would find a provision that—

"No rule shall contain anything contrary to or inconsistent with the provisions of this Act."

He would remind the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel Nolan) that the object of the Amendment was to prevent the exercise of the very despotic power of which he complained. It should be borne in mind that the case which had been cited from Jamaica occurred, not under military, but under martial law, which was the negation of all law.

MR. HOPWOOD pointed out that the commanding officer might proceed either under the custom of the Service or under the rules; in other words, he might proceed against the custom of the Service. That was the plain construction of the wording. His right hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Osborne Morgan) had proved that in order to put in these words it was necessary to enact them by this Bill. But no one had any doubt about that. What the Committee wanted to have from him was the proof of the necessity for enacting them. As the hon. and gallant Member (Colonel Nolan) had pointed out, they wanted to know what safeguard there was to be in giving this enormous power to somebody to frame rules in future after the matter had gone beyond the supervision of the House of Commons. His right hon. and learned Friend said they could not frame rules contrary to the provisions of the Act. There was no question about that; but the proposal was enormously to enlarge the powers of the Act, and it was therefore no safeguard to be told that in the rules nothing could be enacted contrary to the provisions of the Act. If the Committee agreed to the provision in Section 70, he said it would be giving their sanction to a class of legislation of which there had been already a good deal too much—namely, legislation which allowed changes to be made in the rules prescribed by Acts of Parliament so that men who wanted to be governed by the law, as expressed in the Statutes, found that they were not governed in that way. He said that the men should have a copy of these rules, which at present they could not obtain, although they were hinted at in this Bill. He was in favour of his hon. and gallant Friend's proposal to leave out this clause altogether.

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN) said, that the rules framed must be laid before Parliament.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON said, "custom of the Service" was a very vague and indefinite term. For instance, the custom of the Service was very different from what it was when he entered the Army. There seemed to him to be some truth in the prediction

of Mr. Fox, in 1788, that the Mutiny Act, like Aaron's rod, would swallow all the laws of the country.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, the right hon. and learned Gentleman referred to the Act as evidence of the fact that besides the Mutiny Act there were the Articles of War. He appeared to think that the Military Authorities had *carte blanche* to deal with matters relating to courts martial, penal servitude punishments, and so forth; but, as a matter of fact, all those things had been precisely regulated for many years past by the existing regulations. The comments of the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) were directed against the words of the Bill as they stood, and the Amendment of the hon. and gallant Member for Galway (Colonel Nolan) was intended to remove the very ground of objection which he urged. As the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite (Sir Alexander Gordon) had just said, there was something very vague in the term "custom of the Service," and while nothing more definite was allowed to be introduced a soldier would frequently be in a state of uncertainty as to what the law could do, and what, as a prisoner, he was liable to; but by making fixed rules and orders his liberty would be protected, by safeguarding the power of officers in a way in which it could not be safeguarded by the words "custom of the Service."

MR. HARRINGTON said, his hon. Friend was under the impression that this alteration in the clause was necessary for the purpose of safeguarding the soldier and regulating the procedure of commanding officers. The right hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Osborne Morgan) said the clause was only meant to deal with specific cases of doubt which might arise; that it was not meant for the purpose of defining the term "custom of the Service," but for pointing out how the custom of the Service might be applied. It seemed to him (Mr. Harrington) that it would only be dealing fairly with the Committee if those specific cases were set forth, and then there would be no discussion except on the specific provisions. But here the Committee were told that because there was some doubt as to whether the wording of the Act applied to a particular case, this clause was introduced. He thought it would be better to embody in the Bill the rules, or at least to point out what were the cases not covered by the original wording.

MR. TOMLINSON asked if the rules had been already framed?

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN) said, that certain rules had already been framed under the Act, and were to be seen in the Library. They were made under Section 70 of that Act.

MR. TOMLINSON asked if the rules referred to by the right hon. and learned Gentleman were still in force; whether all the rules became applicable under Section 171; and whether it was the intention of the Government during the present Session to frame rules and lay them upon the Table of the House at such time as would give an opportunity of discussing their bearing on the position of the soldier?

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON asked if the rules referred to by the right hon. and learned Gentleman had really been laid on the Table of the House?

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN) said, if the hon. and gallant Gentleman would go into the Library he would find the rules there.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON said, that being in the Library was not the same as their being on the Table of the House.

MR. WARTON said, he should like to hear from the right hon. and learned Gentleman some distinct statement as to the cases which had occurred to warrant this alteration. Were there two, three, four, or five, or was doubt expressed merely to cover the introduction of the clause?

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN), speaking from memory, mentioned one case in which, in the absence of the Commander-in-Chief in India on an official tour, it was doubted whether, under the custom of the Service, his power to sign an order for removal could be delegated, and much inconvenience had arisen in consequence.

MR. WARTON said, he objected to the provision on the ground that it would allow delegation in every shape and form on every possible occasion.

MR. MOLLOY said, the question, which the right hon. and learned Gentleman seemed to have misunderstood,

was this—were the rules referred to now in existence, or were they rules to be made hereafter?

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN) said, the rules to which the Bill referred had not been made. Like those to which he had before referred as having been already made, they would be framed under the 70th section.

MR. MOLLOY said, he had asked his hon. Friend near him, and he said he could not understand from the right hon. and learned Gentlemen's answers whether the rules were to be made or not. He now understood that further rules were to be made under this section of the Bill.

COLONEL NOLAN said, that when the right hon. and learned Gentleman spoke about the power to be given, he said nothing about the jurisdiction which followed immediately upon it. It was on the ground that the constitution of courts martial would be changed that he objected to the powers being changed. He thought the Judge Advocate General might accept his Amendment with some alteration. If the word "jurisdiction" did not apply to courts martial, and was only used for the purpose of convenience, his suggestion would give the Judge Advocate General what he wanted, and, at the same time, provide protection against those rules being made. The future had to be considered in this matter. They had at the present time an excellent Judge Advocate General, who would not allow anything wrong to be done; but in the event of another Ministry coming into Office, under the power to make new rules, they might, perhaps, have the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) introducing a variety of changes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Question is that the clause stand part of the Bill. If there is any Amendment to be proposed, the hon. and gallant Member must bring it forward in the form of a new clause.

COLONEL NOLAN: The proper course, I suppose, will be to divide against the clause, and then bring up a new clause?

MR. HOPWOOD: Would it not be as well to add the words "Provided that" at the end of the clause? That would give the hon. and gallant Member an opportunity to move his Amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: As I have pointed out to the Committee, the Question now before it is, "That this Clause stand part of the Bill." No Amendment can now be moved to it, and whatever any hon. Member wishes to add must come up in the form of a new clause.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 43; Noes 23: Majority 20.—(Div. List, No. 82.)

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 7 (Amendment of s. 172. of 44 & 45 Vict. c. 58, as to the signing of orders in relation to prisoners).

MR. WARTON said, he should like to ask a question of the right hon. and learned Gentleman in charge of the Bill as to this clause. If he remembered right, last year, when Amendments to the Army Act were proposed, the sections it was proposed to alter were given in the Paper *in extenso*. That was done in the case of the last clause, and he should like to know why they did not proceed in the same way right through the whole Bill? It would facilitate the discussion of a measure such as this if one uniform system were pursued. He should like to know why, in the case of the last Amendment, they had set out the whole clause it was proposed to alter, and in the present case had only set out a part of the section?

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN): We have adopted this course simply for the sake of brevity. Section 171 is contained in four lines, therefore the whole of it was given; but Section 172 contains between 40 and 50 lines. It was thought advisable to save space by giving the effect, instead of the words, of the latter section.

MR. WARTON said, he could quite understand the object in view in giving merely the substance of some of these sections; but why were not the Government consistent in their endeavours to save printing and space? He saw that they had put down the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill on the Paper for Monday—a proceeding which would involve an enormous amount of printing, looking at the many pages of Amendments—when they had promised not to go on with it until after Easter.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 8 *agreed to.*

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON said, he wished to move the Amendment standing in his name to amend Section 81 of the Act of 1881. His object was to make recruiting less irksome to the class of people from whom recruits came. Before 1879 the law stood thus. When a recruit enlisted he was not attested or sworn in until the lapse of 24 hours; at the expiration of 24 hours he was taken before a Justice of the Peace, who was not allowed to be an officer of the Army, in order to be sworn in; and, even then, if the recruit changed his mind, he had the privilege of being able to get out of his engagement by paying £1 smart-money. It often happened that a young lad was induced to enlist over a glass or two of beer or some other excitement. It might be he was the main or sole support of aged parents, or of a widowed mother, and that his friends did not wish him to leave. He had the privilege of being able to buy himself off for £1. When, however, the law was changed, the Government did away with that privilege and made the law such that when a man enlisted, say in the street, he could be taken into the barracks close by and within half-an-hour sworn in as a soldier, not by a civilian magistrate, but by the Colonel of the regiment—who, of course, would be anxious to get recruits—and then there would be no possibility of his getting off except by paying £10 within the first three months of enlistment. Let the Committee weigh that in their minds, considering also the class of people from whom the recruits came. Recruiting officers had told him that it frequently happened that a young lad came to them and said—"I have £8 or £9; to-morrow is the last day of the three months; I cannot get the remainder; let me off—I do not want to be a soldier." But under the Act the officer had not power to remit a single 1*s.* If hon. Members would look at the Report with regard to recruiting laid before them within the past few months, they would see that no less than 1,751 lads had last year paid the £10 in the three months following the date of enlistment in order to leave the Army—they would be able to form some opinion from that as to how many would have left if they had been able to obtain the money. Those who would have got away if they could must have been double or treble as many. Since the Act was passed in 1879 no fewer than 7,649 recruits had paid the £10 within the first three months of enlistment to get away from the Army. In this country they prided themselves upon having a Volunteer Army, and thought that a Volunteer Army meant a willing Army. But had all those 1,751 been willing recruits, and if they had been unable to raise the £10, would they have made willing soldiers? He maintained that it was unwise on the part of the Government to compel men to remain in the Army if, directly after entering it, they desired to leave it. He proposed to give those who were dissatisfied greater facilities for leaving by reducing the amount necessary to buy a recruit off from £10 to £5. Even £5 would be a great tax upon the class of people from whom the recruits came. As he had said, another change had been effected in the law. The Act of 1879 had also provided that a military officer should be the authority for swearing in a recruit, and he could not help thinking that that was a very unwise arrangement. However, the matter was a small one, and he did not propose to change the law. He mentioned the point to show the hardship on the class of persons from whom recruits came, in having the recruits sworn in so rapidly and by persons interested in the Army.

THE CHAIRMAN: I notice a blank in the Amendment. What does that mean?

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON said, it would be for the Committee to fill in the blank.

New Clause—

(Purchase of discharge by recruit.)

"Whereas, by section eighty-one of the Army Act, 1881, a recruit who, under certain circumstances therein mentioned, pays a sum not exceeding ten pounds for the use of Her Majesty within months after the date of his attestation, is entitled to be discharged from the Army with all convenient speed.

And whereas it is expedient that recruits who are unwilling to remain in the Army should be able to purchase their discharge without the payment of so large a sum as ten pounds: Be it therefore enacted as follows:—

In section eighty-one of the Army Act, 1881, the word 'five' shall be substituted for the word 'ten' in line 3,"—(*Sir Alexander Gordon,*)

—*brought up,* and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN) said, the matter was very fully considered in 1879, and £10 was then decided upon by the Secretary of State for War as a sort of rough estimate of the amount a recruit who left the Service at the end of a month or two would have cost the country. As a matter of fact, a recruit who left at the end of three months cost more than that—somewhere about £15. If they allowed recruits to leave the Army on payment of £5 after having been in it three months, they would inflict a loss upon the country of £10 in each case, and would be turning the Army into a huge system of outdoor relief for loafers. It was not desirable that they should enable men to enter the Army for a lark, and allow them to leave it the moment they got tired of it, regardless of the cost they put the country to.

COLONEL NOLAN said, that the right hon. and learned Gentleman's arguments upon legal questions were always sound; but this was not a legal question. It was a question of general policy, and the right hon. and learned Gentleman had not that knowledge of it that he had upon matters of law—to which knowledge hon. Members always bowed. The right hon. and learned Gentleman was such a master of reference that upon legal grounds they could not follow him. The first argument used against the new clause was that a man who was in the Army three months cost the country £15. Well, he (Colonel Nolan) denied that this money was lost to the country—that was to say, that the country got no return for it. The country got a good deal out of such a man. It was an advantage to it that there should be an additional man amongst the population with three months' drill. Such a man would always be useful in time of emergency—in the event of an invasion, for instance, or when they were engaged in a great war. What would not France have given for a number of such men in her hour of need? The right hon. and learned Gentleman told them that the reduction of this payment would render the Army a huge system of outdoor relief. Did he mean to say that any man who wanted to get outdoor relief would pay £5 and go through the most disagreeable work imaginable? The life of a recruit was by means an enviable one. Standing upon one leg for half-an-hour at a time was not a pleasant operation; and though the duty of an old soldier was not very unpleasant, he doubted whether any Member of the Committee would care about going through the drill to which young recruits were subjected. He thought, therefore, that the arguments of the right hon. and learned Gentleman fell to the ground. He (Colonel Nolan) supported the clause moved by the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for East Aberdeenshire (Sir Alexander Gordon), because he believed that if they were to have a Volunteer system of soldiering they should pay the soldier his market price. He had always contended in that House that the soldier was not paid his market price. If they could catch soldiers like Sergeant Pike, no doubt they could get them below the market price. Men who joined the Army for a freak or for fancy were not always fit for it, and the Government ought rather to smooth the way for them to come out than to render it difficult. He would not allow them to come out for nothing, but he certainly thought that £5 would be enough to charge them. There was another argument of the Judge Advocate General which deserved notice. ["Oh, oh!"] If hon. Members did not care to sit longer, he was quite prepared to move to report Progress. He wanted to point out that the country was a great deal worse off than it was in 1879, and that it was much harder now for a man to get £5 than to get £10 then. That appeared to him to be a good reason why the sum should be lowered; indeed, there were very many reasons why they should adopt the suggestion of the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for East Aberdeenshire (Sir Alexander Gordon).

COLONEL O'BEIRNE pointed out that when a soldier enlisted he understood he was to get free rations and a free kit. He got nothing of the sort. He was required to pay 4*d.* a-day for rations, a sum which he never expected to have to pay. He (Colonel O'Beirne) thought the State owed the soldier £10, instead of the soldier owing the State that amount. Men did not enlist on the supposition that they would have to pay for their food and their underclothing.

Mr. HOPWOOD said, that without wishing to be disrespectful to the right hon. and learned Gentleman in charge of the Bill (Mr. Osborne Morgan), he would venture to appeal to the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War (the Marquess of Hartington) to settle this matter for them. This was not a matter merely of drafting, but of policy. A good many hon. Members thought that £5 was the utmost the country ought to drag out of the family of a scapegrace or a lad who, perhaps, in a moment of pique, was got hold of by the recruiting sergeant, and, for the time, nailed to Her Majesty's Service. Was it to the interest of the country that it should take an unwilling recruit? Imagine a few of such men standing side by side with their real soldiers in the Soudan. What could be expected of them? They hated the Service; they would like to get out of it. Perhaps if they found themselves face to face with the Arabs they would turn out patriotic; but was it not right that the country should ask that her soldiers should be willing ones? Imagine a young man entering the Service for a lark. A young fellow was certainly mistaken if he thought the Service was a lark. The early stages of the drill was anything but a comfortable process; there was a great deal of knocking about and hard work. Even if young fellows did enter the Army for a lark, was not a £5 penalty enough to pay for it? The £5 did not come out of the man's pocket; it was wrung from his relatives who were anxious about him. He (Mr. Hopwood) ventured to submit to the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War that a £5 penalty was sufficiently large to secure the Service against reckless enlistment, while, at the same time, it would secure the Service against unwilling recruits.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, he only wished to point out to the Committee that the arguments by which this clause had been supported were perfectly inconsistent, or, rather, no one who had supported the clause had done so on the same ground on which it was proposed by the hon. and gallant Member (Sir Alexander Gordon). The hon. and gallant Gentleman proposed the clause on the ground that, in his opinion, many men enlisted when they were under the influence of drink and did not know what they were really doing, or, at any rate, at a moment of excitement, and that, therefore, £10 was a great deal too much to be paid for their discharge. If what the hon. and gallant Gentleman stated were a fact, he (the Marquess of Hartington) thought that not only £10, but £5, would be too much to pay for a discharge. Anyone who would take the trouble to investigate the process which was to be gone through in order to make an enlistment binding would find that a man had plenty of time to realize what he was doing. When a man had been in the Service a few months he had certainly cost the country £10; and why, simply because he found he had made a mistake and he preferred some other profession, should the country lose that amount? It appeared to him (the Marquess of Hartington) that if a man desired to change his profession after he had been some time in the Service, he ought to be called upon to pay something approaching the sum he had cost the country before he got his discharge.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, it appeared to him the proposition was none the worse because it could be supported with good arguments from a number of different points of view. It was true that hon. Members were in favour of the proposal of the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Sir Alexander Gordon) for different reasons; but one reason had not been mentioned by anyone who had addressed the Committee, and it appeared to him a very good one. It was that one of the most palpable effects of the present system of recruiting was to retain unwilling soldiers in the ranks and to increase immensely the number of desertions, especially in the first three months of service. It was perfectly well known that of the men who rejoined after desertion in the first three months hardly one of them made a good soldier. He questioned very much whether it was an economical proceeding to retain in the ranks unwilling soldiers. When a soldier was discontented, and found himself, as he considered, entrapped in the Service under false pretences, he got into bad books. Every entry in the Regimental Defaulters' Book delayed his good conduct pay, and from the outset he became a man whose whole prospect in the regiment was blighted. There used to be a system of making a

man pay smart-money, if after enlistment he wanted to withdraw within 72 hours. The amount was £1, and he could not see why that penalty should not be continued. He quite agreed with the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) that if £10 was too much, £5 was also too much; that the same argument which could be urged against £10 could be urged against £5. He (Mr. A. O'Connor) would even do away with a £5 penalty. The records of courts martial, which the Judge Advocate General (Mr. Osborne Morgan) would have had in his hand, showed that a very large number of the men tried by court martial were men who had got into trouble in the first three months of the service. If hon. Members turned to the Annual Statement of the British Army, they found a very large proportion indeed—the great majority—of desertions occurred in the first three months of service. It was perfectly hopeless to make a decent soldier of a man who got into bad books almost immediately he joined the Army. He (Mr. A. O'Connor) was, therefore, favourable to the sum payable on discharge being fixed at £2. Some years ago, when the sum to be paid was £20, a most ridiculous system existed. Formerly, the parents or relatives would pay the £20, and then if the man took it into his head to re-enlist half the amount was given to him. That had been altered, and now the person who paid the liberation money got half of it back if the man re-enlisted. It must be borne in mind that the fine very seldom came out of the pocket of the soldier himself; generally it came out of the pocket of some woman—the man's mother, or the woman to whom he was engaged to be married. He (Mr. A. O'Connor) was quite certain the Service was all the better for being free of unwilling recruits.

MR. SEXTON said, the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War (the Marquess of Hartington) rather made it a subject of reproach against those who supported this proposal that their arguments were not identical. He did not think the arguments of the Judge Advocate General (Mr. Osborne Morgan) and the noble Marquess were so identical as to entitle the latter to reproach the supporters of the proposed clause with the variety of their arguments. Indeed, the arguments of the Judge Advocate General were neither identical or consistent with each other, because he said that people should not be allowed to join the Army for a lark, and then he said the Army should not be made a place or resort for loafers. Those people who perpetrated larks were of a very different class to loafers, and, generally speaking, men were not disposed to pay so high a price for a lark as the price of a discharge from the Army. What attraction had the Army for a loafer? There was plenty of drill and hard work. It was said a recruit cost the country in the first three months a certain sum of money. It was well, however, he (Mr. Sexton) should remind the Committee that the process of enlistment was a very brief one. A young fellow who had got into trouble, or who had a fit of drinking, or who was under the influence of passion, or who had fallen out with his people at home, could easily go through the process of enlistment in half-an-hour. Surely the noble Marquess would admit that a man might do in half-an-hour many things he might regret afterwards. Upon the economical point of view, the objection he had to take to the speech of the noble Marquess was that he did what was a very common thing in argument—namely, took an exceptionally extreme case. The noble Marquess said that in three months a recruit cost the country about £10. Surely a recruit who changed his mind did so long before three months had elapsed. The probability was that the man who was dissatisfied with the Service would want to get out of it within a week; his family would certainly make an effort to induce him to leave the Service before a fortnight was at an end; so that, instead of the State having spent £5 or £10 on him, the extent of the outlay was not more than 10*s.* or 15*s.* On what principle did the Authorities wish to get recruits for the Army? Did they want men who were unwilling soldiers, or did they want men who joined the Service in the exercise of their better judgment? He should certainly support the proposal of the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for East Aberdeenshire (Sir Alexander Gordon); indeed, he would support any Motion for the reduction of the payment on discharge, because he maintained that as long as they continued the law as at present, it was a

farce to call their system one of voluntary enlistment.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON said, that at present a man might be walked into barracks, and within half-an-hour sworn in as a soldier. From that moment he could not obtain his release without paying £10. The noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War (the Marquess of Hartington) spoke of the cost of a recruit to the country in pay and allowances during the first three months. He (Sir Alexander Gordon) did not complain of the estimate made, but he did complain that the smart of £1 within 24 hours had been taken away since 1879. He wanted something like an equivalent to be given back. He did not now say whether the payment on discharge should be a small sum for a short time and a larger sum for a long time; but he hoped that the noble Marquess would consider the question before the next Army Act, with a view, if possible, of restoring that which was for a whole century the privilege of the people of the country —namely, the privilege of paying a smart of £1 within 24 hours in order to obtain their release from Army service.

MR. WARTON said, that although the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War said that this proposal had been supported on different grounds, he did not take the pains to specify those grounds; probably they had already escaped his memory. Now, the hon. Gentleman the Member for Queen's County (Mr. A. O'Connor) had advanced a very powerful argument which had not yet been met by anyone on the Treasury Bench, and that was that in many cases desertion was the result of too high a figure for discharge. He (Mr. Warton) had not the honour to be a soldier; but another argument suggested itself to his mind, and it was that if there was a low sum for discharge many men would enter the Army to see whether they cared for it as a profession. Many men, no doubt, would find they were fit for the Army, and therefore the Service would actually gain. In his opinion, many good men were lost to the Service on account of the figure of discharge being too high. His suggestion appeared to him a very rational one, and he would like to know whether there was any answer to it?

MR. KENNY said, he thought the Committee would generally recognize that the attitude of Her Majesty's Government in the matter was extremely unreasonable and exceedingly obstinate. A good case had been made out by the hon. and gallant Member for East Aberdeenshire (Sir Alexander Gordon), whose knowledge upon matters of this kind was second to that of no hon. Member of the House. The proposal of the hon. and gallant Member was also supported by every military man in the House, and by everyone who had had the slightest experience of the Army. Surely, then, the circumstances were such as to deserve the fullest consideration at the hands of the Government. Even if they were not prepared to accept, in full, the Amendment proposed by the hon. and gallant Gentleman, some modification of it might be entertained. The argument of the Government seemed to be this—that at the end of three months' service a man who enlisted into the Army had cost the country something like £10. If that were so, there was an easy way of meeting the matter. If a man repented within two months after having enlisted and wished to leave the Army, he ought at least to be allowed to obtain his discharge on the payment of the sum of £5. There could be no objection to a provision of that nature. He was afraid that at that hour of the morning (2.45) Her Majesty's Government were not in a position to consider the subject dispassionately. They seemed to be to a greater or less extent piqued at the attention which the provisions of the Bill had received at the hands of the Committee; and the consideration which had been raised by hon. Members, most of them possessing a wide experience of Army questions, did not appear to commend itself to the Treasury Bench, or to be met in anything like a conciliatory spirit. He did not know whether the suggestion he had made would receive the approval of the Government, or even of the hon. and gallant Gentleman who had moved the Amendment; but he certainly thought that it was one which deserved consideration; and in order to give the Government time to consider it, in connection with the Amendment moved by the hon. and gallant Gentleman, he would move to report Progress. There could be no advantage to the

country in retaining an unwilling and discontented recruit in the ranks of the Army.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Kenny,*)—put, and *negatived.*

Question put, "That the Clause be read a second time."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 22; Noes 42: Majority 20.—(Div. List, No. 83.)

MR. SEXTON moved the following new clause:—

"Whereas it is important that the liability of a soldier or marine to maintain his wife and children should be real and better defined, and it is expedient to provide for the same; Be it therefore enacted as follows:—That section one hundred and forty-five of the Army Act, 1881, shall be construed as though all the words after the words 'commanding officer of such soldier,' in sub-section three, were omitted."

The hon. Member said, that a few words would suffice to explain the clause, which was not brought forward now for the first time. The object of it was to make more clear the liability of a soldier to maintain his wife and children. The Army Act of 1881 said that the liability should be the same as if he were not a soldier; but the rest of the Act entirely falsified that assumption by the exceptional provisions which it laid down. An Amendment was consented to by the Government, at his instance, two years ago, the Secretary of State having consented, in the case of a sergeant, to make an allowance up to 6*d.* a-day, and in the case of a private up to 3*d.* a-day; but it was also within the power of the Secretary of State to reduce the allowance to the very smallest coin of the Realm, even as low as ½*d.* per day. He did not propose, however, to press any objection now upon that point; but he would be content to trust to the method in which the Secretary of State was prepared to administer the clause. Perhaps, next year, if he found that the administration was unsatisfactory, he would move an Amendment. The immediate object of the clause was to make the liability of the soldier to provide for his wife and children to be what the clause declared it to be—namely, the same as if the man were not a soldier. At present, when a woman went before the Board of Guardians, in order to obtain support from her husband, if he happened to be a soldier, however poor she was, she was required to deposit a sum of money sufficient to pay for the removal of the soldier from the place at which he was quartered to the place of hearing and back again. Sometimes the sum required to be so deposited amounted to £2 or £3, and was such a sum as a poor woman, in a state of poverty and distress, was not in a position to provide. If the case were that of a civilian, all that would be necessary would be simply to serve a summons, and the defendant, wherever he happened to be, would be required to answer the charge against him, and to pay his own expenses to the Court. If he failed to do that, a warrant would be issued for his arrest. It could not, therefore, be contended that a soldier was treated in the same way as a civilian, when he was able, in numerous instances, owing to the impossibility of the deposit money being raised by the woman, to evade the charge against him. It was certainly absurd to require a woman, who was in an abject state of penury, to forward to the regiment a sum of money sufficient to cover the soldier's expenses to the place of hearing and back again. He might be quartered, at the time, at the most distant military station in Ireland, and the retention of this provision simply meant that the equity of the woman's claim was not to be investigated. Seeing that the country was spending many millions a-year upon the Army, the additional cost involved in his proposal would be an inappreciable trifle. If the claim made by the woman turned out to be an improper one, the Board of Guardians, at whose instance the summons would be issued, would have to pay the costs in the ordinary way, so that no real loss would fall upon the Public Exchequer. In the ordinary case of a civilian, the accused was required to appear in Court and answer the summons, paying out of his own pocket the expenses that were necessary to take him there. All that he asked of the Government was that they would make the clause what it professed to be—namely, that the liability of the man should be the same as if he were not a soldier. He did not think that even a possibility of being ordered out of the country for foreign service should be allowed to prevent the man from answering the

charge. He was aware that the present was not a favourable moment for making this claim; but right and justice ought to be exactly the same, whether there was the prospect of a foreign war or not. He believed that, on the average, about 800 of these orders were made in the course of the year, so that there was no probability of the compulsory attendance of the soldier at the Court of hearing, affecting the fighting efficiency of the Army. When such a claim was made—and it must be borne in mind that it would have to be investigated, in the first instance, by the Board of Guardians—the soldier ought to be required to meet it. No civilian was allowed to plead any other engagement, no matter what urgent or important duties he might have undertaken, either for the Queen or the Realm. No other engagement was allowed to stand in the way, but he was bound to answer the summons; and all that he (Mr. Sexton) asked was that the soldier should be compelled to obey the summons also, and that not even orders for foreign service should enable him to evade his liability. If Her Majesty's Government insisted now upon retaining the clause in its present shape, it was very certain that in the next Parliament, when the new franchise came into operation, they would not be able to maintain it.

New Clause,—

(Liability of soldier to maintain wife and children.)

"Whereas it is important that the liability of a soldier or marine to maintain his wife and children should be real and better defined, and it is expedient to provide for the same; Be it therefore enacted as follows:—

That section one hundred and forty-five of the Army Act, 1881, shall be construed as though all the words after the words 'commanding officer of such soldier,' in sub-section three, were omitted,"—(*Mr. Sexton,*)

—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN) said, the hon. Member had stated very fairly that a married soldier had certain duties to perform to his wife and family; but he had also certain duties to perform to the country and the Queen, and the difficulty was to reconcile these conflicting duties. Under the old Mutiny Act, no soldier leaving his wife and children was subject to any liability at all. That state of things was altered by Lord Cardwell in 1873, and two years ago a further Amendment was introduced by himself, at the instance of the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton). It was not correct to say that the Amendment was illusory, for, as a matter of fact, whenever a competent Court decided that a soldier was liable to maintain his wife and children, the Secretary of State always arranged that a certain portion of his pay should be stopped and set aside for the use of the wife and children.

MR. SEXTON said, the knowledge that that was the fact was the reason why he had not moved an Amendment to that effect.

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN) said, the present Amendment of the hon. Member would not touch that point at all; and he thought the hon. Member had somewhat misapprehended the effect the Amendment would have. Under this section of the Army Act there were two cases in which a reduction of the soldier's pay could be made. In the first place, where a maintenance order was made by a magistrate; and, secondly, where the Secretary of State was satisfied that he had deserted, without reasonable cause, his wife or legitimate children under 14 years of age. The Amendment would have no application to the second provision, under which the Secretary of State always acted in the case of a wife and legitimate children. But the Act of Parliament required that, before the soldier could be called upon to answer an affiliation summons, a sum of money sufficient to take him to the place at which the summons was to be heard and to bring him back again should be deposited. It was that provision which the hon. Member proposed to strike out of the clause. He was unable to agree to the proposal of the hon. Member for two reasons—first, because of the danger of collusion between the soldier and the woman, if the money was provided by the State; and, secondly, because of the hardship which would be inflicted on the man if, through his inability to appear for want of means, an *ex parte* order was made against him on a possibly trumped-up charge. The case of the soldier differed entirely from that of a civilian, for whereas a civilian

was a free agent, and could reside where he liked, the soldier was bound to go wheresoever he was ordered. On those grounds, which were not now put forward for the first time, he could not agree to the proposal of the hon. Member.

CAPTAIN MAXWELL-HERON said, he might perhaps be allowed to point out that the hon. Member for Sligo was mixing up in this clause two perfectly distinct questions. If the hon. Member looked into the Act he would see that the portion of it which this new clause proposed to omit embraced two totally different subjects—one, that a sum of money should be deposited in the hands of the commanding officer; the other, that no action against a soldier should be valid if process be served after such soldier was under orders for service beyond the sea. Now, it might be right to dispense with the deposit of money and yet refuse to allow the soldier to be detained on such a plea from the service of the country, because otherwise any man might get up some case against himself. Therefore, if the hon. Member wished to deal with both those provisions, he should frame one clause for the purpose of amending this section so far as the deposit of money was concerned, and another to amend the section so far as it related to the invalidity of a summons served on the soldier after he was under orders to serve his country abroad. Of course, as the Committee was now considering the Motion for the second reading of the clause, he was placed in a somewhat difficult position with regard to this question; but if the clause were read a second time, he hoped the hon. Gentleman would consent to strike out the last part of the Amendment, which ought not to be brought in contact with the other matter under consideration. He wished to know whether it was now in the power of the hon. Gentleman who brought forward the clause to limit it by omitting that portion of it which related to the service of the soldier abroad—an arrangement which would leave the Committee to deal with the question of the deposit—while the hon. Member could raise the other question on a separate clause?

THE CHAIRMAN said, the hon. and gallant Member was not in Order in proposing any Amendment to the clause until the Committee had decided to read it a second time.

MR. SEXTON said, the clause in the Act declared that the man should stand in this matter in the same position as if he were not a soldier. He proposed to take away two motives for treating him differently, one being the provision relating to foreign service, and the other the provision relating to the deposit of money. But if the Government would consider the matter, he should be willing to withdraw the clause, and bring in one which would deal with the deposit of money only. The noble Marquess might perhaps think the question too small to take any trouble about.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, he was afraid the Government could not agree to the hon. Member's proposal, for the reasons stated by his right hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Osborne Morgan). It was quite true that the number of cases occurring under the existing law was very small; but his right hon. and learned Friend had shown that the proposal, if agreed to, might open the door to the concoction of charges between soldiers and women, and then the number of cases would greatly increase. Although he recognized the spirit in which the hon. Member had proposed the omission of what he considered to be an unfair arrangement, he felt, in the absence of stronger arguments than they had heard in this discussion, that the Government could not omit the safeguard included in the Bill.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY regretted that the Government could not accept the proposal of his hon. Friend the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton). He did not think that any great difficulty could arise from the trumping up of cases which the Judge Advocate General had mentioned. Surely, such cases could not be trumped up to an extent that would make them a source of injury to the Army; and he could hardly suppose that any Board of Guardians would be so stupid as to be made an instrument for enabling soldiers to shirk duty. He was bound to say that the soldier who would trump up a case against himself would be a man whom the Army would be exceedingly well rid of. The Judge Advocate General had referred to the fact that the soldier might be compelled to leave the place where the woman lived; but because a soldier might be taken away by no act of his own, was

the woman to be left destitute? He thought they ought to have some consideration for her, because he did not think that they ought to assume that every case in which a woman was left with a child was trumped up for the purpose of shirking duty on the part of the soldier.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he wished to make a suggestion to the noble Marquess with regard to soldiers under stoppage for the maintenance of their wives and children. There were a great many good-for-nothings in the Army who were under a series of stoppages for barrack damages, loss of articles of kit, and other things, and who were sometimes brought before courts martial and fined for drunkenness. He knew of one man being sentenced to pay 3*d.* a-day, and who declared his intention of not allowing "the old girl to get anything," because the fines would absorb his pay. Now, the suggestion he had to make was that when a soldier was sentenced to pay anything for the maintenance of his wife and children, that stoppage should be made a preferential stoppage, and should be deducted in full before any others. In that way one object of his hon. Friend would be secured, because the wife would really get the maintenance money which the soldier was sentenced to pay. As the matter now stood, he believed that in many cases where the man was under stoppages the woman never got any of the money she was entitled to. If, therefore, the noble Marquess would make maintenance a preferential stoppage, a great advantage would undoubtedly be gained.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, the question should be considered.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 15; Noes 43: Majority 28.—(Div. List, No. 84.)

COLONEL NOLAN said, he wished to move another new clause—

"No rules made under this Act shall have any force to alter the constitution or procedure of any court martial as defined by the Army Act of 1881."

That would not deprive the Judge Advocate General of powers under Clause 6.

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN): I cannot accept such a clause off-hand. I will consider the matter before the third reading. I hope the hon. and gallant Member will not move the clause.

COLONEL NOLAN said, that having brought the subject under the notice of the Judge Advocate General, he would not detain the Committee any further upon it.

MR. KENNY said, he wished to move a new clause in the direction of the clause of the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for East Aberdeenshire (Sir Alexander Gordon). The hon. and gallant Member had endeavoured to reduce the sum to be paid by a recruit on leaving the Service before the expiration of three months from the date of enlistment from £10 to £5. By the present clause he (Mr. Kenny) proposed to reduce the sum to be paid by a recruit for the purchase of his discharge at any time to £3. The clause would run as follows:—

"Be it enacted that a recruit may purchase his discharge at any time from the date of his enlistment on the payment of £3."

This clause evaded the objection taken to the proposal of the hon. and gallant Member. As well as he could understand the plea of the Judge Advocate General and the noble Marquess, it was that——

MR. WARTON: I rise to Order. I wish to ask whether it is competent for the hon. Member to move this clause, seeing that it will be enacting something totally inconsistent with the 81st clause of the Act of 1881? It seems to me that the only course open to the hon. Member is to move a clause amending the section of the Act of 1881—following the precedent of the hon. and gallant Member for East Aberdeenshire (Sir Alexander Gordon).

THE CHAIRMAN: I feel that this clause is out of Order, seeing that the Committee has rejected the proposal to alter the amount to be paid by a recruit for the purchase of his discharge. The hon. Member may endeavour to bring about the alteration he desires on Report or third reading.

MR. KENNY: I will move the Amendment, then, on the third reading.

Bill *reported*, without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow*.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY REDISTRIBUTION BILL.—[BILL 105.]

(*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

MR. SEXTON said, he observed that the Bill proposed that the Lord Lieutenant might alter the free quota at the end of three years after the passing of the Act, and thereafter at each succeeding term of five years. He (Mr. Sexton) had had an opportunity of consulting the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) on the subject, and he found that the hon. Gentleman's intention in the debates which had taken place on the subject had been that the re-arrangement should be permanently triennial. He (Mr. Sexton) hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary would see his way to alter the Bill in that direction. For the convenience of hon. Members who took an interest in this subject, if the Committee stage of the Bill were fixed for a day before Easter, it should be not earlier than Monday next.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said, he had been a little at a loss to know whether the understanding was that the period at which the free quota might be altered was every three years or every five years. He had thought the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) had meant that the first alteration should be three years after the last settlement. The hon. Member opposite (Mr. Sexton) would have it this year instead of two years hence. He (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) did not see what advantage there would be in fixing the period at every three years. It would be inconvenient to disturb the arrangements so often. However, it was not a matter of much importance when it took place, provided it were decided that it should be done. He would see what could be done, and would inquire whether there was any objection to making the period every three years. He would fix the Committee stage of the Bill for Monday.

Motion *agreed to.*

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at half after Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 27th March, 1885.

MINUTES.] — *Sat First in Parliament* — The Earl of Shrewsbury and Earl Talbot, after the death of his father.

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Honorary Freedom of Boroughs * (61).

Second Reading — Tramways (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 1) * (34); Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Labourers Act) (No. 1) * (35).

Second Reading — Committee negatived — Third Reading—Consolidated Fund (No. 2) *; Cape of Good Hope (Advance) (59), and *passed.*

Committee—Educational Endowments (Ireland) * (44).

PRIVATE AND PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILLS.

Ordered, That Standing Orders Nos. 92. and 93. be suspended; and that the time for depositing petitions praying to be heard against Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills, which would otherwise expire during the adjournment of the House at Easter, be extended from this day to the first day on which the House shall sit after the recess.

PARLIAMENT—WESTMINSTER HALL (RESTORATION).—QUESTION.

LORD NORTON asked the noble Earl the First Commissioner of Works, Whether he could now inform their Lordships what the Government were doing as to the designs for the restoration of the west side of Westminster Hall?

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY said, that the treatment of the west side of Westminster Hall was now out of the hands of his Department, and for the present it had passed into the hands of a Committee of the House of Commons. When it had reported, the evidence and the drawings would be laid before that House, so that the Members could exercise a judgment upon them.

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—ARTICLES IN "THE TIMES" NEWSPAPER.

OBSERVATIONS. QUESTION.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH said, he felt it necessary to refer again

to the character of the artices in *The Times*, and to return to the charge he made the other day. The Correspondent of *The Times* in Paris had commented upon his Question and the answer of the noble Earl the other day; and yesterday *The Times* had an article in which it took upon itself to interpret the explanation of the noble Earl as being practically an admission that *The Times* was a semi-official organ. It would not matter if *The Times* did not go on almost to declare war against Russia. He was sure that if there were any truth in the suggestion that *The Times* was a semi-official organ, the noble Earl would give some indication of it. He would, therefore, ask the Foreign Secretary, Whether *The Times* had put a fair interpretation on his reply, or whether that paper was merely a commercial undertaking, which had no connection with the Government?

EARL GRANVILLE: I am rather unwilling to continue to take part in the discussion which has arisen between the noble Duke and *The Times*. I believe that what I stated the other day was that there was no doubt of the fact that for a good many years past it had been an opinion on the Continent that *The Times* either represented Her Majesty's Government or public opinion; and it may be said that under all Governments these two things are not exactly identical. I went on to say—and I gave my reasons for it—that I thought nobody would suspect me of having written or inspired the foreign articles of *The Times* during the past year. I really do not know that I have anything further to add.

CENTRAL ASIA—THE RUSSO-AFGHAN FRONTIER.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, I feel some delicacy in putting a Question to the noble Earl the Foreign Secretary; but the Easter Recess is now at hand, and it hardly seems right that the Government should let the House separate without giving, as far as it is possible to give, some indication of the precise state of things in reference to Russia. The Question I would ask the noble Earl—at the same time saying I shall be glad of any information the noble Earl can give us—is, Whether the Government can foresee the date at which the demarcation of Afghanistan will be commenced; whether it is understood that the Russian troops are to remain in their present positions until the demarcation is concluded; and, if the understanding does exist, whether the Ameer of Afghanistan is a consenting party to it? I venture to ask these Questions because I think that the reticence of Her Majesty's Government, although very intelligible and, to some extent, in consonance with the practice of most Governments in grave situations, has this evil effect—that it is liable to be misunderstood in the East. Things have been said in the other House of Parliament which have thrown some doubt on the steadfastness and staunchness of Her Majesty's Government in this matter, and I should be glad if the language used here were of a character to repel and dissipate any such impression, for we must always remember that we have made it, at a cost of some sacrifice, an essential part of our policy that we should have the friendship and support of Afghanistan. If there be one thing in this matter more certain than another, it is that the slightest indication of flinching on our part will not only cost us the friendship but probably will bring upon us the desertion of Afghanistan.

EARL GRANVILLE: My Lords, in answer to the noble Marquess, I have to say that I am not cognizant of anything that has passed in the other House or in this House which indicates any flinching on the part of Her Majesty's Government from the course which they may consider it right to pursue. I have stated on a very recent evening exactly the same thing as has been, I believe, stated in "another place"—that we firmly adhere to the policy which we believe is agreed to by the great political Parties in the State, while, at the same time, we desire to avail ourselves of every means of coming to a settlement honourable and satisfactory to Russia, to India, and to ourselves. I was going to say that I am the more ready to give an answer to the three Questions of the noble Marquess, because I feel bound to do him the justice to acknowledge that he has entirely abstained from pressing Her Majesty's Government with troublesome Questions at a moment of very great complication,

of very great delicacy, and of very great importance both to ourselves and to Afghanistan. Therefore, the answer I have to give in regard to the progress of negotiations is that I cannot fix a date because, in reference to a communication which we made to the Russian Government, the Russian Ambassador, whom I saw yesterday, told me that he had been instructed by his Government to acknowledge the receipt of the communication, and that the Russian Government were considering it and would send a reply. As to the second Question of the noble Marquess, I may say that Her Majesty's Government certainly hold that the Russian Government are bound by the assurance which, as I stated a few days ago in this House, they have given us. With regard to the third point, communications have been made to the Ameer from India, and we believe that orders by the Ameer have been given to the Afghan troops, and that they are being obeyed by them at the present moment.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: As I have taken some part in former years in discussions upon Afghanistan, I am supposed to have expressed opinions at that time favourable to Russia. I am anxious to say at the present moment that, so far as I understand the situation of affairs, it is now entirely altered from what it was at the time to which I refer. I was then of opinion, and am still, that it was highly inexpedient to remonstrate with Russia upon what were called her advances in Central Asia, which were in reality inevitable. I was always of opinion that up to the point of the possession of Merv that advance was inevitable, and, on the whole, not undesirable. The result of my researches at that time was that Merv was nothing but a nest of robbers, and that there was no possibility of any peace, or of any progress, or of any commerce in Central Asia until the Tekke Turcomans had been subdued by some civilized Power. But from the moment that Russia arrived at Merv and put one step forward towards Herat, the whole political situation became altered. I must express the infinite pleasure with which I have heard the assurance of my noble Friend that Her Majesty's Government will not be accused of any flinching or weakness in this matter, and that they are determined to hold to what they believe to be the policy of this country in regard to Afghanistan, and that they are resolved to support the Afghan Kingdom in the defence, to the utmost extent, of its ancient territory. I should like to ask my noble Friend a Question, although I have given him no Notice of it. I have no desire to put any Question embarrassing to Her Majesty's Government, but will ask this in the hope that he may be able to answer it. Very confident statements were made yesterday in a conspicuous organ of public opinion, *The Pall Mall Gazette*, setting forth certain alleged facts, which were these—that in the instructions given by the Government to Sir Peter Lumsden for the settlement of the Frontier of Afghanistan, the Penjdeh district was specially mentioned as a part of the debated and debatable ground respecting which negotiations were to take place upon the spot. That was the first statement. The second statement was that since the issue of the Commission, and since it was known to Russia and to Sir Peter Lumsden that this point was part of the debated and debatable land, and was to be the subject of negotiations, the Afghans had violently seized that territory. These statements were made professedly after inquiry from persons who are said to be cognizant of the facts. I may state at once that my own private inquiries have resulted in a positive denial of these facts; and I wish to know from my noble Friend whether he is in a position to say whether these assertions are accurate or not?

EARL GRANVILLE: I am very much surprised that my noble Friend and late Colleague should, without giving me any Notice, have asked me a Question of the most complicated character with regard to the instructions given to Sir Peter Lumsden; and I am almost inclined to say to him, "Et tu Brute!" I must really decline, as I have declined to less important Peers in this House, to answer Questions put absolutely without Notice. But, at the same time, I beg your Lordships to remember that this movement of the Afghans to Penjdeh was made before Sir Peter Lumsden arrived.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: I have extracted from my noble Friend the very answer which I wished to obtain. I came down to the House determined to ask the Question, and was anxious but

was unable to see my noble Friend before the discussion arose, and I did consult my noble Friend at the head of the India Office as to whether he could answer it. I put the Question entirely in the interests of my noble Friend and the Government with the view of eliciting a contradiction of a statement which was injurious to the interests of England. Incidentally, and in spite of the disorder of my Question, my noble Friend has answered it precisely in the manner in which I hoped he would.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE (ADVANCE) BILL.

(*The Earl of Morley.*)

(NO. 59.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF MORLEY, in moving that the Bill be read a second time, said, its object was to guarantee a loan of £400,000 in order to enable the Cape Government to continue as far as Kimberley a railway the construction of which had been already begun. In consequence of recent occurrences in Bechuanaland, it was highly desirable that the line should be completed without further delay. He begged to move the second reading of the Bill, and he trusted that their Lordships would permit the measure to pass through all its stages at once.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Morley.*)

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª; Committee *negatived;* Then Standing Order No. XXXV. *considered* (according to order), and *dispensed with:* Bill read 3ª, and *passed.*

THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE—SECRETARIES OF EMBASSIES.

QUESTION.

LORD LAMINGTON asked the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Whether there is any objection to give all the first secretaries of embassies the same privilege that is granted to the first secretary at Paris—viz., the rank of a minister, while acting as chargé d'affaires during the absence of the ambassador? If his suggestion were acted upon, it would be of great advantage when circumstances called the Minister from his post.

EARL GRANVILLE said, that although in the case of Paris for some years, and occasionally at other Courts, the rank of Minister had been given to the Secretary of Embassy, there were several inconveniences attached to the system, particularly as regards questions of promotion. He admitted that an inconvenience did occasionally arise under the present system; but he could not help thinking that matters had better remain as they were for the present.

EGYPT (FINANCE, &c.)—THE NEW EGYPTIAN LOAN—THE INTERNATIONAL GUARANTEE.

QUESTIONS. OBSERVATIONS.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY, in rising to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any communications have been received from Foreign Powers explaining the reasons which have induced any of those Powers to require that the guarantees to the proposed Egyptian loan should be international rather than purely British; and, if so, whether he will lay them on the Table? said: My Lords, in putting the Questions which I have placed upon the Paper to the noble Earl the Secretary for Foreign Affairs as to the Egyptian Correspondence, I may state that they were designed to throw light upon what appears to be, after considerable study of the Blue Book, a very dark place in that Correspondence. If the Blue Book had come into my hands as a telegram, or, say, as some ancient manuscript that had been recovered from Herculaneum, I should have said that a large portion of it had dropped out, and that the sequence of its several parts had become unintelligible on that account. I want to know from the noble Earl whether there really are any Papers which he can supply to us which will fill up these very awkward and perplexing gaps? There is not upon the surface of the Papers anything to show that the Foreign Powers had any reasons for making the request, or even that they did make the request, that the Guarantees to the proposed Egyptian Loan should be International rather than purely British. All that we can find is that there was a great deal of very kind, charitable, and philanthropic interest in our own affairs on the part of the Foreign Powers, which induced them to

facilitate the operations which we have had in view, and to lend us the help of their unimpeached credit in order to support our monetary transactions. For instance, I find that last year M. Waddington first introduced the proposal of an International Guarantee in this way —that, in order to facilitate the task of the English Government, the Powers should be asked to join in the Guarantee of the proposed loan. Then, again, this year M. Waddington said that it was far preferable and more simple to increase at once to £9,000,000 the amount of the loan to be issued, attaching thereto the collective Guarantee of the Powers, and then the motive was given; it was not that he demanded it—he did not desire it in the least—but he said that on those terms the loan might be issued at 3½ per cent, and that there would be no need of any special security or of a sinking fund. The suggestion, therefore, was offered entirely in the form of an assistance to English credit. That was the view which the Austrian Ambassador also took. He said, on the 19th of January, that the sum of £4,000,000 required for the payment of indemnities should be included in the new loan, and that in order to secure a cheap rate of interest this loan might receive the collective Guarantee of the Powers, and, finally, the Austrian Ambassador's view was that the attachment of the signature of Austria would enable us to raise money at a cheaper rate. There is no indication in the Papers of any other motive than that. There is no pressure, there is no expression of a strong desire, there is no argument for it. On the contrary, Italy received the proposal with considerable doubt. M. Mancini, on the 25th of January, said that, as far as his Government was concerned, they had no objection to a collective Guarantee if it were allowed by the other Powers. Russia, in the same way, made conditions, and said that unless all the Powers became parties to the Guarantee she should not be bound by it. Therefore, there was no desire on the part of the Foreign Powers, as far as is indicated by the Papers, to associate themselves in this Guarantee. They simply offer us the assistance of their credit in raising the loan. Perhaps if they knew more of the London Money Market than they evidently do they would not even think it necessary to make the offer. When a similar transaction took place in 1855, Mr. Ricardo said that when a mercantile man saw two names on the back of a bill of exchange, and knew that the first was a good one, he did not care about the second. What I want to know is how it comes about that without a practical pressure on the part of the Powers, or even of apparent wish on their part in favour of this change, this change should have been made? Because this change has been made in the teeth of a very grave objection. The noble Lords and the right hon. Gentlemen who constitute the Government have had to swallow a good deal to make the change, and have had to retreat from the opinions which they so distinctly expressed last year. Mr. Childers, in the most formal way, stated to the Conference that the Government could not expect Parliament to agree to a Joint Guarantee. I observe that in "another place" a noble Lord, who ought to have known better, spoke of the Protocols as something not indicating very precisely what the Plenipotentiaries said, but as being only an abstract. But it is an abstract corrected and approved by the Plenipotentiaries themselves, and every word which appears in the Protocols has been submitted to the men in whose mouths the words are placed. Now, in spite of the strong objection that the Government entertained, and in spite of no pressure being exercised on the part of the Foreign Powers, we find the noble Earl opposite on the 21st of January sending to all the Courts the following statement—

> "As regards the proposal that there should be a loan of £9,000,000 guaranteed by the Powers, to be a pre-preference stock, we have no desire to ask the Powers to share with us the liability which such a Guarantee would involve. Still if it is the desire of the Powers to join in the loan upon the same principle as the Anglo-French Guarantee of the Turkish Loan of 1855 we are ready to concede the point."

There is the gap, there is the *lacuna*, which I wish the noble Earl to fill up. I trust that the noble Earl will produce Papers which will show us where this pressure comes from. It must have been made in the form of some communication, and all that we ask is that we should be allowed to see that communication also. The Anglo-French Guarantee of the Turkish Loan of 1855 has

been brought forward as an analogous case with the present; but so far from being analogous, they are as distinct as it is possible for two operations to be. In 1855 France and England were fighting side by side for Turkey, and it was reasonable that if they wished a loan to be advanced they should share the responsibility attached to it. But now we are doing all the fighting, and not side by side, for the other Powers are merely looking on. It is a very remarkable allusion, because it is an allusion which I think Her Majesty's Government would rather have avoided. That Arrangement was fiercely contested in the House of Commons, and of those who opposed it, and who were in the minority of three, there were three distinguished persons. One was the noble Earl the Secretary for the Colonies, another was the noble and learned Lord who sits on the Woolsack, and the third was the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government. Their spokesman, the right hon. Gentleman, opposed it by every argument that it was possible for human ingenuity to conceive, and he opposed it with the utmost tenacity, so much so that Lord Palmerston and Sir George Cornewall Lewis actually went so far as to charge him with talking against time. I want to know why they made this unpleasant allusion? Did the Powers merely desire that the Anglo-French Guarantee should be taken as a model, and, if so, what reason had they for doing so? To explain that mystery I thought it well to refer to Mr. Gladstone's speeches, and I find two sentiments in those speeches which, I confess, made me quite understand why the other Powers should desire that the Anglo-French Agreement should be taken as a model, but which did not explain to me why Her Majesty's Government were so yielding as to accept the analogy. Mr. Gladstone made three long speeches, but I will only quote from his speech of the 27th of July, 1855. The first observation the right hon. Gentleman made is certainly alarming. He said—

> "The worst of this Guarantee is, that all the Guaranteeing Powers acquire a political hold upon Turkey."

Instead of Turkey let us read Egypt, because it is the case of Egypt now. That was Mr. Gladstone's opinion at that time; but it was not his only opinion. He went on to say—

> "If you provide in a Treaty to leave the Revenue of a given Power as security for your Guarantee, no one can have a right to charge with ambitious designs the Government that occupies that Province."—(3 *Hansard*, [139] 1475.)

What is the use of impounding the Revenues of Egypt unless such arrangements are of the nature of a mortgage? It is a most singular feature of the Convention, and one to which attention has not been sufficiently drawn, that the indebtedness to the Powers of Europe laid on Egypt by the Convention is of the nature of a mortgage. By, I think, the 3rd clause of the Convention there are special revenues of special Provinces that are mortgaged for the payment of the loans which the Powers of Europe guarantee. I confess that it is not reassuring to find that Mr. Gladstone has laid it down that if you provide in a Treaty to have the revenues of a Province as security for that guarantee, you give a right to the Guaranteeing Powers, under certain contingencies, to occupy that Province. The proceeding to which the Government have given their sanction is in a great measure new, and I cannot help feeling that we shall enter upon new difficulties in Egypt in consequence of it. Hitherto we have only had to deal with the debts of Egypt to private persons, and that has been difficult enough; but now we shall have to deal with the debts of Egypt to Governments, those debts being mortgaged on special Provinces, which, according to the opinion of the First Minister of the Crown, will confer upon them the right and power to occupy such Provinces in case of the debt not being paid. It may be said that this is a pre-privileged debt, and that there is no danger of it not being paid. The Anglo-French Loan was privileged, but I am not sure that it was found more easy to get the interest into the Treasury. We shall have further opportunities of considering this matter when it comes before us in the form of an Act, and I hope that it may be possible for this House to do something to dissipate the ambiguity and the danger which seem to me to surround this diplomatic operation. But in the meantime it is of great importance that we should have all the information which it is possible for the Go-

vernment to give us. There must be some Correspondence indicating how this mysterious desire on the part of the Foreign Powers arose, what reasons they urged, what is the real cause of this Guarantee being inserted. I earnestly trust that some at least of that Correspondence the noble Earl will find it possible to lay before us.

EARL GRANVILLE: My Lords, when I saw the noble Marquess's Notice on the Paper yesterday, I thought he intended simply to ask a Question, so much so that when I was unavoidably compelled to leave I supplied to my noble Friend (the Earl of Kimberley) the answer which appeared perfectly obvious—that was to refer the noble Marquess to the Papers, particularly to the communications with M. Waddington and the Memorandum handed in by Count Karolyi. But it appears that that was not the noble Marquess's object. His object was to take part in the debate which is going on in the other House, and still more to do what he particularly likes to do—that is, to enter into a debate with Mr. Gladstone—whether he thinks or does not think that his Friends in the other House are not quite equal to competing with that statesman in debate. I am not bound to defend the reasons which have induced Foreign Governments to enter into this International Guarantee. I quite agree that our credit is sufficient to float a loan at a very moderate rate of interest. The noble Marquess alluded to the possible motives of Foreign Governments in associating themselves in this Guarantee. I am not given to attributing motives to anyone, and certainly not as to the conduct of the greatest Powers of Europe. At the same time, there is one motive that may possibly have actuated them in the course they have pursued. Your Lordships may remember that on the last day of the Conference of last year the French Government made a proposition which amounted to an ultimatum which we could not accept, and it was impossible to go on, on those terms, with the Conference. We arrived at a deadlock, and surely if anyone desired to get out of that deadlock it was this country in its connection with Egypt. Of late it seems to be laid down as a principle that if a Government—and especially the Government of this country—ever makes a proposition or resists a proposition made by any other country, it is an absolute disgrace to withdraw in the slightest degree from that which they have once maintained, or to make concessions, or to give or take in any way. All that I can say is that I do not believe that there is any Court in Europe, except perhaps Monaco, which does not constantly make proposals which it afterwards modifies to a certain degree in order to come to a friendly understanding with other Powers; and if this practice was not usually adopted Europe would be perpetually either in a state of deadlock or of war. I do not think that it is an unfair thing to attribute to the French Government a good motive when making a proposal of this sort, which covered their withdrawal from the position they adopted in their ultimatum; and I do not think it was an unstatesmanlike act in us to meet them half-way in order to relieve Egypt from a dreadful incubus and ourselves from a millstone round our necks. I have nothing further to add.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH pointed out that this was not merely a money matter; it included several points of great political significance, and he wanted to know whether, their Lordships' House being a part of Parliament, and it being announced that the Agreement would be submitted to Parliament, they should not have an opportunity of expressing their opinion upon the Convention?

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: The noble Duke cannot, I think, have studied the Papers, or he would see that in this Arrangement there were concessions, and very important concessions, made to Great Britain by the other Powers. In the first place, the Powers had insisted upon an immediate financial inquiry. Her Majesty's Government held that such a financial inquiry at the present time would be attended with very serious inconvenience; but the other Powers gave way to that remonstrance on the part of Her Majesty's Government, and the question of inquiry was reduced to the possibility of inquiry two years hence. Then there was a concession on a second most important point, which the Government regarded as vital. The Powers objected to diminishing the receipts of the bondholders; but there is to be a reduction from the interest paid to the bondholders. Then there is the

third point, which certainly was regarded as one of some moment—namely, the taxation of foreigners, to which the Powers agreed. I merely mention these three points to show that it is an entire misrepresentation or misunderstanding, indeed, to suppose that in this Financial Arrangement there was no concessions on the side of the Powers. If we conceded something the Powers also conceded something.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: One observation which fell from the noble Duke requires a reference. This Bill must pass this House as it must pass the other House, and on the stages of that Bill it will be open to take any further discussion. I confess the answer of the noble Earl is not satisfactory. His theory of the reasons why the other Powers pressed for this International Guarantee is that the noble Earl had refused it in July last. He says this is not very logical. It certainly is not. The noble Earl practically says—"If it is any pleasure to you to see me eat my words, I am perfectly ready to do it." That is very kind of the noble Earl. It is a weapon that I think he has exercised before, and found it very useful in conciliating friendships. But as he has started a theory, I will oppose to it a theory of my own, which is one, I think, very generally held, and that is that the Powers pressed for this International Guarantee because some of them, at least, intend to make it a weapon by which they shall obtain a share in the control of affairs in Egypt.

EARL GRANVILLE: I have no right to speak again; but I trust that what I have said will be reported by professional reporters, and that there will not be attributed to me the paraphrase of it by the noble Marquess.

NAVY—THE CHINA STATION.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH, in asking Her Majesty's Government, Whether it is their intention to increase the naval forces in the China Seas and Straits Settlements? pointed out the utterly defenceless position of Singapore and the whole of the Straits Settlements, in consequence of the entire absence of fortifications and naval defence. Although no one could forsee the turn events might take, he could not help feeling that the presence of a hostile Force in those seas must cause great alarm among those who had property in the Islands, and still more among those who held the Colonial Empire of this country most dear to the interests of England. He felt so strongly on this question that, if Parliament should separate without Her Majesty's Government giving some assurance as to an addition being made to our Naval Forces in those seas, he should move a Resolution on the subject immediately after the re-assembling of the House.

THE EARL OF NORTHBROOK said, that, in answering the Question of the noble Viscount, he must ask leave to correct his statement of what took place the other day. The noble Viscount had not given any similar Notice on any former occasion. What he did was to put another Question, in which he discussed a great number of naval subjects, and asserted that the Navy of England was not much better than the Navy of France—a statement which the noble Viscount had never substantiated, and which he himself had always positively denied as being inconsistent with the facts of the case. The noble Viscount stated, as an argument in support of his assertion, that the Naval Force of England in the Chinese Seas was not so strong as that of France. To that statement the answer was that the French were at war with the Chinese, and that Her Majesty's Government did not think it necessary on that account to immediately increase our Squadron in the Chinese waters to the strength of the French Fleet; also that such an increase of our Naval Force, under those circumstances, would only have the effect of creating suspicion and irritation, and endangering the present state of good will between the two countries. The naval strength of a nation could not be said to depend upon the amount of Force that happened at any time to be in any particular part of the world. Instructions had been given to the Commander of our Squadron in Chinese waters to arrange for the protection of British and other foreign residents at the Treaty ports in China. There was nothing to make us suppose that those duties had not been efficiently performed by Her Majesty's Forces in China. There was no complaint whatever that those Forces were not amply sufficient for the protection of

British interests; on the contrary, Her Majesty's Government had received assurances from British merchants and others at the Treaty ports in China that Her Majesty's Forces had given them every necessary protection. If Her Majesty's Government thought it necessary for the protection of British interests and commerce in China to increase our Forces, they would do so from time to time according to the requirements of the case. At present they deemed those Forces sufficient. With respect to the fortification of coaling stations, he had always thought that the efficient protection of coaling stations was most desirable. As regarded Singapore, as he had already stated, the work had been postponed till next year. The work at all the coaling stations could not be done at the same time; and where it was a question of time between Hong Kong and Singapore, the former was regarded as the more important of the two. Her Majesty's Government could not pledge themselves to station an ironclad or any particular class of ship at the Port of Singapore. The Admiralty had always resolutely opposed the principle that any of Her Majesty's ships should be told off to remain stationary at any particular port. They considered it necessary that Her Majesty's ships should be free to go wherever necessary in time of war. The Commander-in-Chief in China and the Admiralty were perfectly aware of their responsibilities, and would take such measures as they might think most desirable for the protection of British interests in that part of the world.

VISCOUNT BURY said, he agreed with the noble Earl that the responsibility of providing for the defence of each particular port rested entirely with Her Majesty's Government, and he had no doubt that they would discharge that responsibility to the best of their ability. The noble Earl had not touched upon one point. It was well known that this country was in a position in which it might at any moment be involved in war. At the Port of Singapore there was a very large store of coal, and the possession of that station would be very desirable for any belligerent Power. One Power with which this county might be involved in hostilities had, at the present time, one of its most powerful ironclads in the Harbour of Singapore. Could not the Government give some assurance that might alleviate the feeling of apprehension which naturally existed in the country when they saw the state of things that existed in the Harbour of Singapore at this moment? If war should break out, Singapore would be lost to this country in 24 hours, unless some preparations had been made not hinted at by Her Majesty's Government. Another matter to which he should like to advert in this connection, and which also bore on the protection of our people in those seas, was this—What was the position which we had now taken up with regard to neutral rights? It was within his own personal knowledge, as a fact for which he could vouch, that within the last few days a cargo which was to have been taken out to China by an English ship had been, in consequence of the action of Her Majesty's Government, transferred to German bottoms and taken out in them, because the position with regard to the French right of search was such that it was more safe to trust cargoes to German ships than to take them out in English ships.

EARL GRANVILLE: Why?

VISCOUNT BURY said, he supposed that it was because the Germans did not take the same exaggerated and over-scrupulous view with regard to the French right of search as Her Majesty's Government did.

EARL GRANVILLE said, he would remind the noble Viscount of his statement the other night, that the French had given positive assurances as to the equal treatment of neutral ships.

VISCOUNT BURY said, he did not dispute the fact of the French declaration that their right of search was extended to other nations as well as England; but he maintained that we were so oversensitive as regards France that we took their intimations as positively settling the question, while the Germans did not take these assertions in the same sense.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that he did not know what questions might have arisen with respect to the right of search between these Powers; but he imagined that the Germans, like ourselves, would hold themselves entitled to the same rights and bound by the same obligations of International Law on that subject. By that law no Power could impose on neutrals with

respect to trade any regulations of its own which were not in accordance with International Law. Any Power would be entitled to object to, and remonstrate against, any action taken against its neutral rights which might be against its views of the rules of International Law. The proper way to raise this question was not by entering into a discussion before the question arose. If any ship of this country were treated by France in a manner we did not think justified by International Law, we should have a right to remonstrate. If the French should hold that any such ship had broken the rules of International Law—by breach of a blockade, for example, or by carrying articles that were contraband—their course would be to take the ship before a Prize Court in the first instance; and if this or any other Government ultimately came to the conclusion that that had been done which was inconsistent with International Law, it would have the right still to treat it as a matter of International complaint, for which redress should be given.

VISCOUNT BURY said, that he had only instanced a case within his own personal knowledge of a cargo being transferred to a German bottom—a practice which would be very disadvantageous to our trade.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR remarked, that there was no possibility of preventing such an occurrence as that.

THE EARL OF DERBY said, he thought that the question of the right of search was hardly relevant to the Notice which the noble Viscount had put on the Paper. With respect to the protection of our coaling stations, he could assure the House that Her Majesty's Government were quite as much alive to the importance of dealing with that question as anyone could be. He must remind their Lordships that the present circumstances were somewhat extraordinary and exceptional, looking at the situation in the Soudan and South Africa and in Afghanistan. A very large outlay was inevitable, and many things which it was desirable to do might in consequence have to be postponed. Taking a broad view of the question he thought that with regard to the protection of those coaling stations the Government were doing everything that was reasonable, and their Lordships were aware of what had been done towards increasing the general strength of the Navy.

VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH said, that he had addressed this Question, not to the First Lord of the Admiralty or to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, but to Her Majesty's Government, because he considered that it was incumbent upon the Government to see that all our Colonies were safe in the event of war; and his point was whether, if war broke out now, these Colonies would be safe.

INDUSTRIAL AND REFORMATORY SCHOOLS.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY asked, Whether Her Majesty's Government proposed to introduce any measure during this Session respecting industrial and reformatory schools, in consequence of the Report of the Royal Commission of 1883; and, if so, whether it would not be expedient to bring it into this House in the first instance, the Chairman of that Commission being a Member of this House? He thought that this was a subject of the utmost importance, and one which could be best considered in that House, owing to the presence of the Chairman, and also owing to the fact that the time of the other House was fully occupied.

THE EARL OF DALHOUSIE said, he thought that the suggestion made by the noble Earl was a most important one, and he could only wish that he were in a position to make a distinct reply to the Question. He could assure the noble Earl that he, at all events, was the last person to minimize the importance of the Commission over which the noble Earl had presided. The question was under consideration, and a measure was being prepared on the subject; but it was not sufficiently advanced to enable them to state when or where it would be introduced.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—HIGHER EDUCATION IN WALES.

QUESTION.

LORD NORTON asked the Lord President of the Council, Whether it is decided what grants are to be made to colleges in Wales; and to how many; and whether any like grants of public

money for middle-class education are proposed to be made in England?

LORD CARLINGFORD (LORD PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL), in reply, said, that the grants voted by Parliament to the Welsh Colleges amounted to £10,500. This sum was divided into three sums—£4,000 a-year going to each of the two Colleges which had happily been founded in North and South Wales, and £2,500 a-year to the College founded some years ago at Aberystwith. No like grants of public money were in contemplation for England. They did not appear to be needed. The noble Lord would remember that a very important inquiry into Welsh Higher and Intermediate Education was made some years ago by a Committee presided over by his noble Friend Lord Aberdare, upon the Report of which the grants referred to were made. But these Colleges were Colleges for higher education. The subject of intermediate education, upon which there were most valuable recommendations in the same Report, had not yet been dealt with by the Government. He hoped it would be dealt with in the course of the present Session by a Bill, which he would, he trusted, have the pleasure of introducing to this House before the Session closed. It would be for the purpose of providing greater facilities for intermediate education in Wales. As to the distinction to be drawn between England and Wales in this matter, it seemed a very obvious one. Wales was a far poorer country than England, and it was, at the same time, relatively far more poorly provided with educational endowments; and it appeared to the Government and to the other House of Parliament that the case which Wales had to show for some assistance in the matter of higher and intermediate education was at least as strong as the case of Scotland or of Ireland.

HONORARY FREEDOM OF BOROUGHS BILL.

[H.L.]

A Bill to enable municipal corporations to confer the honorary freedom of boroughs upon persons of distinction—Was *presented* by The Marquess of RIPON; read 1ª. (No. 61.)

CONSOLIDATED FUND (NO. 2.) BILL.

Read 2ª (according to order): Committee *negatived*: Then Standing Order No. XXXV. *considered* (according to order), and *dispensed with*: Bill read 3ª, and *passed*.

House adjourned at Six o'clock, till To-morrow, Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 27th March, 1885.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—Commons; Turnpike Acts Continuance, *appointed* and *nominated*.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolution in Committee*—Egyptian Loan [*Second Night*].

Ordered—*First Reading*—Universities (Scotland) * [115].

Second Reading—Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Orders * [100].

Select Committee—Post Office (Acquisition of Sites) * [72], *nominated*.

Report—Local Government Provisional Orders * [91]; Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) * [86].

Third Reading—Army (Annual) [104], and *passed*.

QUESTIONS.

PRISONS (IRELAND)—LEGISLATION.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether any steps have been taken to give effect to any of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Irish Prisons; and, if so, to what extent, more especially how far and how soon it is proposed to deal with the vital question of the concentration of Prisons?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Speaking generally, I may say that nearly all the recommendations of the Royal Commission which were capable of immediate adoption have been, or are being, carried out. Rules are at present before Parliament embodying the recommendations as to diet, exercise, privileges, and means of restraint of prisoners, and also as to relaxations in the case of untried prisoners. The recommendation that the rules should be made known to the prisoners has been carried out. Circulars have been issued on the lines of the Report containing instructions as to the observation of prisoners on reception; their diet in the latter stages of confinement; the cases of those whose lives are endangered by confinement; the abolition of dark cells; the restriction of punishment diet; visits to prisoners under restraint; cleanliness of prisoners; and precautions as to means of committing suicide. The recommendations as to Visiting Committees, the

right of appeal of officers, the payment of substitutes for the medical officers, the selection, appointment, transfer, and finding of warders, have been all adopted; and it has been decided to establish a prison bakery in Dublin. I have already explained to the House the manner in which the Board itself has been reconstructed. In certain instances the Royal Commission laid great stress on the practice and procedure in Irish prisons being assimilated to those in the English service. His Excellency has obtained the sanction of the Treasury for the employment in Ireland, for a period not exceeding three months, of Captain Stopford, of the English Prisons Board, to assist in securing that object, and Captain Stopford will proceed to Ireland very shortly for this purpose. There remains the large question of the concentration of prisons and certain minor recommendations, the carrying out of which will depend upon how far concentration is decided upon. The Irish Government attach great importance to this recommendation of the Royal Commission, and it is at present engaging their attention; but it needs most careful consideration before a final decision can be arrived at.

MR. T. A. DICKSON: Might I ask the right hon. Gentleman if Dr. MacCabe has been appointed a medical member of the Prisons Board, as recommended by the Royal Commission, or does he merely occupy the position of Prisons Inspector to the Irish Prisons Department?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: He has been appointed Medical Assistant and Adviser to the Prisons Board, which was considered a more efficient way of accomplishing the same object.

INDIA (MADRAS)—OUTBREAK OF MOPLAHS IN THE MALABAR DISTRICT.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether it is a fact that serious disturbances have occurred in the Madras Presidency (Malabar District); whether one European soldier and twelve insurgents have recently been killed in an encounter, and one European officer and several soldiers wounded; whether a force consisting of several companies of the Oxfordshire Regiment, several companies of Sepoys, and two guns has, since the above encounter, taken the field in the disturbed district; and, whether any reason can be assigned for this serious outbreak?

MR. J. K. CROSS: The official Report which the Government of India has promised on the subject of the disturbance in Malabar has not yet been received; but the main facts are, I believe, as follow:—Some Hindus were murdered by Moplahs, who took refuge in a Hindu temple, where they defended themselves for some hours against a detachment of troops, refusing, as is their custom, to take quarter. The Moplahs belong to a class of Mohammedan fanatics in Malabar, who from time to time commit outrages of this kind, which it is necessary to suppress by military force.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—MOUNT TEMPLE, CO. WESTMEATH.

MR. HARRINGTON asked the Postmaster General, Whether he has received from certain inhabitants of Mount Temple, county Westmeath, a memorial with regard to the recent change in the position of the post office there; whether it be a fact, as stated in the memorial, that this change subjects the public to inconvenience; and, if he has any objection to state on whose representation the change was made, and for what reasons?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: No Memorial has been received from inhabitants of Mount Temple, Co. Westmeath, with regard to the recent removal of the post office there. The sub-postmistress, being obliged to take another house, applied for and obtained permission to remove the office to a new house, which is more conveniently situated than the old one; and I understand that in point of accommodation for the public the new office is in every respect satisfactory.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—FISHING IRREGULARITY (LISMORE DISTRICT).

MR. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Is there any regulation in the Constabulary Code against constables fishing; and, if so, can a copy of it be seen, and how do constables who may receive licences free from the Lismore Board of Conservators evade the regulation; and, have the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries

perused the books and accounts of the district, as they are empowered to do under the thirty-eighth section, eleventh and twelfth Victoria, chapter ninety-two, and found out the illegal practice now admitted to have been adopted in the Lismore district; and, if so, have they taken any steps to caution the Conservators against these illegal acts, or remonstrated with them; and, if not, will directions be given to them to do so?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The men of the Royal Irish Constabulary are allowed, under the Regulations, to amuse themselves by fishing during leisure hours. The Inspectors of Fisheries have not inspected the books and accounts of the Lismore district since the Board of Conservators adopted the practice of giving free licences. The admission that the practice is illegal, which the hon. Member refers to, was not made by me.

LIGHTHOUSE ILLUMINANTS.

MR. GRAY asked the President of the Board of Trade, with reference to the statement of the Elder Brethren of the Trinity House that several valuable lenses have been cracked by the heat of the gas burners, Whether this statement has been absolutely denied; whether the makers of the lenses have stated that they can sustain with perfect safety a vastly greater temperature than the 314 degrees mentioned by the Elder Brethren; whether since the reply of the Right honourable gentleman has been made public, the inventor of the gas system has written to the Elder Brethren offering to guarantee the safety of the lenses from injury by heat during the trial of the double triform arrangement; whether it is the fact, as implied by the letter of the Elder Brethren, that Dr. Ball has changed his mind, and that, although he resigned his seat on the Illuminants Committee because they would not allow the double triform to be used in the experiments, he is now satisfied to have it excluded from the trials; whether the inventor of the gas system has repeatedly urged that the full power of gaslight for penetrating fogs could not be shown unless the double triform were tested, and that this method of burning gas would have a much greater effect in illuminating fog than any other lighthouse illuminant, and whether the reasons given by the Right honourable gentleman are sufficient to warrant his refusal to test it; whether, on further inquiry, he is still convinced that the double triform arrangement would work as well with oil as with gas, and in supposing that, a comparison having been made between three gas lights and three oil lights, the same comparison would hold good in the case of the double triform; whether the Elder Brethren, with full cognizance of the lenses having cracked, applied for a tender for the erection of the double triform; and, whether the objection to permit its use lies in the reluctance of the Board of Trade to incur the expenditure necessary for this experiment?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I have no personal knowledge of the matter referred to; but I have received the following letter from the Trinity House:—

"The statement that lenses have been damaged through heat has been denied but not disproved; the cracked lenses are still to be seen in their places. No statement that a higher temperature than 314 degrees could be sustained with safety has been received by the Trinity House from the makers of the lenses (the temperature, as previously stated, was 350 degrees; it has been as high as 374 degrees). The inventor has written an offer to guarantee the safety of the lenses while under trial in double-triform, but limited to what is proved to be injury by heat. The Elder Brethren have received no intimation whatever from Dr. Ball as to the proposal for double-triform lights; but they are assured that in all that pertains to the experiments, they are in perfect accord with the Commissioners of Irish Lights, to whom that gentleman is scientific adviser. The inventor has urged the trial of double-triform apparatus, as being, in his opinion, more effective in fog than other methods; the reasons for not testing it appear to be sufficient to the practical and scientific men engaged in the inquiry. The Elder Brethren applied to the inventor for practical details of the double-triform arrangement, and for a statement of the expense. A partial statement of expense was rendered, but practical details were not given, and the Trinity House are unable therefore to judge of its convenience relatively with oil. There seems no reason to doubt that comparisons between three gas lights and three oil lights would hold good in the case of double-triform gas and double-triform oil. Other objections besides expense have influenced the Trinity House in refraining from trying it."

To this statement of the Elder Brethren I have only to add that there has not only been no reluctance whatever on the part of the Board of Trade to sanction any expenditure which the Trinity House may think necessary to carry out those experiments satisfactorily, but that the

expenses in connection with the experiments up to the end of November last had amounted to upwards of £10,000.

MR. GRAY asked whether it was not the fact that Dr. Ball had resigned his position on the Illuminants Committee, expressly on the ground that the test referred to was not applied?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said, he could not say.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—EXTRA PAY FOR ACTING AS INSPECTORS OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

MR. SYNAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Government propose to carry out the recommendations of the Royal Irish Constabulary Commission of 1883, as regards granting remuneration to members of the above Force who act as Inspectors of Weights and Measures; what is the cause of the delay in carrying out the same; and, whether it is to take effect from the date of the Commission?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I answered a similar Question to this yesterday.

BOARD OF WORKS (IRELAND)—PAYMENT OF DRAINAGE INSTALMENTS, LOUGHILL, CO. LIMERICK.

MR. SYNAN asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Why the farmers in Loughhill, in the county of Limerick, have not received their drainage instalments from the Board of Works, although the works were inspected and reported to the Board, several months ago, as being completed, so as to entitle them to receive the instalments subsequent to those already paid?

MR. HIBBERT: I am sorry that it has not been found possible to identify the cases referred to by the hon. Member. If he will kindly give me the names of the farmers, or, at least, of the townlands, I shall cause further inquiries to be made.

FRANCE AND CHINA — HOSTILITIES (INTERNATIONAL LAW) — CONTRABAND OF WAR—RICE.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, that the answer given a day or two ago by the Prime Minister to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith) answered also his (Mr. W. E. Forster's) Question, Whether any reply had been made to the Despatches from the French Ambassador of February 20th and February 24th, printed in last week's *Gazette*, asserting the intention of the French Government to declare rice contraband of war? But he wished to know whether the Correspondence would be produced before Easter? An additional reason for asking that this should be done was, that the Correspondence had been given to the French public; in fact, he had the French Yellow Book in his possession with the Correspondence up to March 21st, containing, he was glad to say, a protest by Her Majesty's Government against rice being considered contraband of war.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: These Notes were answered on the 27th of February, maintaining the position which, on the 16th, I informed the House had been taken by Her Majesty's Government on this subject. The reply will be included in the Correspondence to be laid upon the Table shortly after Easter.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—BALLYSHANNON UNION—APPOINTMENT OF RELIEVING OFFICER.

VISCOUNT CRICHTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the Board of Guardians of the Ballyshannon Union at their last meeting appointed Michael Kerin to the post of relieving officer and sub-sanitary inspector; whether Kerin was treasurer and organiser of the late Land League in that locality, and is now treasurer of the local branch of the National League, and if his name appears in that capacity at the foot of the placard issued by that body; and, whether the Local Government Board will sanction his appointment?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Mr. Michael Kerin was appointed relieving officer by the Ballyshannon Board of Guardians on the 14th instant He was the only candidate for the office. The Local Government Board have no information as to his alleged connection with the Land League, and as they have not yet received the particulars which they called for on the election of Union officers, they are not yet in a position to state whether they will or not sanction the appointment.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR: Might I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, if this gentleman were connected with the Land League, it would be a disqualification?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That is a hypothetical Question

MR. HARRINGTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman direct the Local Government Board to make similar inquiries with regard to rate collectors who are members of Orange Lodges?

[No reply.]

BREWERS, &c., AND BREWERS' LICENCES (PARL. P. 311, 1885)—BEER MANUFACTURE.

MR. HICKS asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Whether he can supplement the Return of the number of Brewers and quantities of Malt and Corn, and Sugar and equivalent in Syrup, ordered July 31st 1884, by giving a separate Return showing total quantity of Malt and the total quantity of Corn, and the total quantity of Sugar and total quantity of equivalent in Syrup respectively used in the whole Country and in the Metropolis?

MR. HIBBERT: If the hon. Member will look at pages 4 and 5 of the Return to which he refers, he will see the figures for the Excise district of London separated from those for the country; and I am advised that if he will add to these the figures for the Hammersmith collection on pages 2 and 3, he will obtain approximately the totals for the Metropolis so far as they are ascertainable. Malt cannot be distinguished in such a Return from corn, nor sugar from syrup.

ARMY (PROMOTION)—THE 82ND REGIMENT.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR asked the Secretary of State for War, If he will state why the vacancy in the 82nd Regiment in October 1866, caused by the promotion of Captain Richardson to a half-pay majority, was treated as a purchase and not as a non-purchase step, and given to Lieutenant Mason over the heads of several officers of longer service, and especially Lieutenant Maunsell; and, whether such treatment of the vacancy was not a departure from the then existing warrants and regulations?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: On the reduction of the Army in 1866, certain majors and captains were promoted to half-pay commissions. The then Secretary of State decided, in the interest of the public, that such of the vacancies in the rank of captain so caused as were filled should be filled by purchase, the money going to the Military Reserve Fund. Lieutenant Mason, as the senior lieutenant recorded for purchase, was promoted. Such treatment of the vacancy was in strict accordance with the Royal Warrant and Regulations then current.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (SCOTLAND)—THE CUMNOCK SCHOOL BOARD ELECTION.

DR. CAMERON asked the Lord Advocate, Whether his attention has been called to the statements of *The Cumnock News* of March 20th, and *The Cumnock Express* of March 21st, to the effect that, at the New Cumnock School Board Election—

> "The extent to which treating was carried was disgraceful," that "free tables laden with meat and strong drink were common and were largely patronised," and that "drunken men were to be seen in all directions; some staggering along, others lying by the roadside, while others were making election speeches, telling for whom they voted, and how much they received for it;"

and, whether, if these statements be well founded, and if it be competent under the existing law, he will take steps to bring to justice the guilty parties, or, if the law provides no remedy, whether he will consider the propriety of amending it?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR): I have seen the newspaper reports of the school board election at New Cumnock, which appears, if the reports are at all accurate, to have been accompanied by very discreditable scenes. The Corrupt Practices Act of 1883 does not apply to school board elections. By an Act passed last Session, it was made applicable in England to municipal and various other elections, including school board elections. When that Bill was before the Grand Committee, I prepared and put upon the Paper Amendments directed to apply its provisions to Scotland. Representations were, however, received from many quarters, and I think the general feeling of the Scotch

Members on the Committee was that, instead of introducing such provisions into what was substantially an English Bill, it would be better to embody them in a measure for consolidating the whole law as to municipal elections in Scotland. Such a measure, which is much needed, is now in course of preparation. This matter will be dealt with in it.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—KILKENNY AND WATERFORD MAIL.

MR. MARUM asked the Postmaster General, Whether his attention has been called to a Correspondence between the Secretary of the Waterford and Central Ireland Railway Company and Mr. Harley, of the General Post Office, Dublin, whereby it appears that this Company have to run the mail as an extra train from Maryboro' to Waterford and back, a distance of 120 miles, and yet are only paid for 60 miles at 1*s.* 3*d.* per mile, as compared with 3*s.* per mile paid to a neighbouring Company; and further, that the new times of the mail do not suit the local traffic, so that the Company are losing money by the transaction, and will be unable to continue the service if not properly remunerated; whether it is a fact that this Company receives only £1,200 per annum for 60 miles, as compared with £2,059 paid to a neighbouring Company for 44 miles service; and, whether inquiry will be instituted, with a view of adjusting these inequalities and obviating the great detriment to the local public that would arise from the stoppage of the present Mail Service over the Railway line in question, and which is now imminent?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: The Waterford and Central Ireland Railway is under contract with the Post Office to run a mail train in connection with the day mail from Dublin over a part only of their line—namely, from Kilkenny to Waterford, and not over the whole of it, as the hon. Member appears to think. The Company apparently desire that the agreement should be extended over the other half of their line in substitution for the service now rendered by a competing Railway Company. I should be unable to agree to this course, and cannot admit that the Company has any ground for complaint.

The Lord Advocate

ARMY — STAFF APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY COMMISSARY GENERAL.

MR. GREER asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he will shortly take steps to fill the vacancy in the rank of Deputy Commissary General, which has existed for the last seven months in the Commissariat and Transport Staff, owing to the retirement on 24th August last of Deputy Commissary General Pigott?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON, in reply, said, that he hoped soon to fill up the vacancy referred to in the Question.

ARMY—THE MILITARY EXPEDITION TO THE SOUDAN—DEFECTIVE AMMUNITION.

SIR HENRY WILMOT asked the Surveyor General of Ordnance, Whether any Report has been received as to the jamming of cartridges in the rifles in action in Egypt; whether any steps have been taken with regard to a rifle, ·4 calibre, with solid cartridge case, described in the daily papers in November 1883, the principal object of which was to remedy this defect; whether the same ammunition is in use for the small arms as for the machine guns, or whether it is true that some of the machine gun cartridges were found in the men's pouches after Abou Klea, or at any other time; and, whether, if these cartridges had been put in the service rifle and fired, the rifle would be disabled for the time?

MR. BRAND: In answer to the first part of the hon. and gallant Member's Question, I can only repeat what I have before stated, that we have received a telegraphic communication from Lord Wolseley complaining of the action of the service cartridge at the battle of Abu Klea. The new rifle for the Army is still under consideration. The same ammunition is not in use for small arms and for machine guns, nor has any report been received of machine gun cartridges having been found in men's pouches, either at Abu Klea or elsewhere. A few machine gun cartridges have, as an experiment, been fired from the service rifle last Thursday. Judging from the results of the experiment, it is very unlikely that the rifle would be disabled thereby; but, as only a limited number of cartridges have been fired, it

cannot positively be stated that no jam would occur.

EGYPT (THE MILITARY EXPEDITION)—THE BISCUIT STORES AT KORTI.

DR. CAMERON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention has been called to the following passage in the letter from its Special Correspondent at Korti, published in *The Daily News* of 25th March:—

"One may see tons of damaged biscuit from the boat stores brought out to be buried at this place alone, and there is trustworthy authority for saying that similar things are done at other points along the river here, and even on the desert. . . . . At places where no other food is to be got, this becomes a matter of vital importance. Camel-loads were at one time hurried away across the desert without any preliminary examination, and, when the cases came to be opened, an alarmingly large proportion of biscuits especially were found quite unfit for men to eat;"

whether he can yet state how much of the biscuit supplied was found unfit for use; whether the cases in which it was sent were soldered; whether they were ordered to be soldered by the Director of Supplies and Transport or the Director of Contracts when the purchases were sanctioned; whether, before they were "taken into charge," the cases of biscuit were inspected by the staff of the Commissary General at Woolwich to ascertain that they were packed according to contract; and, if he would lay upon the Table a Copy of the Contract under which they were purchased?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: The quantity of biscuit supplied to the troops in the Soudan which has deteriorated cannot be stated until the whole stock is issued and detailed Reports received. The biscuit cases, both naval and contract, were soldered. The contractor was directed to pack the biscuit carefully in tin-lined cases for boat service, which involved soldering. He had previously supplied them soldered for Egypt, where they gave every satisfaction, and for this reason was specially employed on the present occasion. The cases when delivered at Woolwich were examined by the staff of the senior Commissariat officer. He reports that, in his opinion, the contractor's cases were quite equal to naval cases. It is not proposed to lay the contract on the Table of the House.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—IRISH NATIONAL LEAGUE MEETING AT ROSSCREA.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is the custom of the police at Rosscrea to post themselves outside the house where Nationalist meetings are held; whether, on the 15th of February, a posse of police remained outside the hall of the Catholic Club, Rosscrea, and took down the names of persons who entered in order to attend a meeting convened for the purpose of establishing a branch of the Irish National League, and if a similar proceeding on the part of the police occurred on last Sunday; and, whether he will issue instructions restraining the police from continuing these proceedings?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: This Question only appeared on the Paper yesterday, and the Report which I have called for has not yet reached me. Perhaps the hon. Member will be good enough to put the Question down again for Monday.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—MILITIA OFFICERS SERVING IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN IRREGULAR FORCE UNDER SIR CHARLES WARREN.

CAPTAIN AYLMER asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether three Officers of Militia Regiments recently embodied, as well as a number of other Militia Officers, are serving as privates in irregular corps in Bechuanaland; and, whether, during such absence, any provision has been made for the performance of their home duties?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Some Militia officers are serving as privates in the South African Irregular Force. No Militia officer was allowed to proceed thither without first having obtained the consent of his Commanding Officer to be absent from this year's training. Those belonging to battalions of Militia which have been embodied will be recalled. Pending their return their home duties will, when it is considered necessary, be carried on by other officers.

CAPTAIN AYLMER asked, whether the noble Marquess thought it conducive to the maintenance of discipline in Militia regiments that their officers should be serving abroad as privates?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, that was a Question as to a matter of opinion, and not as to a matter of fact; and as by answering he would only be expressing his individual opinion, he thought it unnecessary that he should reply to the Question.

METROPOLIS—THE PARKS—VICTORIA PARK.

MR. BRYCE asked the junior Member for Leeds, as representing the Office of Works, Whether any, and what, steps have yet been taken to fulfil the promise made by the First Commissioner of Works in August last, that labels giving the English and botanical names should be placed on or near the trees and shrubs in Victoria Park, as has been done in Hyde Park; and, whether anything has been done, or will be done, before the beginning of summer, to provide larger and better refreshment stalls in Victoria Park for the numerous visitors and persons playing cricket and other games there?

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: Last year experiments were made in Hyde Park with the view of finding the best and most durable labels on which to place the botanical names of plants, and it has been determined to apply the particular kind which appears in all respects to be the best to all the Royal Parks. A number of them are now being prepared for Victoria Park. The question of the refreshment stalls in Victoria Park is now under the consideration of the First Commissioner, and I shall be glad to confer with my hon. Friend on the subject.

FOREIGN OFFICE—GERMAN COLONIAL POLICY—THE WESTERN PACIFIC.

MR. GORST asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Lord Granville did, prior to December 10th 1884 (as stated in a German White Book), express a wish to Count Münster that Prince Bismarck should receive Mr. Meade, Assistant Under Secretary for the Colonies, to a personal interview on Colonial matters; whether, as stated in a despatch of Count Münster to Prince Bismarck of the 5th of January, Lord Granville expressed his regret that the Prince did not consider Mr. Meade's proposals for the partition of the Western Pacific to be acceptable; whether Lord Granville had previously intimated to the Secretary of State for the Colonies any intention of employing Mr. Meade for this purpose; and, whether any communications have subsequently taken place with the French Government in reference to the surrender of the New Hebrides to France as proposed by Mr. Meade?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Lord Granville suggested to Count Münster, for the first time, on December 10, that if Prince Bismarck were to see Mr. Meade, who had the confidence of Lord Derby and himself, he would obtain information as to questions which had been a source of correspondence, and that an interview might be the means of removing misunderstanding. With regard to the second part of the hon. Member's Question, I understand that Lord Granville expressed his regret that Prince Bismarck's conversations with Mr. Meade had led to no result. In reply to the last part, I may state that there have been no subsequent negotiations with the French Government; and Her Majesty's Government consider that the Agreement between this country and France respecting the New Hebrides is still in force.

EGYPT—ZEBEHR PASHA.

SIR HENRY HOLLAND asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, What has become of Zebehr Pasha; to what place he has been taken, and whether he is to be confined in prison there; and, whether he is to be tried; and, if so, before what tribunal, and on what charges?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Zebehr Pasha has been placed on board H.M.S. *Iris*, and will be conveyed to Gibraltar, where he will be detained so long as the military necessity which caused his arrest continues. It is not proposed, under present circumstances, to put him on his trial.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked whether it was not the fact that Nubar Pasha, the Egyptian Minister, had declined to have anything to do with Zebehr's arrest?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE asked that Notice should be given of the Question.

MR. GORST gave Notice that on Monday he would ask Mr. Attorney

General whether any Ordinance had been passed in the Colony of Gibraltar authorizing the detention there without trial of Zebehr Pasha?

LAW AND JUSTICE (SCOTLAND)—THE MAGISTRACY—COMMISSION OF THE PEACE, DUMFRIES BOROUGH AND COUNTY.

MR. ERNEST NOEL asked the Lord Advocate, Whether it is a fact that out of forty-three justices recently added to the Commission of the Peace for the county of Dumfries, forty are of the same political party as the Lord Lieutenant, and that of seven justices on the Roll, resident in the town of Dumfries, six are Conservatives; and, will the Government take steps to have these inequalities redressed?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR): The Lord Chancellor, whom I have communicated with as to this Question, states that he has no information with respect to the politics of gentlemen recommended to him for appointment as county magistrates by Lords Lieutenant, and that he has no information which leads him to suppose that in the case of the county and borough of Dumfries gentlemen are excluded from the Commission of the Peace on account of their politics.

THE TRAWLING COMMISSION—THE REPORT.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON asked the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department, Why no Copies of the Report of the Trawling Commission, printed without the evidence, were circulated among Members, according to the usual custom, in anticipation of the Report with evidence; and, whether Copies of the Report only, without the evidence, will be prepared for the use of the public, who may not want the evidence?

MR. H. H. FOWLER, in reply, said, he was informed that it was not the usual custom to circulate Reports without the Evidence, though it was occasionally done; but, so far as the present case was concerned, the Stationery Department were instructed to issue the Report of the Trawling Commission in a small volume, and to sell it to the public at a very small sum.

CENTRAL ASIA—THE RUSSO-AFGHAN FRONTIER—PENJDEH.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If it is true that the question whether Penjdeh was Afghan territory or not was specially mentioned in the instructions of Sir Peter Lumsden as one on which the Joint Commission would have to decide; and, whether Sir Peter Lumsden had full authority, if he thought the evidence pointed that way, to assign Penjdeh to Russia?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: For the reasons which I have already stated in this House, I regret that I am unable to give to my hon. Friend the information for which he asks respecting Sir Peter Lumsden's instructions.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY: Assuming, as I do, that the noble Lord has seen the six categorical statements in a journal of great importance in this country, am I to understand that the noble Lord will decline to give an answer to any one of these Questions?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I need hardly say I very much regret not to be able to meet the wishes of my hon. Friend; but I have explained to the House, on several previous occasions, the reasons which, up to the present time, make it impossible for the Government to make partial communications in regard to the particular questions now being discussed between Russia and Afghanistan.

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—ARRESTS IN KILLARNEY.

MR. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is a fact that four respectable farmers were arrested, near Killarney, under the Crimes Act, for alleged intimidation in connection with the Poor Law Elections in the Killarney Union; whether he is aware that the late Chief Secretary for Ireland gave as a reason for not prosecuting landlords against whom charges of a similar character were preferred, that the Crimes Act was not intended to apply to intimidation in connection with Poor Law elections; and, if so, by whose authority these men were arrested, how long they were retained in custody, and why they were not summoned, as were the men charged with

the attack upon two sisters of mercy in Londonderry lately?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is not true that four respectable farmers were arrested for intimidation under the Crimes Act in connection with this Poor Law election. At 5 o'clock on the morning of the 20th instant, a party of men visited the houses of two men named Kissane and Coffey, and broke a window in each. They entered Kissane's house by force, and compelled Mrs. Kissane, on her knees, under threat of death, to give up a voting paper. Three farmers and a labourer were arrested on suspicion of being of the party; but after being detained eleven hours were discharged by the Resident Magistrate, identification having failed. The arrests were made under the ordinary law.

ARMY (THE MILITARY EXPEDITION TO SUAKIN)—THE TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT.

VISCOUNT NEWPORT asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether any, and if so what, steps have been or are about to be taken to reinforce and strengthen the Commissariat and Transport Department under Sir Gerald Graham at Suakin; and, whether he can account for the apparent inadequacy of that important branch of the expedition?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON, in reply, said, the establishment which was provided for the Suakin Force, after careful consideration, comprised 60 officers, 28 warrant officers, and 514 non-commissioned officers and men of the Commissariat and Transport Corps, 320 men of the Indian Corps of Bheesties, 4,607 drivers, and 743 labourers. Sir Gerald Graham had asked for a reinforcement of a company of the Commissariat and Transport Corps; and he (the Marquess of Hartington) had arranged for the despatch of six other officers and 16 clerks, in all 14 officers and 141 non-commissioned officers and men, without delay.

VISCOUNT NEWPORT: I would also ask the noble Marquess, whether his attention has been called to a statement that a convoy was sent from Suakin to one of the zerebas with empty water-skins; and, if that statement is correct, what steps will be taken to prevent the repetition of so grave an occurrence?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: We have received no official account of the circumstance to which the noble Viscount calls attention; but I have not the least doubt that if it occurred General Graham would at once take steps to prevent its recurrence.

ARMY—DEFENCE OF THE COALING STATIONS—THE STRAITS SETTLEMENTS.

MR. CHAPLIN (for Mr. A. BALFOUR) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention has been called to the following Resolution adopted unanimously by the Straits Settlement Association:—

"That the colony of the Straits Settlements, forming as it does one of the most important coaling and docking stations in the East, is at the present moment without effective defence, and would be subject, in event of war with an European Power, to immediate seizure by an enemy. That it is, therefore, with feelings of dismay and apprehension that the Association learn, from the recent statement by the Secretary of State for War, that it is not intended to proceed with the proposed fortifications of Singapore till the year 1886. That a respectful and urgent request for a reconsideration of the question be made to Her Majesty's Government, and that they may be solicited to afford temporary security to British interests in the Straits by stationing in the roadsteads of Singapore an ironclad, man of war, or floating battery, as well as torpedo boats, to provide for offensive measures against an enemy;"

and, whether the statements therein contained are true; and, if so, what steps Her Majesty's Government propose to take in the matter?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: My statement on moving the Army Estimates has been somewhat misapprehended. Although the existing defences at Singapore are by no means inefficient, there is no intention of delaying their improvement. Sites for the new works have been already surveyed, designs are in course of preparation, and arrangements have been made under which the execution of the works is being undertaken. Provision has been made in the Estimates of the ensuing year for the armaments and submarine mine defences of coaling stations generally; but it is not possible at the present moment to state the exact distribution which will be made. The Admiralty have been addressed on the subject of the proposal made by the Association to provide naval means of defence for the Colony.

ARMY—SMALL ARMS—THE MARTINI-HENRY RIFLE.

LORD ELCHO asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is not a fact that more than a year ago Her Majesty's Government received reports from Sir F. Roberts, complaining of the Martini-Henry rifle cartridges in use in India, and giving statistics of the numbers which had jammed during the manœuvres of the troops; whether any notice or action was taken on these reports; and, whether now that these cartridges are reported as having jammed in every engagement fought in the Soudan, Her Majesty's Government will, in view of the present critical state of public affairs, and in view of the fact that this jamming is supposed by the most eminent military authorities to be easily remediable, cause immediate and searching inquiry to be made into the question, without waiting for the presence of Lord Wolseley or even for more detailed reports from him?

MR. BRAND: Since a somewhat similar Question to this was answered last night in "another place," further search and inquiry have been made; and it now appears that the following statement is contained in a Report by the Commander-in-Chief, Madras, dated the 23rd of February, 1884, on certain trials carried on between three experimental Gardner one-barrel guns and 60 men of the 2nd Battalion South Wales Borderers at the Camp of Exercises, at Bangalore, of the Madras Army, in 1884, namely:—

"With regard to the rifles of the Infantry, several rifles were out of action, or only fired comparatively a few rounds, owing to a number of jams of exploded cartridges in the rifle breeches;"

and—

"The jams of exploded cartridges in the breeches of the rifles of the Infantry are being inquired into, and both ammunition and rifles will be tested at the Arsenal, Madras."

The Report from which the above extracts have been taken is one on the subject of machine guns, and was sent to the War Office on the 7th of January, 1885. Action was taken on it as regards the machine guns at once. Action had already been taken in India as regards the rifles, and the result has been asked for. The second part of the Question shows, I think, that the noble Lord has misunderstood the answer I gave yesterday. I then said that it was impossible to explain to the House the cause of the failure of the cartridges at Abu Klea until the detailed accounts had been received from Lord Wolseley; but I did not say it was intended to defer action on these Reports. By the decision of the Secretary of State to-day, orders have already been given for manufacture of the solid-case cartridge for Martini-Henry rifles as requested by his Lordship.

SOUTH AFRICA—BECHUANALAND—MURDERS OF BRITISH SUBJECTS.

MR. R. N. FOWLER asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether Her Majesty's Government have received any official information as to the proceedings now being taken by Sir Charles Warren in Bechuanaland for inquiring into the murder of British subjects in that territory, as well as for the punishment of the murderers; and, whether he will inform the House what is the nature of the difference between Sir Charles Warren and Mr. Upington, the Cape Prime Minister; and what jurisdiction the latter has in Bechuanaland?

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY: Our information as to the proceedings referred to is but scanty. In the case of the murder of the man called Honey, we understand that the inquiry as to Mr. Niekerk's guilt is still proceeding. In the case of the murder of Mr. Bethell, all we know is that Sir Charles Warren introduced the subject at his interview with President Krüger, and that the latter promised that he would help him to the best of his power, so far as the law would allow. As to the second part of the Question, we do not understand that Mr. Upington is at present in any way interfering with the affairs of Bechuanaland, beyond giving to the High Commissioner his opinion as Attorney General when requested to do so.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked whether, in view of the serious differences that had arisen between Sir Hercules Robinson and Sir Charles Warren, Her Majesty's Government were not able now distinctly to state that they would support Sir Charles Warren in the valuable work he was doing?

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY: I demur to the expression "serious differences,"

and would refer the hon. Member to an answer given yesterday in "another place" by my noble Friend the Secretary of State.

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—GENERAL GRAHAM'S FORCE—THE ACTION NEAR SUAKIN, 22ND MARCH.

MR. GOURLEY asked the Secretary of State for War, What measures he intends adopting for the purpose of ascertaining who can be held responsible for the surprise and slaughter which overtook the Transport Department of the Army of Suakin on Sunday last during the construction of the zeribas?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I think it would be very unjust to the officers in command at Suakin, and that it would certainly have a very bad effect both on the officers and the troops they are commanding, if any observations were made in this House tending to throw doubt on the skill and ability of the officers in command; at all events, on imperfect information, and before full details of what actually occurred and the reasons for the step taken have been received. Undoubtedly, the fact that General M'Neill's force appears to have been surprised to a certain extent on Sunday last is one that appears to require further explanation, and explanations have accordingly been called for.

MR. STOREY asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he has taken note of the fact that, among the assailants of the British Camp on Sunday, were many boys of tender years and women; and, whether, in view of so significant an indication of the widespread and universal character of the opposition to our advance, and of the fact that Lord Wolseley's forces have retired unmolested to a point five hundred miles by water from Khartoum, and six hundred miles from Suakin, the Government will revert to its original policy of non-interference with the affairs of the Soudan?

MR. GLADSTONE: The War Department, I am told, is still in the same position in which it was when my noble Friend answered a Question of this character referring to this matter a short time ago, and has no information upon the subject to which the hon. Gentleman refers. As a matter of fact, I must add that, even if the information were true, however deplorable it would decidedly be, it would not appear to me to be at once perfectly clear that it is a circumstance upon which any important conclusions could be founded.

MR. STOREY: Are we to understand that the Government intends to continue the slaughter of the wives and children of "a people struggling to be free?"

MR. GLADSTONE: The Question of the hon. Member appears to refer to words I used. Permit me to say I never used that expression except with respect to the Egyptian yoke upon the Soudan, which was condemned by General Gordon, and which we never have at any period sought to restore.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: I wish to ask, Whether Her Majesty's Government, with a view to putting an end to these terrible massacres, will now consider the expediency of informing the Mahdi and Osman Digna the terms of peace Her Majesty's Government are prepared to accept? If the right hon. Gentleman cannot answer the Question now, I will put it again on Monday.

MR. GLADSTONE: This is a question of policy, and I must be permitted to say that the intention of putting Questions in this House never was supposed to be that the Government were, at the instance of any individual Member, to be expected at any period to declare their policy on a subject of great importance on which they would not have thought it their duty, but for that Question, to make any such declaration. We have already given, Sir, explanations of the measures we have taken in order to make sure that any communications from the Mahdi on the subject of peace should reach our hands. I have nothing to add to that declaration either to-day or on Monday.

IRISH INDUSTRIES—THE SELECT COMMITTEE.

SIR EARDLEY WILMOT asked the noble Lord the Member for Flintshire, If he will nominate the Select Committee on Irish Industries before the Easter Recess?

LORD RICHARD GROSVENOR: I am glad to say I made considerable progress yesterday evening, and I hope to be able to place the names on the Paper shortly.

ALLOTMENTS EXTENSION ACT, 1882—THE CHARITY COMMISSION—FLAWTON CHARITY LAND.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, If he is aware that the trustees of the charity land at Flawton are about to let the land by tender instead of offering it to the labourers in the district, as directed by the Allotment Extension Act, 1882; and, whether the Charity Commissioners will take immediate steps to compel the trustees to carry out the Act?

MR. MUNDELLA: The attention of the Charity Commissioners was first called to this case by the Allotments Extension Association on the 18th of March. On the 25th of March the Commissioners inquired of the Trustees what steps they had taken to bring the Allotments Extension Act into operation. No answer has yet been received by the Commissioners to that letter. The Commissioners have already addressed another letter to the Trustees asking for information as to the circumstances of the proposed letting, and reminding them of the obligation imposed upon them in respect of letting the charity land by the Allotments Extension Act, 1882.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS asked, whether, seeing that this land, if once let, would be beyond the power of the labourers altogether, the right hon. Gentleman would undertake to send a telegram to stop the letting?

MR. MUNDELLA said, he had no power or authority to do so.

JAMAICA—REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether it is the fact that the Government of Jamaica, in order to effect the retrenchment of the public expenditure in that island, recommended by the Royal Commissioners, has commenced by reducing the salaries of the minor officials of the Revenue Department, down to even the hunters and searchers of the Custom House, whilst those of the chiefs of the department and other high officials are left untouched; whether this course has been adopted with the concurrence of the Legislative Council, or by the advice of the official members only; and, whether the subject has received the consideration of Her Majesty's Government?

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY: The retrenchment of expenditure in the Revenue Departments of Jamaica has principally taken the shape of lopping off redundant offices, and the proposed reductions of salary are but slight. The changes are only prospective. Existing interests and salaries will not be touched. The action is that of the Executive and not of the Legislative Council, and the subject has received the consideration of Her Majesty's Government.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. RAIKES said, he understood that the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill was to be taken on Friday after the re-assembling of the House. He desired to ask, Whether the President of the Local Government Board would secure that Schedule 7, which dealt with the boundaries and names of counties, should not be taken until the following Monday, having regard to the fact that the Quarter Sessions in various parts of the country were to be held in Easter week, and it would therefore be extremely difficult for many county Members to be present on Friday week?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, it would not be desirable to give a pledge; but he did not think it likely that Schedule 7 would come on earlier than Monday fortnight. The Bill would be put down for Tuesday next; but in all probability it would not be reached at all till the following Friday week.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR asked the Prime Minister, what would be the course of Business on Tuesday?

MR. GLADSTONE said, the Motion for the Adjournment of the House would be made on Tuesday; and, from communications he had received, he believed that that was likely to give rise to some discussion in the quarter of the House where the hon. Member sat. The Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill would be the first Order.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: Am I to understand it is proposed to make the first Order a Bill which the Minister in charge stated that he had no intention to take?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I must correct that impression. I said I feared

that there would be no chance of taking it.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN asked, whether the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill being down on the Orders, it would not block Supply, and thus prevent debate on the Motion to go into Supply?

MR. SPEAKER said, debate could take place on the Motion for the Adjournment of the House.

DR. CAMERON asked, what would be the Business on Thursday week, when the House re-assembled?

MR. GLADSTONE said, the Civil Service Estimates.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT asked for a more definite assurance that the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill would not be taken on Tuesday.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH thought it would be most inconvenient to have the Seats Bill put down for Tuesday. He would ask the right hon. Baronet to reconsider his determination to put on the Paper a Bill which, he said, was very unlikely to be taken.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he did not think it would be convenient to make any pledge on the matter.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he would remind the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board that he yesterday stated that the Bill would not be taken again before Easter.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that what he stated was that he had abandoned the hope of proceeding with Schedule 7 before Easter.

MR. WARTON said, it was understood that the Bill would not be taken again at all before Easter, and the answer of the right hon. Baronet was so reported in all the papers.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE denied that that was what he promised.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR asked the Prime Minister, Whether, having now heard the statement of the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board, he would put down upon the Paper on Tuesday a Bill which would merely have the effect of obstructing the discussion of other Business; and, whether the right hon. Gentleman did not think it would be well not to obstruct the discussion of the Motion standing on the Paper for Tuesday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Question of the hon. Member is argumentative in discussing the course of procedure of Business, which is entirely in the discretion of the Government.

MR. GLADSTONE said, in answer to the argumentative Question of the hon. Member, he would say that, unfortunately, the time of the House was at present so occupied that the Government could not afford to sacrifice even the chance of pressing forward a measure so desirable to all Members of the House.

MR. R. N. FOWLER asked, at what hour the House would meet on Tuesday?

MR. GLADSTONE replied that the House would meet at 2 o'clock.

ARMY—THE QUEEN'S MESSAGE—THE RESERVES.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I should like to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is intended that the Queen's Message shall be taken into consideration on Monday; and, if so, whether it will be the first Order?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I was just about to make a statement on this subject. My right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who brought up the Message yesterday, fixed the consideration of it nominally for Monday; but it will be convenient to the House to state that we do not propose to ask the House to consider it on Monday. The day for its consideration will be fixed on Monday. Perhaps I may be allowed to state what the exact position of the matter will be. The Proclamation which will be issued according to the terms of Her Majesty's Message will have the immediate effect of suspending the transfer to the Reserves of men throughout the Army. It will also suspend the discharge of men who would otherwise be entitled to take their discharge. It will enable the Government to call out the whole of the Army and Militia Reserves. But which classes, or what portion of classes, of the Army or Militia Reserves it may be desirable to call out shortly is still under the consideration of the Military Authorities; and it will be more convenient to postpone the consideration of the Message until the actual measures immediately to be taken have been decided on. Postponing the consideration of the Message will not involve any de-

lay in any of the actual measures necessary to be taken, as, in accordance with former precedents, those measures should be taken at once.

COLONEL STANLEY: I beg to give Notice that, on Monday, I shall ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether he will be prepared, as soon as possible, to state what classes of the Reserve it is intended to call out, having regard to the fact that all the men of the Reserve are liable to be called out, and that it is inadvisable that they should give up their situations if it is not intended to call them out?

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL gave Notice that, on Monday, he would ask the noble Marquess, Whether, in face of the immense preparations that were taking place both in India and in this country, Her Majesty's Government proposed that the House should separate for the Easter Recess without according to the House any information whatever?

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

RESOLUTION.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Orders of the Day be postponed until after the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Egyptian Loan," —(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

MR. HOPWOOD said, he must be allowed to express the disappointment he felt that, after having secured the first place for showing the necessity for a Court of Criminal Appeal, he should have to give way for a matter which was of little interest to anybody. But he should take the earliest opportunity of reverting to the subject.

Motion *agreed to.*

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—o—

EGYPTIAN LOAN.

COMMITTEE. [ADJOURNED DEBATE.]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Question again proposed,

"That Her Majesty be authorised to guarantee the payment of an annuity of three hundred and fifteen thousand pounds sterling for the purpose of a loan, to be raised by the Government of Egypt, in pursuance of the Convention signed at London on the eighteenth day of March 1885, between Her Majesty and the Governments of Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Italy, and Russia, with the authority of Turkey; and that provision be made out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, or the growing produce thereof, for the issue of such sums of money from time to time, as may be required, to pay any sums which may at any time be required to fulfil the guarantee of Her Majesty in respect of such annuity, conformably to the tenor of Her Majesty's engagement as specified in the said Convention."—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Amendment again proposed,

To leave out from the word "That," to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the proposals for adjusting the finances of Egypt contained in the Convention of March 18th, and the collateral arrangement, indicated in the Papers presented to Parliament, for regulating, without any previous communication to Parliament, the international position of the Suez Canal are unsatisfactory, and do not warrant the agreement into which the Government have provisionally entered," — (*Mr. Thomas Bruce,*)

—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: The proposal which is now under the consideration of the Committee has been recommended by Her Majesty's Government rather as a financial than as a political arrangement. We have been warned not to exaggerate the effect of this Agreement. On the one hand, the serious importance of impending bankruptcy in Egypt has been painted to us in the darkest colours; on the other hand, we have been asked to avert that evil, firstly, by consenting to bear the burden of an International Guarantee involving no real liability and no idea international interference; secondly, by undertaking an inquiry by English officials during the next two years into the finances of Egypt—an inquiry of a kind which, I am afraid, has been going on at any time during the past three years; and, thirdly, by agreeing to a proposal for the appointment of an International Commission of Inquiry at the distant date of two years hence, under conditions which Her Majesty's Government have endeavoured to show may be no real undertaking at all. Now, if that be the opinion, or anything like the opinion, which the Prime Minister entertains of the Agreement which is now under the consideration of the Committee, I must say that a good deal which has hitherto seemed to me unac-

countable in his Egyptian policy is to some extent explained. We on this side of the House, and a good many hon. Members on the other side also, look upon this Agreement from a different point of view. To us it appears a proposal entering into all the relations which exist between England, Egypt, and the Great Powers of Europe. It seems to be something very like the first step on a course which will, as we believe, inflict incalculable evils both on this country and on Egypt. I should like to address to the Committee, in the first place, a few observations on the purely financial aspect of this question; and I hope the Chancellor of the Exchequer will undertake to explain certain points, the nature of which I confess do not appear to me at present in any way clear. I think some time ago the Prime Minister stated that, in his opinion, an English guarantee of an Egyptian Loan might properly be part of the price of a really stable and complete arrangement for securing an equilibrium in Egyptian finance. Now, is this arrangement stable or complete? Has it the slightest element of stability about it? Is it merely a postponement for a couple of years of the day of reckoning, which must inevitably come? Is it complete? Why, last year, in the London Conference, Her Majesty's Government insisted on certain concessions by the bondholders as the minimum to be required. Now they have accepted from the bondholders a tax which can in no case fall short by less than £140,000 a-year of the concessions which six months ago they thought were the least that should be obtained. Not only so, but the arrangement with the bondholders is purely conditional. It is conditional on the acceptance by some person or persons not defined, but who may be, of course, an International Tribunal, of the belief that the state of Egyptian finance during the two years to which this concession is to extend has been such as to require that that contribution should be made. I will venture to say that nothing more indefinite than this contribution was ever embodied in a financial agreement. There is no real certainty that it will ever be made at all. More than that, are the provisions of this Agreement complete in themselves so far as they affect finance? Is there anything to show that the probable Revenues of Egypt during the forthcoming two years have been taken into consideration, and the deficits which must almost certainly accrue as they have accrued in past years? I will venture to say that if there be any provisions made within the terms of the Loan for meeting those deficits it is inadequate. It is inadequate on the showing of the Government themselves; for, as far as I can gather from the figures before the Committee, the calculations of Revenue that have now to be accepted are much more akin to those French calculations which were rejected at the Conference in London, than to the moderate estimates which commended themselves to Sir Evelyn Baring and to the English Committee at that Conference, and which were reported upon by the Earl of Northbrook, when Her Majesty's Commissioner in Egypt, as substantially correct. It appears to me that in this arrangement, even as regarded from the financial point of view, Her Majesty's Government are now preparing fresh trouble for Egypt. Is the Revenue of Egypt likely to reach even the estimates which Sir Evelyn Baring has assented to? I should like to read to the Committee a short passage from the fragments of the Earl of Northbrook's Report, which have been presented to the House on this subject. The Earl of Northbrook states his strong opinion that in order to enable Egypt to meet the cost of her administration and the interest on the Debt—

> "It is indispensable she should be set free from the trammels which now hamper the action of the Government, increase the cost of the administration, and diminish the resources of the country."

Then he goes on to refer to the difficulty of taxing foreigners equally with the Natives. This is a principle which months ago was conceded by the Great Powers, and which I am quite ready to acknowledge the provisions of the Convention may enable us to put in satisfactory practice. But I will read to the Committee his first and third "incumbrances." He refers to the

> "Constitution of the Administrations of the Daira and Domain Lands and of the Egyptian Railways in the supposed interest of the bondholders,"

and to

> "Certain provisions of the Law of Liquidation, especially those which debar the Egyptian Government from making fiscal changes in the

assigned Provinces and revenues without the consent of the Commissioners of the *Caisse*."—[Egypt. No. 4 (1885), p. 32.]

Now, nothing can exceed the stress which the Earl of Northbrook lays upon the injury done to Egypt, in point of economy and efficiency, by the composition of those Boards of Daira, Domains, and Railways, composed as they are of Representatives of the three nationalities, and by their independence of the Egyptian Government. It may be said that in this Convention the French Government have agreed to discuss this important matter with the English Government, and that it is hoped that some satisfactory conclusion may be arrived at. But in what spirit have the French Government undertaken to enter on this discussion? It may be found in the reply of the French Government to the suggestion of Her Majesty's Government on this matter. The French Government, in their counter proposals to those of Her Majesty's Government sent on January 17, state—

"As regards the Daira and the Domains, the Government of the Republic does not think it necessary to alter the system at present, as is proposed in the Memorandum of the 29th of November. From the financial point of view, there is no advantage in the Domain Loan being amalgamated with the Preference Debt and the Daira Loan with the Unified Debt. From the administrative point of view, the disadvantages resulting from the comparative independence of the Administrations of the Domains and the Daira are largely compensated for by the guarantees which these Administrations offer."—[*Ibid.*, p. 100.]

It has always been the case throughout those negotiations; the French Government have had in view the guarantees of the bondholders, and not the promotion of economy and efficiency in the Government of Egypt. Can we believe that it will be really possible for Her Majesty's Government with an International Commission of Inquiry hanging over their heads, upon this important question, to arrive at an understanding with the French Government, in the next two years, the satisfactory settlement of which is described by the Earl of Northbrook himself as indispensable for the safety of Egypt? It seems to me that on these points which I have touched, and viewed as a merely financial arrangement, this Agreement cannot be considered satisfactory; but it is infinitely more important as regarded from the political point of view. Last night the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in the course of a very able speech, referred to the arrangement, which the Committee is now asked to sanction, as being in the nature of a "compromise." With the exception that some concession, the extent of which I have already described, has been obtained from the bondholders, and that the institution of an International Commission of Inquiry has been postponed for two years, I will venture to say that this arrangement is not a compromise, but a complete surrender on the part of Her Majesty's Government. It bears the most wonderful resemblance to a certain proposal, which appears from the Protocols of the Conferences to have been made by the French Government as long ago as the 24th of July last. In that proposal I find a suggestion that there should be a provisional Egyptian Budget for two years; that at the end of that time the Powers should examine the Budget for 1887; that there should be a preliminary English inquiry on finance; and that there should be a joint guarantee. That was the occasion on which the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in reply to these proposals, gave in his memorable answer to the Conference, when he said, on the part of his Colleagues, as well as of himself, that Her Majesty's Government could not expect or ask Parliament to agree to a joint guarantee. The noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs last night attempted to explain that answer away. He suggested, in the first place, that it had not been accurately reported. Well, when we remember the care with which all these Protocols are framed, that they are submitted to the persons whose speeches they report before they are confirmed, I think it would almost be sufficient to justify me in characterizing the suggestion of the noble Lord as one that is absolutely unworthy of himself. But, more than that, my right hon. Friend the Member for King's Lynn (Mr. Bourke) pointed out at once to the noble Lord that it is impossible there could have been any such mistake in this case, because the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer formed part of a written Memorandum laid before the Conference, and, therefore, represented the actual words that were

used. When this suggestion was put aside, the noble Lord tried another one. He seemed to suggest that the Chancellor of the Exchequer might have changed his mind since the date at which he expressed the opinion that I have quoted, and on this account alone—that now some concession has been exacted from the bondholders. Well, but that does not agree with the view which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has himself expressed. Why does the right hon. Gentleman now agree to the joint guarantee? He told the House the other day that the Anglo-French Convention of 1855 was a purely financial arrangement, which gave the guarantors no right to interfere in Turkey, and that, in his mind, this Convention was precisely like it, and therefore gave no ground for International interference. Now, it has been already pointed out more than once in the course of this debate how completely the circumstances of the Anglo-French Convention of 1855 differ from those of the Convention into which we are now asked to enter—how all the relations of the contracting Powers to the country which requires the loan are absolutely unique in this case as compared with any of those loans or guarantees that were dwelt upon at such length by the Prime Minister yesterday. I should like, Sir, very much to know how long Her Majesty's Government retained the opinion that was expressed on this matter by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Conference last July. When this proposal of a joint guarantee was renewed in January, did Her Majesty's Government make any attempt to resist it? Has there been any correspondence between the Powers on this subject? And, if so, why has not a single passage of the Correspondence been presented to Parliament? They could have resisted it if they had chosen, and successfully resisted it, because when the same proposal was made to the Conference it was withdrawn by France on the objection of Her Majesty's Government; and even now, in the course of the later negotiations, it will be clear to anyone who reads the Papers that, in the first place, Italy by no means anticipated that Her Majesty's Government would accept the joint guarantee, and would have been quite prepared to aid them in resisting it; in the second place, that Russia was not prepared to enter into it to the fullest extent; and, in the third place, Austria-Hungary declared that if any single Power did not join she would not join either. Therefore, it is perfectly clear that if Her Majesty's Government had retained their objections to the joint guarantee, they could have successfully resisted it. What is the real truth of the matter? They did not care to try. And why did they not care to try? Because, in the words of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, they thought that no claim of International interference had been brought forward, and so there was no occasion to refer to it. I should like to argue this point very shortly. What is the idea of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the subject? Why, does he think that these Foreign Powers would have incurred the liability for this joint guarantee, unless it be to enable them to gain some fresh right of interference in Egypt? Can they have done it for the benefit of Egypt? Why, it is impossible, because the sole interest of Egypt in the matter is that the loan should be raised as cheaply as it can be, and it could be raised more cheaply under our sole guarantee than in any other way. Could they have done it for the benefit of this country? Is it likely that these Foreign Powers would try to save the liability of the British taxpayer in regard to Egypt? But even if it was, there was no reason for them to attempt to do so, because the Prime Minister has shown that, owing to the peculiar nature of the guarantee, it imposes no real liability on the guarantors at all. There is no reason shown for the action of France or the other Powers in requiring this joint guarantee unless it be to secure some fresh right of interference in Egypt. It does secure them that right of interference, and why? Because their present right is limited by the Law of Liquidation, and the Law of Liquidation relates simply to those bondholders who happen to be subjects of those Powers. But it is one thing for those Foreign Powers to have the right of interference on behalf of their subjects who are bondholders, and it is quite another thing for them to have the right which springs from the fact that they have

entered into a joint State guarantee of this kind. But the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs seemed to have some inkling of this matter in his speech last night. He told the Committee that the reason for this joint guarantee was a natural desire on the part of all the Powers not to be left out of the arrangements that were being made. Did the noble Lord ever ask himself what is the meaning of that natural desire? Did he ever think that its meaning was explained by the history of the last 12 months? The Committee will remember the extraordinary differences of opinion that arose between the English and French Governments in reference to the interpretation of the provisions of the Anglo-French Agreement, that gave extended powers to the *Caisse*. Her Majesty's Government took one view on that matter, and M. Ferry took quite another. According to the French idea, that was no mere affair of accounts. The agreement was one that gave to the *Caisse* powers of disallowance and surcharge, powers of superintendence, practically, over the finances of Egypt; and, according to the words used by M. Ferry himself, the *Caisse*, under the new arrangement, would have nearly all the Powers of the old Dual Control, except the right of sitting at Cabinet Councils in Egypt. What then followed? What was the ultimatum presented by France to the London Conference? It was described by Her Majesty's Government themselves as a scheme that conferred on the Commission of the *Caisse* the mastery over the government and affairs of Egypt. Will the noble Lord tell me that that shows only a desire to interfere on the part of a single Power? I refer him to the words used by the Foreign Secretary. When Russia applied to be represented on the Commission of the *Caisse*, what was Earl Granville's answer? He said that this request could only be made for political reasons. I should like very much to hear from some Member of Her Majesty's Government some reason for the belief which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has expressed that no claim of International interference in this matter has been brought forward. I think I have proved not merely that such claims have been made, but that they have been pressed to the utmost extent during the past 12 months by the Powers that have made them. I should like to be told in what way the French proposals that were rejected by Her Majesty's Government at the Conference last summer were more objectionable than those which they have agreed to under this Convention? The Prime Minister last night said a good deal about the postponement of the International inquiry. Well, we know very well how strongly Earl Granville, on the part of Her Majesty's Government, objected to the immediate institution of such an inquiry. I want to know why is the institution of such an inquiry at the end of two years less objectionable than at the present moment? In some respects it may be even more objectionable, because it keeps everything in hot water during all that time; it prevents anybody supporting you in reforms; it debars you from bringing about any settlement of Egyptian affairs, simply because everybody knows that you have agreed at the end of two years to the institution of a tribunal which may practically oust you from your position in Egypt. It cannot be contended that the inquiry is merely financial in its nature; Earl Granville himself has contradicted that. He said to the Conference that there was hardly any question, political or administrative, which might not be considered as indirectly connected with finance. I was surprised to hear the Prime Minister state yesterday that there was nothing in this Convention that recognized the right of interference. Why, Sir, what are the terms in which this Commission of Inquiry was referred to? The Governments agree to institute a general inquiry by Representatives of the Powers into the financial resources of Egypt, with power to suggest the adoption of such measures as may appear to be suitable to insure in the future a fresh distribution of the resources of that country. I say that this proposal was justly characterized yesterday by the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Bruce) as a practical supersession of the Government of Egypt. The noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs dwelt upon the way in which the Egyptian Government were already hampered by the powers of the *Caisse*. That was a remarkable argument to bring before the Committee in support

of a proposal for giving to a Commission of Inquiry powers infinitely greater than were ever possessed by the *Caisse*. What I fear is, that the joint guarantee, combined with this proposal for an International inquiry into Egyptian finance, is the first step in a course which must certainly lead to the internationalization of Egypt. Now, is that a result which Her Majesty's Government can contemplate with satisfaction? Why, we know very well from the speech of the Prime Minister yesterday that it is the last thing they desire. Is it a result that anybody can desire who sees the effects of the intrigues of the Powers in that unhappy country during the last half century? Is it a policy which can be completely executed? I think not, because, although the Government may neutralize the influence of England in Egypt, they cannot induce any other Power to share with us the burden of defending it, of maintaining law and order in it, and of raising those revenues with which the bondholders have to be satisfied. The Prime Minister put the matter very euphemistically yesterday when he said that nobody grudges us the performance of our duty in Egypt. The fact is nobody will lift a little finger to help us. All that the Foreign Powers have done hitherto has been to reap the fruits of our labours, so far as those fruits were necessary for their own purposes; and to interfere whenever our labours threatened to come to the point at which they might confer good government or prosperity upon the unfortunate country itself. Now, it seems to me that it is impossible for us to give up these duties which we have undertaken with reference to Egypt. Our interests compel us to perform them, because our interests are different in kind and greater in extent than the interests of any other Power. Then, if that be so, surely it should follow that we are also justified in claiming powers and rights in Egypt greater than are possessed by any foreign nation. I have often thought during the past three years that the Government have attempted to hold power in Egypt and avoid responsibility. They now seem to be aiming at responsibility without power. What are they doing in the Soudan? They are about to enter on a fresh stage of a bloody and hateful war—a war the main purpose of which, and possibly the only purpose and justification, is the safety of Egypt; and yet at this very moment they are of their own free will taking the first step in the surrender of their power for good in Egypt itself. I do not know what may be the military reasons of the Campaign which we are pursuing in the Soudan; but I am confident of this—that by such a policy as seems to be embodied in this Convention, the Government are destroying their political reasons for that Campaign, inasmuch as they are taking the first step in the surrender not only of the fruits of their sacrifices of men and money which has been made to such an extent during the past three years, but also of all those fresh sacrifices which the Government are every day calling on the country to incur, into the hands of the Committee representing Foreign Powers in Egypt. I am quite aware that some hon. Members, in the vote they will give to-night, will not be guided solely by their opinions on the merits of this Convention. If it were so, the proposals of the Government would be rejected by a very large majority. We have heard over and over again already—and I have no doubt we shall hear to-night—speeches from Members on the Ministerial side of the House who, from one point of view or another, have denounced this Convention, and yet who are going to vote for it. Now, we have heard a good deal of what happened as to the Convention of 1855. I should like to refer to a certain part of those proceedings, which appears to me to have very considerable significance. Considerable opposition was offered in this House to the terms of that Convention. The opposition came not merely from the Conservative Party, but from those who sat on the same side of the House as Lord Palmerston, who was then Prime Minister. There was a division of great importance upon the Convention. Lord Palmerston's Government was saved from defeat, and I have no doubt also from resignation, by an infinitesimal majority. But what was the composition of the minority? It included not merely the bulk of the Conservative Party of that time, but the present Prime Minister, with many of those able Colleagues who then acted with him in political life; and, more than that, it included certain hon. Mem-

bers below the Gangway, such as Mr. Cobden, Mr. Miall, and the senior right hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright), who at that day were independent Radicals indeed. Where is that independence now? In those days men gave their votes as they thought. Now, it seems to me the fashion to throw over your opinions in order to keep your Party in Office. I should like to read to the House the appeal which the present Prime Minister made to it with regard to this vote upon the Anglo-French Convention—

"The terms of the Convention contemplate the exercise of free discretion on the part of the House of Commons; and as they leave you the exercise of that free discretion, they leave you charged with a full responsibility."—(3 *Hansard*, [139] 1232-3.)

Will he repeat those words now? And, if he were to do so, would hon. Members behind him act upon them? It may be a great evil to overthrow a Government. Probably few men in this House are less anxious than I am to turn the Government out of Office; but there would be a greater evil than the overthrow of the Government, and that would be if this House should lose its independence of action upon these great questions, and should deprive itself of all practical usefulness in the conduct of public affairs. Hon. Members may think—though I do not say that the argument has been put into words — that we are not free in the vote we are about to give, because of the opinions and action of Foreign Powers. I was very gratified to hear the statement made by the Prime Minister last night, when he said that in this matter—

"The interests and views of the Powers are one, and they are cordially united with us in the desire to ascertain and rectify the condition of Egyptian finance."

That was a delightful picture which I had not anticipated from my previous perusal of the Blue Books. It had occurred to me, when reading the Papers which have been laid on the Table, that the Prime Minister, who, when in Opposition, made it a cardinal point of his policy to promote the Concert of Europe in Eastern affairs, had on this occasion promoted, no doubt, a Concert of Europe, but a Concert of Europe against his own country. I read with humiliation, I admit, those passages in which Earl Granville plaintively bleated out his complaints of delay on the part of Foreign Powers in the consideration of the proposals of Her Majesty's Government, when, all the time, these very Powers were discussing and settling among themselves a question of vital importance to English interests, without even the knowledge of the English Government. It was not pleasant to see how futile was the remonstrance which Earl Granville made against the institution of this International inquiry—futile because it had been previously agreed to —and now, even the place of the meeting of the Conference on the Suez Canal was settled by the Powers behind his back. I confess all this gave me an impression of the isolation of this country which is painful indeed. But such ideas must be quite baseless; for we know, from the speech of the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, that this Convention is the favourite child of Her Majesty's Government. The noble Lord spoke of it as the dawning of a better day for the future of Egypt. If that is so, and if the Government have adopted it because they like it, we are certainly free in our consideration of it. Then, what is there in the Convention which necessitates its acceptance? They repeat the original argument that immediate action is necessary because Egypt is bankrupt, and that something awful will happen in the month of April unless the House of Commons endorses the action of Her Majesty's Government. The absurdity of such a suggestion was yesterday exposed by the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Bruce), the Chairman of the Ottoman Bank, the highest authority in the House, and perhaps in the country, on the subject. He pointed out how obvious it was that those bankers, who from time to time had advanced as much money as the Egyptian Government required pending those negotiations, would be perfectly ready to make similar advances pending the consideration of this matter in the English Parliament. Then we are told that the financial situation is bad and must be remedied. Of course it is bad; of course it must be remedied. But the question before the Committee is, whether Her Majesty's Government have chosen the best way to remedy it? The noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs asked us last night—"What

good we should get by rejecting this Convention?" I will tell him. We should maintain the influence of England in Egypt. Again, the noble Lord asked—"How would the rejection of the Convention benefit the Fellaheen?" Again, I will tell him, because the maintenance of English influence in Egypt is the only hope the Fellaheen have of obtaining a good and just government. The noble Lord told us that its rejection would not injure the bondholders. I have no sympathy with the bondholders; but I say no policy could be more foolish for this country than to attempt to injure the legal interests of the bondholders. The noble Lord went on to say—"If you reject this Convention, what will happen?" I will tell him again. Parliament will maintain—I may say will recover—freedom of action in Egyptian affairs which Her Majesty's Government have bartered away for a mess of pottage. And I think it would use that freedom in a wiser way than their boasted freedom of action at the close of the Conference has been used by Her Majesty's Government. They seem to me to have been led by a nervous apprehension of financial liability to set up afresh those claims to foreign interference in Egypt which had practically fallen into abeyance, and to have obtained nothing in return except this conditional contribution from the bondholders. To my mind it would be infinitely better for us to have taken the whole responsibility of guaranteeing this loan, which the Prime Minister has conclusively shown could impose no real burden upon the taxpayers of this country. It would even have been better, if it had been necessary, to have given to the bondholders all that they are legally entitled to in the way of interest under the Law of Liquidation, than to agree to conditions which will destroy our power for good in Egypt; which will sacrifice English interests, which will prevent—or, at any rate, indefinitely defer — the establishment of good government and prosperity in that unfortunate country, and which, from the complications almost certain to follow the institution of a Commission of International Inquiry, may, too possibly, land us in a European war. I know there are difficulties in our way. I do not underrate them; but, to my mind, all those difficulties are the outcome of the incapacity and irresolution which have characterized the conduct of Her Majesty's Government. The difficulties will continue and increase until that policy is changed. They will not be removed by the acceptance of this Convention; but its rejection would, at least, save this country from the first step in a path of incalculable danger and disaster to Egypt and to the Empire.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: The right hon. Baronet commenced his speech by saying that he and the Party he represents approach this subject from a totally different standpoint from that occupied by Her Majesty's Government. I think the speech to which we have just listened is a sufficient proof of the truth of what he said; although I am not quite certain whether he himself has appreciated the most important point of divergence between the two sides of the House. In the course of his own speech, and of the debate which took place yesterday, that difference has been completely disclosed; and it shows in Gentlemen opposite a totally different view of the spirit and temper in which nations ought to enter into such negotiations as those in which we have been engaged. Her Majesty's Government thought that they had claims to make upon other Powers, which those Powers were legally entitled to refuse; and, therefore, they considered that the subject of negotiation was a matter for the courteous and considerate interchange of opinion, and probable also for mutual concessions. But if I understand the language on the other side, the right hon. Gentleman maintains that we ought to have made demands, and insisted upon their acceptance—["Oh!"]—that our first proposition should have been an ultimatum from which we would abate nothing, not even one jot, in consideration of the claims and rights of the Powers with whom we treated. ["Oh, oh!"] I see hon. Gentlemen opposite do not like to have their own views presented to them in that way; but I have provided myself with some extracts from the speeches which they have delivered, and which justify me in what I have said. The hon. Member for Portsmouth (MR. BRUCE) referred at some length to what he called the exceptional position of this country; and he based upon that exceptional position the argument that by our sacrifices we were entitled to

ignore the rights of other Powers, and to set aside the Law of Liquidation, which he describes as the supersession of the Egyptian Government. Now, we have been told that we have humiliated the country—[*Opposition cheers*]—that we have ignored British interests, and considered only the interests of Foreign Powers. Yes; and it appears that our crime consists in this—that we have not violently abrogated the solemn obligations which you yourselves were the persons to contract. It is to you we owe the Law of Liquidation, a *damnosa hereditas;* and yet you now complain because we did not, under circumstances of greater difficulty than when you consented to the law, violently abrogate it. The hon. Member for Guildford (Mr. Onslow) went further. He said that after the first shot we fired at Alexandria we ought to have known that Egypt should be ours. The hon. Member for West Gloucestershire (Mr. Ackers), who made a speech in some portions unintentionally humorous, said it was our duty as a Government to say, with all the sense of duty that power gives, that it was our intention to do what we thought fit—that is to say, to ignore the rights of other Powers. I want to know whether the right hon. Gentleman who spoke last accepts the views put forward on the part of his Party? The right hon. Gentleman himself went nearly as far. He said that we should be justified in "exacting"—that was the word he used with reference to our negotiations with the Great Powers—rights greater than those which any other Power possessed. All I say to that is that I think a very great change will come over our foreign relations for the future if they are to be conducted in this style. But it is not in this case alone that we are asked to do so. We are blamed because we are willing to concede to other nations something of what they demand on questions that have arisen—for instance, with reference to the French Expedition in Madagascar, and to the French War in China; we are told that we have humbled ourselves by yielding to the demands of Prince Bismarck, and there are Gentlemen who wish that we should send an ultimatum to Russia on the question of Afghanistan. I want to know whether Gentlemen opposite, who have some experience of Office and of official responsibility, approve of this policy; and whether they think it would be wise—I do not say whether it would be right—for us to oppose an obstinate resistance to the claims of other Powers—each in turn—upon points on which the Powers are most sensitive, and to defy and insult collective Europe in this matter of Egypt? If that be so, to vary a well-known expression, I will only say *C'est magnifique, mais c'est la guerre.* [*Laughter from the Opposition.*] I hope the House will mark the spirit in which that remark is greeted. That is the spirit in which Gentlemen and right hon. Gentlemen opposite desire that our relations with Foreign Powers should be carried on, and I am very glad to bring out this, because, after all, our whole discussion must turn upon that. If we are entitled in our negotiations with other Powers to say that we intend to have this or that, and that we will take no denial, then I admit that our negotiation is a failure, because we have never represented that we have got all that we desire. We have represented it as a bargain, in which we have conceded something, and have been met by reciprocal concessions on the other side. I would ask the Committee to consider what alternative is before them? We have some right to complain of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down. I know it is customary to say that an Opposition is not called upon to formulate a policy—that a physician is not called upon to prescribe until he is asked. But in discussing this Convention, the Committee are not in possession of all the facts until the views of the Opposition are made known. We cannot stand where we are. Something must be done. If you do not like what we have done, you are bound to tell us what we ought to have done, or what you would have done if you occupied our seats. The right hon. Gentleman, however, has not given us the least indication as to what he would do in our place. He turned with some asperity to my hon. Friends behind me, and accused them of voting against their convictions, in order to keep the Government in Office. I might as well accuse the right hon. Gentleman of concealing his convictions in order to gain Office. In the absence of any explanation of his real views, I put it to the Committee that there are practically only two alternatives to the course which

we have pursued. The first is, that we should guarantee the Egyptian Debt, and practically annex Egypt. Does the right hon. Gentleman accept that alternative? Is that the policy which he would substitute for that which we put before the House? I admit that there is something to be said for such a policy. It would be vigorous enough even to please the hon. Member for Eye. [Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett: No.] Well, I am very sorry if I have done the hon. Member an injustice. But there would be something to be said for such a policy. A proposition of that kind would relieve us at once from immediate financial embarrassment in Egypt. With English credit to support Egypt in such circumstances, there would be no reason to call upon the bondholders to make any sacrifice. Thus we should conciliate the bondholder, and the bondholder is a very important person. He is a person who must be conciliated; he has a great deal of influence, if not in the Councils of this country, at all events in the Councils of Europe, and his silence or assent might materially affect our negotiations. The hon. Member for South Northumberland (Mr. Grey) told us yesterday that he believed that some such proposal would be approved by 99 out of 100 Englishmen if the matter were placed before them fairly; and I believe that he proposes to devote the next two years of his life to convincing his constituency of the desirability of this step. I tell my hon. Friend candidly that I do not think that two years will be too long a time to devote to that purpose. I am afraid that he will have even more difficulty than he has already experienced in his endeavour to convince the public in connection with another matter.

Mr. ALBERT GREY: What I said was that 99 out of 100 persons would be prepared to incur a small money sacrifice rather than see established in Egypt a Multiple Control.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I think my hon. Friend said much more than that. It is all very well to talk about a small money sacrifice; but if my hon. Friend knows that it would only be a small sacrifice, he knows a good deal more than the financiers, who have considered the question. The hon. Member talked about taking the advice of Prince Bismarck, and of leasing Egypt from Turkey. That is the policy of the advantage of which the hon. Member is going to persuade his constituents; but I believe that the people are opposed to it, and that they are prepared to repudiate any Government who should become responsible for the annexation of Egypt. But I go further. Supposing my hon. Friend convinces this country, are the difficulties of the case at an end? No; for we have other countries to convince. Then my hon. Friend talked about taking a lease from the Sultan; but is the Sultan willing to grant a lease? Up to the present time we have not found him at all practicable in connection with questions affecting his relations with Egypt. But even supposing we overcame the reluctance of the Sultan, how are we to overcome the objection of other Powers? Prince Bismarck might make no objection; but the Government of France would object; and if it did not carry its objection to such a pitch as to make it a *casus belli*, a bitter, rankling feeling would, at any rate, be generated between the two countries, ready to break out at the first convenient opportunity. I hold that any such scheme as that to which I have been referring would not only be inexpedient, but almost impracticable. The only other alternative that I can see is to allow Egypt to go into bankruptcy, and that alternative will, perhaps, commend itself to a different class of mind, such as that possessed by the hon. Members for Kirkcaldy and Northampton (Sir George Campbell and Mr. Labouchere). Under such circumstances, the bondholders would suffer for their imprudent investments, and very few persons would sympathize with them in their suffering. But if the country went into bankruptcy, just consider what would happen. Either the cost of administration must fall into arrear, and the whole country get into a state of anarchy, or if we hold, as we well may, that the cost of the Government was a first charge on the Revenue, then the payment of the bondholders must be stopped, the Law of Liquidation must be broken, and in that case it is perfectly certain that the various Governments acting on behalf of their subjects would move the *Caisse* to proceed in the International Tribunals against the Members of the Government of Egypt who had counselled or allowed this to occur. We

know what the results of such an appeal would be. Execution would issue against the property of the persons forming the Government of Egypt, and that execution would be operative unless the Government of England were to step in and say that it should not be; unless, in other words, we were to declare in a high-handed manner that we should not allow the judgment of the Court and the provisions of Treaties to be observed. In that case, we should be in absolute conflict with the whole of Europe; there would not be one of the Powers that would not have a clear *casus belli* against this country. ["Oh!"] We should have broken International obligations and repudiated Treaties, and every Power which is a party to those Treaties would have a *casus belli* against us. It is quite conceivable that the Powers of Europe might combine and address an instant demand to us, asking that we should either allow the judgment of the Court to be operative, and the debts due to their nationalists to be paid, or that we should stand out of the way and evacuate Egypt. In that event, we should either have to evacute Egypt, coerced by and at the demand of Foreign Powers, and with the knowledge that our place would be immediately taken by one or other of them, and that the interests which it had hitherto been our policy to guard would be dependent for the future upon their goodwill and pleasure, or we should find ourselves opposed to a united Europe. If such a step should ever become necessary, it ought not to be contemplated by any sensible or reasonable Government until every other peaceable means of avoiding it has been exhausted. Under these circumstances we are brought back to the third alternative, that which we have adopted, that of entering into an agreement with Powers who are entitled to rights similar to ours. If the Government were justified in entering into negotiations with the Powers for the purpose of making a bargain, then what the Committee have now to do is to look at the bargain as business men, reasonably and impartially, and to consider, not merely whether it gives us everything that we could possibly desire, but whether, on the whole, it affords us substantial advantages, and whether it is the best that we could have expected under the circumstances. It is in that light that I propose to count up our gains and losses in this matter, and to examine what ground there is for the exaggerated language in which the so-called surrender of the Government has been described. We have made concessions; but other Governments have made sacrifices at least equal in importance. That has been especially the case with the Government of France; and we are bound to acknowledge and reciprocate their concessions in a similar spirit. The right hon. Gentleman referred to one or two points in his detailed criticisms of the Agreement which I should like to allude to in the outset. He said that there was no provision for deficits which had accrued, and which might accrue, before the expiration of two years. But there is connected with the loan of £9,000,000 a provision which covers not only the whole of the deficits which have accrued, but also the deficit expected to accrue in 1885. Although the deficits for 1886 and 1887 are not specifically provided for in the loan, yet power is taken to make a loan of £1,000,000 by the Government of Egypt to meet them, which sum, I suppose, would provide for anything we have the slightest reason to suppose could possibly accrue in the shape of deficits. It was also complained that there was no provision made for the reform of the Daira and Domains, on which the Earl of Northbrook laid such stress in his Report. It is quite true that is not the subject of the present Convention; but we are much more sanguine than right hon. Gentlemen opposite, because we believe that if this Convention goes on we shall be met fairly by the *Caisse* in reference to those important matters. Now, I will just ask the House to follow me while I point out the concessions we have made. They may all be measured by the difference between this Convention, as it stands, and the first proposals made to the London Conference in July, 1884. In the first place, they consist in the general guarantee for the loan which has been substituted for the single guarantee of Great Britain. I shall return to that directly, though I only mention it in passing now. Of the same kind is the assent of Great Britain to the inquiry which is to be conducted at the end of two years if, unfortunately, the deficit should continue so long. Well, all I

can say of that is that we have never contemplated a permanent settlement of Egyptian finance, or permanent sacrifices to be imposed upon the bondholders. We have always thought that the difficulty in which Egypt has been placed was essentially temporary, and that if Egypt had time she would probably be able out of her own resources to pay off the whole of her liabilities, and therefore we have never thought of making a permanent arrangement, though we have never resisted the proposals made to us that if further sacrifices were required from the bondholders, the Government who represented them should be entitled to make a further financial inquiry, such as has already taken place. Then, the third point was that the cost of the Army of Occupation had been reduced from the estimated sum, £300,000, which was asked in 1884, to £200,000, the estimated sum under the present Convention. And let me say this, although it has not attracted so much attention from hon. Gentlemen opposite, by far the greatest concession we have made is that we have accepted a sacrifice of 5 per cent on the interest on the loan in place of a sacrifice of one-half of the dividend, which would have amounted on the average to something like 11 per cent, which we asked in the first instance. That is a great sacrifice which we have had to make in behalf of the unfortunate taxpayers of Egypt, because of the influence which the bondholders have been able to exert in these negotiations. These are the whole of the concessions we have made—there are four of them. I have endeavoured to state them frankly, and I admit them to be concessions. But now, let me ask the Committee to look at the concessions that have been made to us, which are more numerous and quite as important as any that we have made. In the first place, we have got what I consider to be a very great concession—we have got the principle of the taxation of the bondholders conceded. At first, the French maintained the argument that there was no deficit at all; that the Revenues of Egypt could produce £600,000 a-year more than we had estimated; and that there was no ground whatever for asking for any sacrifice to be imposed on the bondholders. They still maintain that Egypt was solvent; but in deference to the pressure put upon them by us they have yielded and made this concession, and agree to a taxation of 5 per cent. I wonder that hon. Gentlemen opposite, who represented every concession made by this country to anybody else as humiliation and degradation, who blush whenever we give up anything in fair negotiation—I wonder what they would think if the French Parliament were to treat this concession in the same way, and say that M. Ferry and his Government were disgraced by their conduct in weakly yielding, and that they had been coerced by the pressure which Great Britain had put upon them. Well, then, the second point that has been admitted, to which I have not heard a single reference in this debate, is that the Great Powers have agreed to the equal taxation of foreigners. That is a concession of the very utmost importance. I should think that of all the iniquities under which Egypt has had to suffer in consequence of past International interference, there is none greater than that which has allowed foreigners to escape all taxation, while the poorest of the Fellaheen had to pay. Then, in the third place, although we have agreed to diminish the estimated cost of the Army of Occupation, the French have altered their Estimate from £120,000 to £200,000, and have met us half-way in the matter. Of course, it is a matter of an Estimate; and I am bound to say that if the Forces of Egypt returned to their normal condition, I see no reason whatever why £200,000 should not be accounted sufficient for the Army of Occupation. Another concession is in regard to the Suez Canal. In the first instance, the French demanded that the deduction from the interest of the Suez Canal should be 1 per cent. Now, we receive 5 per cent interest on the Suez Canal, 3½ per cent of which we regarded as interest, and 1½ per cent as Sinking Fund. The French demanded that the Sinking Fund should be suspended; but, as a matter of fact, they have reduced their demand to ½ per cent. And that is the whole of the sacrifice England has been asked to make with regard to the matter of the Suez Canal. Then, another point, which is of some importance, is with regard to the new loan of £9,000,000. The French, in the first instance, required that the loan should

be issued for £6,000,000 only, and that there should be no Sinking Fund; but, under the present arrangement, the sum allotted for the service of the new loan is sufficient to provide for a Sinking Fund which will provide for the total extinction of the loan, in what, at all events in the history of nations, is a reasonable time. Then, again, the Powers proposed that Egypt should be called upon to pay interest upon the indemnities for the Alexandria disturbances; but that proposal was never supported by the French Government, and had been withdrawn by the Powers, and does not appear in the Convention. And, lastly, a matter of very great importance, the French and the Powers have agreed to substitute an inquiry at the end of two years, if the deficit should continue, for —what they asked for in the first instance — an immediate inquiry. The right hon. Gentleman opposite actually declared that an inquiry at the end of two years was worse than an inquiry at the present moment. But an inquiry now would take away from us all freedom of action whatsoever; and for such an inquiry to have gone on while we were supreme in the occupation of Egypt would, undoubtedly, have had the effect of weakening our influence in the Egyptian Government and that of the Englishmen who are now advising and, to some extent, controlling it. But at the end of two years a period will have elapsed during which we shall have had an opportunity of doing what we can to restore Egyptian finance to a proper position; and I confess I think this concession is one of the most important of those obtained in the course of these negotiations. Again, the Powers have not only condoned the illegality committed when the Sinking Fund was suspended by the Earl of Northbrook's advice, but they have actually legalized the suspension of the Sinking Fund for a term of years. Now, I ask whether, after we have received all these concessions, it is fair to say that we are humiliated by the concessions we have made, where, as a matter of fact, we have got at least as much as we have given? Now, Sir, I come to a very important point. It is said—"You may have obtained advantages by this Agreement, but you have purchased them too dearly, because you have re-established or extended the right of International interference and International control." Now, I cannot help thinking that in the whole argument of the Opposition in this matter there is a fallacy, or, at all events, an omission, which vitiates its importance. Hon. Members opposite argued as if we had *tabula rasa* to deal with; as if Egypt were a free and independent country, and that we had deliberately established some right of interference by foreigners. As a matter of fact, Egypt is the creature of International interference. International rights of interference exist at the present time, and always have existed. They have given rise to the Law of Liquidation, and to International Tribunals, and they are the origin and foundation of all the troubles in which we find ourselves, and of all the proceedings which we are now asking the House to sanction. It is absurd for the Opposition to leave out of sight the position in which we find ourselves, and to treat these so-called International rights as if they were altogether a new creation. I should like to call the attention of the House to the way in which this matter is regarded abroad. I notice a letter in *The Times* from its Correspondent at Vienna, in which he says—

> "The Powers having always considered their right of interference as incontestable deem it superfluous to deduce a new title as to that right from the collective guarantee which they have assumed for the Egyptian loan."

Again and again this right of interference has been exercised by the Powers. I might refer to the events which led to the Law of Liquidation, when Prince Bismarck, in order to protect the rights of German bondholders, interfered on their behalf, and made an instrument of the Egyptian Courts for this purpose. I should also like to point out another instance of the exercise of this right of interference which is more germane; because it may be said that things are now very different from what they were when Prince Bismarck interfered in the above instance, owing to the sacrifices we have made, and to the English occupation of Egypt at the present time. The interference to which I am going to allude took place the other day, and during the present occupation of Egypt by British troops. The Earl of Northbrook found it necessary to advise the suspension of the Sinking Fund. The Egyptian Exchequer would otherwise

have been bankrupt, and there was not time to consult the Powers. We know from their own statements that the necessity of that step was admitted by all the Powers; yet when the Earl of Northbrook took that step all the Powers protested; International relations at once became strained. The Courts were appealed to, and a judgment was obtained, which would probably have led to further grave complications if the matter had not been disposed of by the present settlement. Under these circumstances, it would be absurd and idle to deny that the right and pretext of interference on the part of the Great Powers existed long before this Convention was entered into. It is said, why do the Powers ask that they may be allowed to join in this guarantee, if it does not give them a right of interference, which we know some of them have desired? But I would ask what authority is there for saying that the Great Powers of Europe had any desire for this collective guarantee? On the contrary, it appears that the Great Powers, with one exception, were absolutely indifferent on the matter. The right hon. Baronet opposite has, indeed, made that a ground of complaint against us. He says that if we had held out France would have been alone, and that the other Great Powers may be dismissed from the argument; and he says that this is a concession to France, and to France alone, that we have made. The right hon. Gentleman says we might have successfully resisted the demands of France. Perhaps we might; but we did not think that it was of sufficient importance to resist this concession to France. We found that France attached the utmost importance to this matter, and that, having regard to the fact of its special connection with Egypt in the past, this was to some extent a matter of *amour propre*, and that she desired to have her position with regard to Egypt recognized. Therefore we made the concession frankly, and we made it because we thought it was not of the slightest importance, and did not in the slightest degree increase the right of interference which France or any other Power previously possessed. I will only call attention to the fact that while in the absence of any agreement the right of interference in the financial concerns of Egypt might arise to-morrow if there was a failure to pay the last farthing due to the creditors of Egypt, the right of interference under this Agreement does not arise unless there is a failure to pay £300,000 annually out of a Revenue of £9,000,000. It is evident, therefore, that the right of interference is almost illusory. It is impossible to suppose that a Revenue of £9,000,000 can be so much reduced as not to be able to meet a first charge of £300,000. It has been said that an inquiry is to take place two years hence. But that inquiry is only to be held if we fail to find £200,000 additional out of the Revenue of £9,000,000. But if we have good luck we certainly ought to be able to find that surplus of £200,000. In that event no demand for an inquiry will hold good. If, however, all the resources should fail, and there should be at the end of two years a further deficit, and consequently a further demand upon the bondholders, even then all we have admitted is the principle that an inquiry of some kind should be held—an inquiry such as has been held again and again into the state of Egyptian finances, similar to the inquiry which preceded the Law of Liquidation —an inquiry solely into the financial situation, such as took place in 1876, 1879, and which accompanied the London Conference the other day. I would like to sum up the case as I venture to put it before the House on the part of the Government. First, I say that this Agreement presents considerable, substantial, and important advantages to the Egyptian taxpayers and to the Egyptian Government. In the second place, I say that it relieves the English Government from present embarrassment; that it gives us a breathing space of two years, in which to look about us, and in which to carry out much-needed financial reforms; that the concessions we have admittedly made to the susceptibilities, if you like to call them such, or to the rights and demands of the other Powers, have been fully and more than balanced by the concessions the other Powers have made to us. I say we have not created any new right of interference; that we have not established any new title to political or financial control; and I say, lastly, that the Agreement that we present to the House is the best that could have been obtained by any diplomatic representa-

tions, and without the risk of breaking with all the Powers of Europe. I have pointed out that the only alternative was the bankruptcy of Egypt, or the assumption of enormous liabilities upon the English taxpayers; and I have endeavoured to show that both these alternatives would have involved us in the gravest complications, and this at a time when, as all hon. Members must feel, it is certainly not desirable to multiply causes of offence to the other Great Powers of Europe. Now, what is the policy of the Opposition? Have they any policy at all? Will they disclose it now, even at the last moment, and tell us what it is they propose? The only indication I have had from the Front Bench opposite on this point is contained in the speech of the right hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Gibson) delivered at Darlington on Wednesday, and reported in *The Times* of yesterday, in the course of which he said—

"One would expect that the Ministers of England would unflinchingly insist on the patent and mandatory part of England's position and influence in Egypt."

If these words have any meaning—if they are not mere empty and vain bluster, as is much of the language used by hon. Gentlemen opposite—they mean that we are to disregard International rights; that Treaties are to be broken by us; that Europe is to be defied; and that the standard of action of this country is to be measured by its own convenience and its own interests. That is a policy unworthy of a great nation which desires to obtain respect, and which would be respected in proportion as it regards the just rights of others. I believe it is a policy that the House of Commons will reject; and I am quite convinced that it is a policy which the great majority of the nation will absolutely repudiate.

BARON HENRY DE WORMS said, that they had again been told that all their misfortunes were due to the Dual Control. That Dual Control continued for a considerable time after the present Government came into Office, and received the approval of the present Chancellor of the Exchequer and other Members of the Government. He thought it came strangely from the right hon. Gentleman, at the present moment, to take to the Government the credit of having done away with this Dual Control, which he said was so prejudicial to Egypt, and yet in the same breath to tell the Committee that it was to be to the advantage of the country to establish a Multiple Control. The right hon. Gentleman had given the Committee a variation of a quotation—"*C'est magnifique, mais c'est la guerre;*" but he commended to the consideration of the right hon. Gentleman another rendering of the phrase—"*Ce n'est pas magnifique, mais c'est la guerre.*" He thought this quotation was more suited to the policy which the Government was adopting; because if anything was calculated to bring about war it was the cowardly policy of concession of which the right hon. Gentleman was a distinguished advocate. He would go a step further, and say to the right hon. Gentleman that the policy he now advocated was one of giving up everything without receiving anything adequate in exchange for the concessions made. The policy of the Government was to receive nothing, but to give away that which was intrusted to their keeping. It was a reversal of Prince Bismarck's motto—"*Do ut des;*" the policy of Her Majesty's Government was —"*Do ut capias.*" It appeared that the House of Commons was to be jockeyed into accepting an Agreement which the common sense of the country repudiated. The right hon. Gentleman had told the Committee that their position in Egypt was the same as that of the other Powers. That was a point on which he joined issue with the right hon. Gentleman. That argument underlay the whole fallacy, the whole absurdity, and he might say the whole imbecility of the Government policy. Their position was unique with regard to Egypt. Their interest in Egypt was different from that of any other Power; but this was what Her Majesty's Government would not recognize. The interest which they had in Egypt had always been paramount, inasmuch as it was necessary for England, if she was to hold India, that she should command the high road to India. Napoleon I. had said that "the Power that commands Egypt commands India." What was said by Napoleon I. was equally true now. He could not, therefore, conceive why dust should be thrown not only in the eyes of the House of Commons, but in the eyes of the people, by making them believe that it was

simply a question of bankruptcy or non-bankruptcy in Egypt; and that all the Powers being equally interested with England, and England being equally interested with them, they were bound to carry out this Agreement for fear of offending them. Why did the Conference break up last year? At the time of the Conference the Chancellor of the Exchequer said —"We could not expect or ask Parliament to agree to a joint guarantee." That statement was made on the 24th of July last; and he asked the Committee to consider how very materially the opinion of Her Majesty's Ministers seemed to have changed since that utterance had been made. Earl Granville, when he explained away the failure of the Conference, said—

"There was hardly any question, political or administrative, which might not be considered as indirectly connected with finance."

How could that statement be reconciled with the statement made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer now? The Chancellor of the Exchequer stated the other day that the Government—

"Did not think it necessary to introduce into the Declaration or the Convention any reference to a claim which had not been put forward, and for which we did not conceive that any occasion had been given."

He wanted to know why the Committee were told at one moment that they were not, on any consideration, to offend the susceptibilities of the Powers, while at another Earl Granville did not hesitate to break up the Conference? Then the Committee were told that there was not the slightest idea on the part of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that a joint guarantee was intended; but that they were to be guided entirely by the point which the Powers had taken in signing the Convention of 1855. The Government explained the failure of the Conference on the ground that they could not consent to arrangements which would give the European Powers a mastery over the *Caisse* and affairs in Egypt. The courage of the Government had been gradually oozing out at their fingers ever since they plucked up the little show of spirit exhibited by Earl Granville at the Conference. They appeared then to have blustered, and now they had become afraid of their bluster. The President of the Board of Trade now admitted that England was supreme in the control of Egypt, while the Chancellor of the Exchequer said that they would not admit any interference of the Powers in Egypt. What conclusion was to be drawn from such diverse views on the part of the Government? He thought the conclusion to be drawn was that the Government did not themselves believe in the Convention which they asked the Committee to agree to. For the Government to come to the House of Commons and to say that because £1,500,000 was wanting therefore they were to hand over the control of Egypt to the Great Powers was an insult to the common sense of the country. Was it not a fact that the reason why the Government were so anxious for this International Control was that they wished to shift again the responsibility from their own shoulders to the shoulders of other countries? They did not feel themselves strong enough to accept the burden, therefore they wished to put it on the shoulders of Europe. Supposing this Convention to be signed, England would have but one voice out of several in the direction of affairs. If the Powers should say that their interests were equal with our own, even then the position would be fraught with the greatest danger. He maintained, however, that none of the Powers had the same interest in Egypt as this country had. He asked the Committee to say whether, admitting the question of the bankruptcy of Egypt to be imminent, that bankruptcy could not be averted at small cost by the action of England? The argument used by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer in defending the Convention on the ground of the precedent set in the case of the Anglo-French Loan to Turkey in 1855 had been completely refuted by anticipation in the speech made by his own Colleague the present Prime Minister in regard to that very Turkish Loan. The present Prime Minister, answering the then Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir George Lewis) in 1855, who had said—

"You can only call on the Turkish Government to fulfil its obligations, and, if they omit or refuse to fulfil them, there is, unhappily, only one *ultima ratio* to which independent nations can have recourse; and that, I grant, is of very imperfect value for the purpose of enforcing a guarantee;"

and that—

"Mr. Pitt did not go to war with Austria to compel her to fulfil her pecuniary obligations to this country;"

spoke thus—

"My right hon. Friend has entered at great length into a discussion of the Sardinian and Greek Loans, and into a history of the proceedings which led to the present Treaty. . . . But when he comes to my argument as to the terms of the Convention, he passes that over in a few words, which show that he is entirely in the dark as to its purport. . . . To my mind, the financial questions are utterly trivial and unimportant as compared with the political questions involved in this matter. . . . But observe, that you are now forming a partnership between England and France—a partnership, first, as to expenditure, and, secondly, as to re-imbursement. I want to know, under these circumstances, what law is to regulate the relations of the parties to that partnership? My right hon. Friend has not attempted to answer any of these questions. If I understood him correctly, he said that there was no right on the part of the Powers guaranteeing the loan on behalf of Turkey to occupy her territory in the event of her failing to make her payments. I would like to know what my right hon. Friend means by that doctrine? You have assigned to the British Government a portion of the revenues of Egypt and part of the Customs duty of Syria and Smyrna as a security. How, for instance, will your power over the Customs of Smyrna affect the rights of the Turkish Government? Will the Turkish Government have the right to abolish or revise the Customs' duties at Smyrna, or will it not? That is a point which I should like to hear explained by my right hon. Friend. Does he mean to assert that, if Turkey does not fulfil her engagement, the guaranteeing Powers are to have no right of occupation?"—(3 *Hansard*, [139] 1474-80.)

That was the language held by the present Prime Minister when criticizing the guarantee for the Turkish Loan of 1855; and now this Convention being proposed by the Government of which that right hon. Gentleman was the head, he (Baron de Worms) could not help thinking that there was an extremely dangerous ambiguity about that Instrument. He asked by what right did the Government now ask the House of Commons to approve a compact by which England would be giving away all her rights over Egypt to a Multiple in place of a Dual Control; and that, too, at a moment when Egypt, at all times important to us, was doubly important to our vital interests? One of the signatories of that Convention was Russia. He hoped that a struggle between that Power and England might yet be averted; but they ought to be careful not to give to Russia an authority over Egypt which it was essential that she should not have. The Committee at such a time surely ought, without distinction of Party, to refuse to sanction an Agreement which would hand over to such a Power any control over the highway to their Eastern Dominions. Those were considerations of the very gravest character, and no answer whatever was given to them by the speech of the President of the Board of Trade.

MR. SUTHERLAND said, that as far as the Motion and the Amendment before the House were concerned the speech delivered by the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. T. C. Bruce) possessed the great merit of considerable vagueness. He (Mr. Sutherland) imagined that hon. Members had formed the same judgment of that speech as he had, which was that it had not, in any way, met the admirable reasoning contained in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Chamberlain). There was no doubt whatever that the Motion and the Amendment before the Committee were of very great importance; and he confessed that he listened with the utmost interest and the utmost anxiety to the speech of the hon. Member for Portsmouth in support of his Amendment. He was, of course, perfectly well aware that no one was more thoroughly capable than that hon. Member to instruct the House as to the intricacies of Oriental finance; but the Amendment the hon. Member put before them was not a financial Amendment; it was a political Amendment. They had therefore a right to expect that he would show the Committee, plainly and clearly, that this country would derive some advantage from throwing over the Convention made by the Government; and it was not too much to say that the hon. Member had completely disappointed the Committee in that respect. It was, of course, very easy to pass strictures upon an arrangement of the kind proposed by the Government—an arrangement of so complicated a character—and, no doubt, there were many hon. Members who could pass elaborate strictures on every point in it. But that was not the question which they who had to vote on this matter had to consider. The question that they had to consider was, whether there was any other policy or proposal before the Committee; and, if not, whether, under these circumstances, the Government

proposal was one which, on its merits, should be condemned, or should be accepted. The question really was to determine whether, under all the circumstances, the Government in this arrangement had done the best in their power for the interests of Egypt and the interests of this country. In order to ascertain that point, it was necessary that the Committee should examine the surrounding circumstances of the case under which the Convention had been made. There was no doubt about one thing—that the condition of Egyptian finance was exceedingly pressing; that that country's affairs required to be set in order as speedily as possible. He quite agreed with the observations which had been made from the Opposition Bench that it would have been perfectly easy temporarily to have arranged for the £1,500,000 deficit; but he failed to see how a temporary arrangement, in regard to that deficit, would possibly mend the state of affairs. Every day that a permanent settlement was put off, the state of affairs must become worse than before. There was no doubt that there were very great difficulties about settling the financial question of Egypt. There was no doubt, at all events, that they were honourably bound to assist in removing the difficulties that had stood, and that still stood, in the way of that country. He regretted that the proposals put forward by Her Majesty's Government last summer were not accepted by the Powers. They were infinitely superior in the interests of Egypt to the proposals the Government had had to accept. Still, the counter proposals of France were such that it was impossible for the English Government to have accepted them, and to have remained in Egypt. It was said at the time, and many persons thought we had gained a great advantage by not having our proposals accepted, and that it would enable us to exercise the so-called "free hand" in regard to the finances of Egypt, which was obtained by the adjournment of the Conference *sine die;* but the result was deplorable, for we found that we were powerless to do anything but to break the Law of Liquidation by suspending the Sinking Fund—a course of procedure which would have placed us in antagonism to all the Powers of Europe. Clearly, the position of Egypt in regard to its finances was then much worse than it was before. There were then only two courses open to Ministers—namely, to make the best arrangement they could, or to put their hands into the pockets of the taxpayers of this country in order to make up the deficiency in the Egyptian Exchequer. In his opinion, the Government were wise in entering into the arrangement they had done. They would all have liked to have had a better arrangement; but if they compared the conditions of the arrangement with the conditions sought to be imposed upon this country at the Conference by France, they saw clearly that the conditions obtained were far more favourable to Egypt, and to the chances of this country doing some future good in Egypt. The Government had secured a 5 per cent tax on the coupons, and they were not face to face with the danger of an inquiry for two years, while Europe had consented to an equal tax on foreigners in Egypt. The arrangement was in itself a good arrangement, and there was no doubt whatever it was the intention of the Government that, at the end of two years, the condition of affairs in Egypt should be such that no inquiry would be necessary, or, at all events, that they would be prepared to come forward in such a way as to render the inquiry unnecessary. Such an inquiry, in the case of a Company, would be fatal to the Directors; and in this case it would mean neither more nor less than a Vote of Censure on this country; and if it took place it would be impossible for this country to remain for a single moment longer in the position of Advisers in Egypt. If he thought that the Convention meant additional International interference in Egypt he would not vote for it. He had had some experience of Boards of International Control in Egypt. The affairs placed in the hands of the International Sanitary Commission had been grossly mismanaged, both in the interests of England and of Egypt. It was interesting to note, in connection with this matter, the effect of the great terror which seized upon the different communities of the South of Europe when the cholera broke out. The steps which were taken were of the most extraordinary character, and the result was that the whole commerce of Italy and France to the East was for the time being suspended. The object of these

Mr. Sutherland

countries—and the proposal was attempted by Germany to be brought forward at the Conference—was to put Egypt into the position of a buffer, which would relieve them from the necessity of putting on quarantine themselves; and the result of that operation would be that the commerce of this country would be delayed and injured, while it would also be opposed to the interests of Egypt. He trusted, therefore, that the renewal of such a proposal would be prevented. Should the solution of the Suez Canal question be strictly on the lines laid down in Lord Granville's Circular, it would be entirely favourable to the interests of commerce, and therefore of civilization. He needed scarcely to say that he should vote for the proposals of the Government without any of the hesitation which some hon. Members had expressed; for he had failed to discover in the speeches of the opponents of this Convention any line of policy which the country could adopt in preference to that of the Government. He would only add that the policy of the Opposition, so far as he could discover any policy in their statements, appeared to be that of letting "I dare not wait upon I would," which led to nothing.

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON said, that the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Chamberlain) had altered and shifted a little the arguments adduced by his Leader last night. The right hon. Gentleman had declared that if we did not pass this Convention at once, we should be involved in a European war. If there was such a danger, the Prime Minister should not have omitted to refer to it. Certainly, there was no danger of the bankruptcy of Egypt, because as long as we occupied that country it would not become bankrupt. There was, however, a danger of the bankruptcy of the English Government; and it was for the sake of saving the Government, and not Egypt, that they were asked to decide this question without proper Notice. The Prime Minister said that we were the natural Advisers of Egypt. We were nothing of the kind. We were there because we had spent £15,000,000, and because we had lost 10,000 men. These sacrifices had given us duties, and placed us in a position of command there. How were we to fulfil these duties? What advantages to England and to Egypt ought these sacrifices to bring? The Convention secured nothing to England, and a dismal future to Egypt? During the last two years the French had been intriguing against us incessantly at Cairo; and ever since she had lost the Dual Control she had been striving to regain it. It had been truly said that this was not an English, but a French Agreement. This Convention meant nothing more nor less than the sale of Egypt to the Continental Powers, and England was the broker in the transaction. Every day it remained before the public the more unpopular the Government would become. That was a good reason for the Government pressing a decision in hot haste upon the House of Commons, but a very bad reason for the House assenting to such a course. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade had stated that if England alone guaranteed this loan it would mean nothing but annexation. ["Oh, oh!"] By parity of argument, if the Powers guaranteed the loan, it was nothing but the annexation of Egypt by the Powers. Europe was shocked, at the beginning of the century, by the partition of Poland. Were they not about to partition Egypt? He trusted that the Government would yet see that the effect of this Convention would be to allow the European Powers to exercise lordship over Egypt. A Multiple Guarantee and a Multiple Control would be no compensation to England for the sacrifices she had made.

MR. SLAGG said, he could not help remarking upon the Egyptian darkness which prevailed in the counsels of hon. Gentlemen opposite upon the subject before the Committee, and which the Conservative Leaders had seemed rather to add to than decrease. They certainly had heard a good deal of invective, and some abuse; and when they spoke of the proposed arrangement as one which ought for every reason to be condemned, it was their duty to offer some guidance to the House, and show a way of deliverance from the dilemma in which they thought their unhappy country was now placed. They were, however, pregnant with objections, but absolutely barren of advice or opinion. It seemed from the speeches of hon. Gentlemen opposite that the operation of the Government loomed rather larger in their eyes than

it really ought to do, or the facts justified. It was not an arrangement of that stupendous nature which would justify the portentous condemnation which they had heard. It seemed to him that the object of the Agreement was to give temporary relief to the financial difficulties of Egypt, and to stave off for a short time the pressure which would otherwise place the country in serious embarrassment; and it surely must be perfectly plain to anyone who had watched the course of affairs that the present would be an unwise and almost impossible time at which to undertake to recast entirely the complex questions and arrangements of Egyptian government. There was much that was unsatisfactory in regard to our present position in Egypt; and although the House had directed attention to the evils of a future Dual Control, he regarded with the greatest apprehension the Multiple Control which at present existed in Egypt, and was sure some change must be made in that respect before we could hope for any great results from our occupation. The Prime Minister had referred to the advantages which England had conferred on Egypt; and he (Mr. Slagg) was happy to be able to confirm much of what the Prime Minister said of the happy results. He might notice especially that, through the influence of the English Government, the kourbash had been entirely abolished, and that justice had been put in an infinitely better position. But perhaps the most beneficial change was the irrigation work of Colonel Scott Moncrieff. If nothing else had been done, English intervention in Egypt would not have been undertaken in vain. He thought it was no exaggeration to say that of the cotton crop of £10,000,000, some £5,000,000 depended upon the fructifying power of that work. Out of the sum of £9,000,000 which they were going to arrange for, £1,000,000, he was glad to find, would be devoted to the development of that system. There were only two modes of action open to us with regard to Egypt—either to stay there or to go away; we must either govern or go. By governing he did not mean annexation, but supreme power in the hands of the English Government to initiate reforms, and to carry them into effect, and a freedom from those intrigues, ambuscades, and thraldoms which now so obstructed and beset the path of our officials. At present they were held responsible for all that occurred; while it was impossible for them to gain the advantage of half their successes. There were many special reasons which eminently fitted the English people for the task of successfully governing Egypt. Besides the important commercial interests which we had in Egypt, we could better supply the country with the capital of which it was so much in need for the development of agriculture and commerce than any other country. There could be no doubt, also, that our high-minded and public-spirited officials were better qualified than any other for the administration of Egyptian affairs with justice and equity. But under the present system the door was left open to all sorts of abuse and corruption, and the full benefit of our rule was not obtained. This sum of money which was now being raised was mainly on our responsibility. The Power which could borrow at 20 per cent less than any of the other Powers required no backing up in its responsibility. To a certain extent the Convention into which we had entered with regard to Egypt made us responsible to the investors in Egyptian Stock; and he was inclined to think that it was not too great a price to pay in order to gain a little more control—a sufficient control—that we should take upon ourselves a little more responsibility with regard to Egypt than we now had. He did not think, as some did, that it would be in the least degree necessary to undertake a guarantee for the whole Debt. He did not say that we should incur any fresh responsibility for the sake of the bondholders, with whom he had no sympathy. But there were only two ways of dealing with the bondholders. We must either repudiate them, or we must acknowledge them. It was idle to suppose that we could refuse to acknowledge them; and that being the situation, we must make the best possible terms with them, and reduce the burden of the taxpayers in Egypt to the greatest possible extent. What were the alternatives we had before us to our taking a larger responsibility in the conduct of Egypt? We could hand over the Government to the Turk, to France, or to some other country; or we could do as many hon.

Mr. Slagg

Gentlemen sitting near him desired—we could allow the Egyptians to "stew in their own juice." We had the chance of allowing the Egyptians to "stew in their own juice" at the time of Arabi Pasha. But we did not take it, and he thought we acted wisely in putting the rebellion down. As to the management of its own affairs by Egypt, he wished to know what some of his hon. Friends meant by the phrase "Egypt for the Egyptians." Why, there were only three prominent administrators in the whole country — Nubar, Riaz, and Cherif Pashas. Before we could hope that the Egyptians could successfully undertake the conduct of their own affairs and their own government, they must have very much to add to their list of capable statesmen and administrators. There did not seem to be any rising men in that country to whom they could look forward with hope in the future. Were we, then, to hand over the country to the Turks? Very few would be found in this country to advocate such an alternative. There was the third course of allowing, or encouraging, the French to undertake the government. But there were many objections to that; for although the French would mean well by Egypt, they would mean much better by themselves. Moreover, with all possible politeness to our neighbours, he was quite sure they were in no way specially fitted for it. They had no commercial interests in the country, and French official ways were not always popular. We might, therefore, dismiss all those alternatives, and we should then find ourselves forced to the only possible conclusion—that England had not only a great duty in Egypt, but that she was specially designated to the task of governing and developing the country. He hoped that they would have the term of two years for experimental experience of this arrangement. From his observation during the little time he spent in Egypt, he thought the future of the country did not look very bright. The Fellaheen were deeply in debt, and their land was passing into the hands of the money-lenders; and, in spite of all that had been done, no one could stand up and say that the taxation in Egypt did not at the present moment equal the whole productive capacity of the Fellaheen. There was also a serious decline in the prices of every product of the country—in corn, in cotton, and in sugar. In view, therefore, of a possible crisis, it was surely the duty of the House and of the people at large to make up their minds as to what they were going to do. We had halted long enough between two opinions—we must now come to the conclusion whether we were to govern the country ourselves, or to leave it altogether. Our relations with Egypt had been solely undertaken with the view of benefiting that country; and he thought that that part of the question which related to the Suez Canal had been exaggerated. Since the new arrangement with regard to the Canal had come into effect, the irregularities and grievances of which shipowners used to complain had nearly all been removed; and he thought that there was nothing with regard to the question of the Canal in time of war that would bind us to the occupation of Egypt. He believed that it would be an ill day for Egypt and for the civilization of the world, although it might be a happy one for ourselves, if we were to leave that country; but to adopt neither of the two alternatives was a policy of which the people of this country were getting tired. He hoped that when the time came, as it must come soon, when we should have to decide, that we should have the courage to declare either that we should only remain in Egypt with full and sufficient powers over the administration of its affairs, or else that we would depart absolutely, and so relieve this country from a difficult and dangerous problem.

Mr. STUART-WORTLEY: I gather from the speeches that have been made from the opposite side that the best that can be said for the Convention is that it is in the nature of a disagreeable necessity; but I should be inclined to say that if the House is in face of a disagreeable necessity, it can be so only because the Government have missed two great opportunities. In 1882 they might have made arrangements for the government of Egypt and the future administration of the Suez Canal on the basis of the ascendancy of British interests and the abdication of French interests, both of which were at that time accomplished facts. Again, in 1884, the failure of the Conference left Her Majesty's Government free to settle the financial question in the same way that

they afterwards suspended the Sinking Fund. That is, on the principle that the Law of Liquidation had succumbed to inexorable necessity, and that English credit was strong enough to provide for the consequence of that state of things. The sole liability of England would have raised at a cheaper rate the necessary loan. The substantial acquiescence of the Powers, if not their formal consent, to the taxation of the coupons would have followed, as it had to follow the suspension of the Sinking Fund. Surely, in that case, the sacrifices made by England would have been no greater than they now are to be in virtue of the reduced payment on account of the Army of Occupation and of the taxation of the coupons and the Suez interest. The sacrifices made by England have alone averted total loss from the bondholders; yet, notwithstanding these sacrifices, the treatment of England in these negotiations by the Powers in the pretended interest of the bondholders has been something inconceivably shabby, and the Papers laid on the Table make that shabby treatment to seem to have been positively courted by Her Majesty's Government. Her Majesty's Government seem, throughout these negotiations, to have placed first the whims—I will not call them the interests—of France; and, next to that, the interests of the bondholders; and, last of all, the interests of England. Yet it is to England that France has surrendered all the duties, and that the bondholders owe all their safety. And here let me remark on the beggarly nature of the so-called French concessions, the assumed magnitude of which formed the whole basis and substratum of the speech of the President of the Board of Trade. Where would the French bondholders' 4 per cent or 5 per cent have been but for the Army of Occupation? What could be a more vital point of the administrative expenses than the cost of that Army? In this question is summed up the whole value of the French concessions. The policy of the Opposition, I can tell the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, would not have been to let France trade either upon that sense of duty, which forbade us to withdraw that Army, or upon the unfriendly attitude to us of certain of the Powers, of whom France is only one. The policy of the Opposition would have been to say—"England has been obliged, mainly through your *laches*, to pay enough and too much. If you and your bondholders will not recognize how much you already owe to us, you must stand aside and allow us to settle Egyptian finance on the principle that no settlement would now have been possible if it had not been for our sacrifices in the past." It is easy, but quite useless, for the right hon. Gentleman to pretend that he does not see that this must have been the policy of any Party that cared more for bare justice and the true welfare of Egypt than for the success of hostile intrigues against England. It may be that in previous cases International Guarantees have not been followed by International interferences and meddling; but the Prime Minister knows, as well as anyone, that the chance of that interference depends neither upon established practice, nor upon technical rule, but upon interest and impulse. In this case, both the interests and the impulses are proved to exist by the eagerness of the Powers to share the burden of the guarantee. That eagerness can be in no way due to any desire to benefit Egypt or to help England; for its effect will not be to lighten the burdens of the one, or the difficulties of the other, any more than they could be lightened without the International Guarantee. To the interest and impulse of which I spoke there will assuredly be added the opportunity and the pretext for the intervention which is only too clearly desired. As if this were not enough, the Powers are to be allowed, two years hence, to use the re-opening of the question to demand further terms. However, it is practically by the Government alone that these fears are not entertained. Of independent Members on the other side of the House, scarcely one, even for the purpose of debate, pretends to approve of this Agreement. Hon. Gentlemen's private opinions are notoriously unanimous in its condemnation. The defence of the inconsistency of the vote by which the same hon. Members are going to approve the Agreement appears to be that the Agreement, with all it faults and dangers, is a preferable alternative to a Liberal defeat. The contention is that to refuse this Resolution would place the Opposition in power; and that, therefore, the Agreement must be sanctioned as the lesser of two evils.

But I may remind hon. Members that the question whether the return of the Opposition to power would be an evil, is a question not for them, nor for their Party Associations, but for the nation to decide. I am not aware that hon. Gentlemen opposite have such complete infallibility, or such abundant virtues, that they can be trusted as judges in their own cause. If their doctrine, that you must not change horses crossing stream, is to be pushed to a length that happens now to suit hon. Members opposite, then all that Foreign Powers will in future have to do to force us into any disadvantageous concession is to harass us elsewhere, as Russia is now doing, in the hope that their game may be played for them in this country by some political wiseacres with talk such as this of changing horses. But, at all events, I am glad that at last the mask is off, and it is no longer pretended that the vote which is to be given has any reference to the real merits of the case; that at last we know that, on a question vitally concerning Egypt as well as England, neither Egypt nor England is to be considered, but are to be disregarded, if not sacrificed, solely for the benefit of a particular English faction. I congratulate Her Majesty's Government on the peculiarly Constitutional and conscientious nature of the approval by which their official existence is about to be prolonged.

MR. HENEAGE said, that the remarks of the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) were perfectly unjustifiable. He (Mr. Heneage) ventured to say that hon. Members on the Ministerial side were all agreed that the arrangement which had been entered into was perfectly fair, perfectly practicable, and perfectly reasonable, and their votes would be given solely upon that basis. ["Oh, oh!"] For his part, he thought the debate they had heard perfectly justified the Government in saying that it should not be further adjourned, because there appeared to be very little interest taken in the matter on the Opposition side. He did not quite know why the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Mr. T. C. Bruce) should have offered the Government a Vote of Confidence, unless it was that he had done it in a spirit of patriotic sacrifice, feeling that England was passing through a rather severe crisis, and that the Government should have its supporters united behind its back. On the Ministerial side of the House they were glad of the opportunity of showing that they approved of the arrangement that had been made. On some occasions they had not entirely agreed with the Government; but they preferred to put on one side their own opinions rather than support the Opposition, which had neither policy nor statesmanship. Hon. Members opposite had had great advantage in having speeches made for them from the Ministerial Benches, and they had also had the advantage of the votes of Irish Members. They would now have to be left to their own resources, and if those resources were as poor in the Lobby as they had been in debate he did not think they would gain much. After the Conference of last year, it was entirely impossible that this question should be settled without agreement with the Powers, who had always claimed a right to interfere in Egypt where their interests were concerned. The only way they could keep that interference at a minimum was by showing during the next two years that they intended to have their own way, and to govern Egypt in its own interests, and not for the interests of the bondholders. The question they had to consider was whether the Convention was good for Egypt, for the Fellaheen, and also for England and Europe generally. He ventured to say it was good for all three. If they could only place Egypt in a solvent position by this Convention, that alone, he thought, would justify them in supporting it, for he believed that when once she was placed in that position she would have abundant resources to make her prosperous and happy. The masterly speech of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade left little to be said upon the question, and he would not detain the House by reiterating his powerful arguments, with which he cordially agreed. The second great advantage was that we should have a free hand in Egypt at least for two years, and he hoped by that time the country would be in a solvent state. He did not believe that, except in a great emergency, we had a right to reduce the interest on the bonds. We ought either to repudiate the bondholders altogether, or to accept them in their present position. The bonds were

only paying 4 per cent, and that was what people paid in England for a mortgage on their land. It was said that the bonds were put out a great deal under their value; but in the time of the Great War English Consols were issued at 60, and now they were 100. To diminish the interest on these bonds would be no benefit to the Fellaheen, who were the tillers of the soil. It all went into the pockets of the landlords, who were the immediate tenants of the Egyptian Government. He regretted that the Domain and Daira Lands were not to be dealt with under the Convention; but the Government had reason to believe that they would be met in a fair spirit in this matter. He believed the real business of England in Egypt was to re-organize the Government and to place the Revenues in an efficient state, while protecting the Fellaheen. They were told that the Land Tax—that was to say, the rent paid for the land—was very severe in Egypt; but that was not the case. Twenty-five shillings per acre was the price paid by the Fellaheen, and 11*s.* by the large landholders. He thought the whole might be raised to 25*s.* an acre, considering the exceptional advantages the landowners possessed, and the fact that they often relet the land at £3 per acre. If, in good times, the Fellaheen were able to pay £3 an acre, the large landholders ought to be made to pay 25*s.* an acre. If the Fellaheen were free to cultivate their own lands, they would do very well; but when the large landholders let land to the Fellaheen, the latter were obliged to cultivate, not only their own lands, but those of the landholders. He would give the Government a most hearty vote, believing that they had made the best possible arrangement in the interest of Egypt, the Fellaheen, and this country.

MR. GRANTHAM said, that he had heard many extraordinary speeches delivered by the hon. Member for Grimsby (Mr. Heneage), but had never heard anything so extraordinary as the speech to which they had just listened. The hon Gentleman seemed to forget that in last night's debate the strongest opposition to the scheme now before the House came from his own side of the House. In fact, he (Mr. Grantham) thought that if they required further proof of the objectionable character of the Convention, it was to be found in the speeches of the supporters of Her Majesty's Government, for he had never known before an occasion on which all the Members who spoke on behalf of the Government condemned the policy of the Government for which they were about to vote so strongly as they did in that debate. All the men in whom the country had confidence on that (the Opposition) side of the House had spoken against Her Majesty's Government, and they were supplemented by hon. Gentlemen on the other side, not one of whom, when speaking last night, had a good word to say for Her Majesty's Government. Their language was, if anything, more drastic than that which had been used by the hon. Member for Wicklow (Mr. M'Coan)—a Gentleman who knew a great deal more about Egypt than the hon. Member for Grimsby; and it would be well if many Members of Her Majesty's Government knew Egypt as thoroughly. What did the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. Joseph Cowen) and the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) say? Why, all the speakers last night, though speaking from different points of view, condemned in the same way the conduct of Her Majesty's Government. They had last night a cloud of words in the able speech of the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice); but it all ended in this—that the Government had been obliged to make concessions to France. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Chamberlain) to-night ended in the same strain—that they had been obliged to make concessions to France. The right hon. Gentleman had applied himself to magnifying the concessions made by France, and minimizing the sacrifices made by England. That was where the Government had gone wrong throughout these transactions—they had forgotten what was due to England in their endeavours to uphold what they thought was due to other countries. But the first duty of an English Government was to look to the interests of England; and it appeared to him that in this arrangement the interests of this country were entirely overlooked. In his opinion it was half-hearted conduct such as that which had led to all the troubles in which this country was now involved; and in that way it could be shown that

all the difficulties of the Government in Egypt originated in the base concessions they made to the Boers. From the moment when the Government yielded to the Boers, the idea became prevalent throughout the East that any Power, however weak it might itself be, could get something out of England by a little squeezing. The First Lord of the Treasury on the previous night had argued that a Power's right of interference in the financial matters of another country did not denote the existence of any right to exercise control over the internal affairs of that country. He did not understand how the right hon. Gentleman could reconcile that view with the action of Lord Granville at the meeting of the Plenipotentiaries last July, when the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs resolutely opposed the suggestion of the other Powers to give them rights of financial control, on the very ground that those who were connected with the finances of Egypt would have, or would claim to have, a right to interfere in the administration of that country. The noble Lord said that it would involve, instead of a Dual, a Multiple Control, for there was hardly a question, political or administrative, which might not be considered to be connected with the question of finance. The noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had told them that, at the close of the Franco-German War, when France had been crushed by Germany, was the proper time for England to step in and get rid of the Dual Control. That might be so in the opinion of the noble Lord (Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice); but, at the same time, in his opinion, it would have been the most dishonourable time to have taken for doing so. It was too bad that the interests of this country should be sacrificed by a Government who appeared willing to give up anything and everything if they were only squeezed sufficiently. On the opening night of the debate, many hon. Members had assumed that Italy, Russia, Austria, and France all desired to share in the Guarantee, in order to gain a right to interfere in the affairs of Egypt in two years' time. Now, however, they were told that that assumption was unfounded, and that the present plan was acceded to for the sole purpose of pleasing France. That he held was not a sufficiently good cause for the action of the Government, considering that the country disliked the idea of a Multiple Control. The Government had made the mistake of forgetting the position which England gained by the bombardment of Alexandria and the battle of Tel-el-Kebir, and they ignored the position in which France placed herself by her conduct in 1882. It seemed as if the Government supposed that the bondholders must be paid in full; but they acquiesced in a reduction of their claims at the time of the Mission of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ripon (Mr. Goschen), and they would have acquiesced in a greater reduction than was now proposed. If Arabi had gained possession of Cairo and Alexandria, who could doubt that the bondholders would have been glad to get even only 1 per cent on the money which they had advanced? What was the pecuniary interest of this country in Egypt? This loan was not to enable Egypt to do something for this country, but was given her to enable her to do something for herself, and to enable her to pay interest to foreign countries. Hon. Gentlemen opposite had referred to the Loan of 1855; but there was no parallel between that case and the present. On that occasion the money was advanced by England, in order to advance her own interests; whereas now all the interests of this country were to be sacrificed, merely because there was a Government at the head of affairs who were ready to give way to anybody who squeezed them hard enough. Of course, he had no doubt as to what the vote would be that night. Whatever might be the merits of the case, they had seen in the course of this debate, as they had seen on other occasions, Member after Member get up on the Ministerial side of the House and repudiate the principles and policy of the Government in no measured language, but winding up their speeches by stating that they intended to vote for the Ministry they had denounced. Hon. Members opposite seemed bound in the iron chains of a despotism which they could not break; and the result was that upon every Vote of Confidence they had observed the Prime Minister, as he had a perfect right to do, turn round and say—"You approved of the blunders of my Government 12 months ago; how dare you op-

pose me now?" For those reasons he had, as he had said, very little confidence as to the result of the debate. Doubtless, the Government, with their big battalions, would carry the Vote; but however large or small the majority for Her Majesty's Government might be, whether 20, 30, or 100, it would count for nothing with the country, for the country knew too well how such a majority was made up.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, that in reading the Papers dealing with this subject, he felt increasing admiration for his own country. We had lost many valuable lives; we had paid higher Income Tax, and a great part of the energy of the public life of the country had been set aside; and we had given all this to Egypt, and we were doing, and had done, all this, not only without seeking selfish reward, but, as far as appeared from the Egyptian Papers, without one word of acknowledgment from those whose interests we had safeguarded and secured equally and conjointly with those of this country. He was sure that modern history afforded no parallel case; indeed, it seemed to him that, in the comity of nations, gratitude was entirely omitted. In these Papers, the Ministers of Foreign Powers were very strenuous indeed in defending their subjects against a charge of 5 per cent, but not one word did they say of thankfulness to the Power without whose intervention the charge would have been 50 per cent, for no Power on earth but England could have saved Egypt from a declaration of bankruptcy. Yet he was sure that, in their hearts, these astute foreign Gentlemen agreed with Mr. Mill in regarding this country as "incomparably the most conscientious of all nations in our national acts." The best trace of the sacrifices of this country was the tone of sympathy with, and for, the needs of Egypt which was apparent in Lord Granville's own language. That of other Powers displayed a most disagreeable cynicism, which we should be imitating if we were to engage in barren disputes as to the ascendancy of England, instead of looking to the necessities of Egypt. This was not a fitting opportunity to discuss our general policy in Egypt; but he did not understand how it would have been possible to obtain, in this financial matter, that denial of the International character of Egyptian finance which many hon. Members so ardently desired. To begin with, he did not see how the Khedive could have given priority to this loan over the Preference Debt if Her Majesty's Government had refused the Joint Guarantee of the Powers. The proposal of the Government in November to raise £4,000,000 of this loan in privileged stock at rather more than 4½ per cent, was undoubtedly less favourable for Egypt than the counter-proposal of France which had been accepted. The English Guarantee did not propose a lower rate than 3½ per cent for the loan. At the Conference of last year, the Guarantee proposed and rejected was clearly a controlling Guarantee; the re-forming of the *Caisse de la Dette* showed that it should govern Egyptian finance, and through the power of finance should control the political affairs of Egypt. Then the Powers demanded a fixed and certain re-assembling of the Conference to consider the Budget of 1887, and would yield no reduction of bondholders' interest. This Guarantee was quite a different matter. It was incident to the Law of Liquidation, and gave no right of interference that was not pre-existent. The Loan of 1885 was said to be the model; but it was not so. In that case, the service of the loan was practically conducted by the Bank of England; and France accepted, in the Convention and in the Declaration, a secondary place, though one of equal responsibility. The real question was, what did the country wish in regard to Egypt? Did it wish to annex Egypt? If so, then the proceeding they were asked to sanction would, undoubtedly, be a check, though not necessarily a hindrance, or a denial of that desire. He did not think the people of this country desired to make Egypt part of the British Empire, and, therefore, he did not object to the Convention on that account. Did they wish to be paid in full for the sacrifice of money which had been made in Egypt? If so, then the Convention ought to be rejected. But this House had, again and again, affirmed by its votes that it did not desire to lay upon the Egyptian Treasury all the expenditure which had been made, and, therefore, he did not object to the Convention on that account. What they did desire and demand was, that the efforts and sacrifices of England in Egypt should be acknowledged, and that the action of this country for the

welfare of Egypt should be undisturbed. He did not wish to make England more vulnerable in Egypt than she was at present. He did not find that this Convention lessened our power of action in Egypt, and, therefore, he did not object to the Convention on that account. But our sacrifices in Egypt had not received adequate acknowledgment from the Powers, and that was probably partly due to the modesty of the pretensions put forward by the Government. But, dealing with the matter purely as a question of finance, it would be seen that this loan was in one aspect borrowed at the expense of the International creditors of Egypt. It obtained a preference over their claims; and it was because of such preference that the Powers were so ready with their Guarantee. They assumed that because of the position of the Loan, it would cost them nothing. But he was not sure that the liability would be gratuitous, were it not for the power of England in Egypt. He did not suppose there would be default in this case; but, if not, it would be owing to the power of British arms. The promise of the Khedive to pay this annuity would not be worth more than the half of £9,000,000 in the open market, if Cairo and the Suez Canal were exposed to be overrun by the tribes of the Soudan. It was, therefore, decidedly necessary that the British Government should insist upon measures for securing good administration in Lower Egypt. If good government was found to be incompatible with the existence of the Capitulations, they should be abolished, if possible, with the friendly consent of the Powers. But good government in Egypt, if we were to remain responsible, must not be wholly subject to such cynical correspondence as that of these Blue Books, which showed that when that country was perishing for this financial relief, the Ministers of Foreign Powers could defer consideration of the subject for months, upon pleas which everyone must regard as inadequate and insufficient. It was the business of the Government, not merely to endeavour, but to succeed, in the next two years in so reforming the Government of Egypt that it might bear its financial burdens without difficulty, and so prevent the meeting of the Commission of Inquiry suggested in the Papers. If necessary, they must deal boldly with obstacles to that success. One result of this debate would be a further resolve on the part of the people of this country, that they would not continue an aggressive campaign in the Soudan unless there was a clearer definition of our position in Egypt and a proved necessity for that tremendous operation in regard to the welfare and security of Egypt. The Prime Minister promised that the House should not be called upon to give any vote on this occasion touching the Suez Canal, and, perhaps, it would have been better if the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Mr. T. C. Bruce) had omitted that subject altogether from his Amendment. He (Mr. Arthur Arnold) did not consider that, in the meeting of the Commission, we entered upon any unexpected obligation with reference to the Canal. It was simply in accordance with Lord Granville's well-known despatch of January, 1883. The arrangement as to the Canal, which was there proposed, appeared to be right and just, although it certainly did dontain a certain amount of what might be called benevolent fiction. If this Agreement were signed, the security of Egypt might justify the sinking of a ship at either end of the Canal. It might be right—indeed, he thought it was right—that the Agreement should be made, but the security of the freedom of the Canal would, in spite of any Agreement, be in the hands of the strongest and most vigilant of the Naval Powers. That, however, was not the question before the House now. They had to consider a very simple financial arrangement. He accepted it, because he believed that if he voted against it he should be acting injuriously to that which was the paramount object of all our efforts—the welfare of Egypt. Indeed, he could not help thinking that the Leaders of the Opposition were glad to find that they were saved by the strength of the Government supporters, composing what they termed the "Government's big battalions," from the responsibility of rejecting the Convention.

MR. MARRIOTT said, he was not surprised at the hon. Member's (Mr. Arthur Arnold's) last statement, for it was now not uncommon for supporters of the Government to bring forward strong arguments against the policy of the Government, and yet announce their intention of voting for the Government. The House had heard two very able speeches—one from the

present Leader of the Radical Party (Mr. Gladstone), and the other from the future Leader of that Party (Mr. Chamberlain); but if one of these was true, the other must be false. Whereas the Prime Minister argued in favour of this Convention, on the ground that it implied no International Control, the President of the Board of Trade argued that International Control now existed and must be continued. The right hon. Gentleman said it had existed all along, and could not be escaped from now. Supporters of the Government, therefore, had to choose which flag they would follow, the flag of the Prime Minister, or the flag of the future Leader of the Radical Party. The President of the Board of Trade made a statement that was certainly true —that the situation was full of difficulty; but he forgot to add that those very difficulties were chiefly the manufacture of the present Government. Two years ago they could have cut the knot of these difficulties, but they had neglected the opportunity of forming a stable, firm, just, or good Government after the battle of Tel-el-Kebir, when they had the game entirely in their own hands. The Prime Minister had made the astounding statement that all the nations had one object in view. The fact was, that every nation had its own object, and the only difference between England, Germany and France was, that while we made hypocritical professions, they did not. They said what they meant. Did the Government think that a firm and stable Administration would be established in Egypt by that Agreement? He believed that it intensified the evils under which Egypt was now suffering. What were those evils? In the first place, there was a mixed Administration in Egypt. With a mixed Administration, it was impossible for Egypt to have a firm, a good, or a just Government. Take, for instance, the case of the railways. At the present time, in consequence of this mixed Administration, the railways in Egypt were under the control of an Englishman, a Frenchman, and a Turk. No cheque could be cashed on account of those railways unless two of those gentlemen signed it. What was the result? Intrigue came into play, and intrigue was at the root of the evils of Egypt. This state of affairs existed not only with regard to the railways, but in regard to law and financial matters. As to the laws at the present moment, there was one administration for the Natives in civil matters and another for Europeans; while in criminal matters, there was one set of laws for the Natives, and 17 different forms of legal procedure for the different Nationalities of Europe. This state of things was, of course, a curse to the country, and if we were really in earnest, and if the professions of the Government were sincere in respect of the well-being of the Egyptian people, the first thing they would do would be to cut the knot of the mixed Administration, and get rid of this curse by setting up a sound financial system. At the present time, there were no fewer than five or six different financial Administrations, which had not the same object in view. One of the great evils under which the country suffered was that even at the *Caisse* four different Nationalities administered the money. How was the Government endeavouring to remedy this state of things? Owing to the weakness of England, the Administration of the *Caisse* had been increased from four members to six. The President of the Board of Trade seemed to think that there was nothing humiliating in the Agreement which the Government had drawn up in regard to Egypt; and he spoke of his great knowledge of the people of this country, by stating, in reply to the hon. Member for South Northumberland (Mr. Albert Grey), that 99 men out of 100 were against England guaranteeing the Debt. The right hon. Gentleman might have a great knowledge of the people of this country; but he (Mr. Marriott) was sure that the right hon. Gentleman did not interpret the feelings of the people of this country with anything like accuracy. He believed that the feeling of the people was one of disgust at the shame and the disgrace which the Government had brought on the nation. The feeling of the country was that the Agreement itself was humiliating, ignominious, and degrading. ["Oh, oh."] He would go further, and say that when the country understood the negotiations which led up to this Agreement, it would find that, humiliating, ignominious, and degrading as the Agreement might be, the negotiations were more degrading still. On the 24th of November last, Lord Granville drew up the English proposals. The chief point of those

proposals was the English Guarantee; secondly, that the money belonging to the Daira and the Domains should be paid to the Bank of England; thirdly, that they should be under the management of Egypt, which, of course, was under English control, and that the Daira and the Domain Loans might be sold, and the proceeds go to pay off the Debt. Anyone, however, who knew what the Daira and the Domain Loans were, knew that they could not pay off the debt upon them. What happened then? During the whole of that year no reply was sent by any Foreign Power to the English proposals. On the 11th of December, Germany and Russia sent an Identic Note, not to England, but to the Khedive, demanding that they should have a delegate upon the *Caisse*. Why did they do that? The reason they gave was in consequence of the arbitrary act of the Egyptian Government—they really meant the arbitrary act of Lord Northbrook—they did not have the same confidence and security for those who held investments in their own country, and therefore they felt that they had a right to have a delegate on the Board. The day after this, Austria and France came forward supporting the claim of Russia and Germany, and the consequence was that we had a concert of the Powers against England. After a great deal of waiting, and a great deal of correspondence between Lord Granville and France and Germany, then came the French proposals, which were diametrically opposed in principle to those of England. The President of the Board of Trade touched the fringe of the matter with great ability, but he avoided the real kernel of the subject. He relinquished the principle that England, having spent money and wasted life, ought to have the power in Egypt; the French principle was, that England, having spent money and shed her blood in the country, ought not to have power there. In fact, the Agreement was the giving up, root and branch, of all which Lord Granville had contended for in the first instance—namely, that England was to be the preponderating Power. If, in 1882, Her Majesty's Government had counted the cost of the war, and had known what was to be the result of their intervention, and had placed before the House the policy that we were going to spend so much money and send so many soldiers into Egypt, and at the end we were going to relinquish the rights of this country and place it in the same position as it stood in 1882, the House would have rejected the proposal with scorn and contempt. If the people of England were appealed to, he believed that they would be of opinion that that Agreement was humiliating and degrading to this country, and that the only thing that could be equally degrading was the negotiations that had led up to it. If it were to be sanctioned, we should be in a worse position than under the Dual Control.

MR. GOSCHEN: Sir Arthur Otway, I do not wish to trouble the Committee with many observations on this occasion. I only wish very shortly to state the reasons for the vote I propose to give. We have heard a great deal this evening, and last night also, as to the pressure that would be put upon Members on this side of the House with regard to the vote they were likely to give to-night, and it is assumed that the Government would be prepared to put pressure upon hon. Members in order to secure the passing of this Agreement. I do not deny that there may have been occasions when pressure has been exercised; but I do not think it has been necessary now, because I think that, on this occasion, the Government could not do better than rest this matter on the candid arguments which have been adduced on the one side or the other as to the feelings which this Agreement may excite, and not upon any preconceived opinions as to what either side of the House or what the country might wish. If the question be submitted to the Committee in this form—"Is it our duty, in the interest of the country, in the given circumstances of the moment, looking to the state of Europe, and to all that has passed, to pass this Agreement or reject it?" I believe that, without any pressure on the part of Her Majesty's Government, the Committee would simply find that it was its duty to pass it. The hon. Member who has just sat down has, in the main, confined his argument to a denunciation of the past conduct of Her Majesty's Government. He has recited the difficulties at present existing in Egypt, the complications existing with regard to finance, with regard to law, and with

regard to the many composite Administrations in Egypt. But that is not the question that is submitted to the Committee this evening. The question, to my mind, is simply this. Ought we to accept this Agreement, in view of the difficulties which this country would have to face if the Agreement were rejected? I am not sure that hon. Members have been fair with respect to this part of the case. For instance, my hon. Friend the Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Bruce) spoke of the attitude the bankers would be likely to assume supposing this Agreement were rejected. He explained that there had been several renewals of the advances made, and possibly, if this Agreement were rejected, there might be a further renewal. I quite agree that that is very probable, for this reason—that if the Egyptian Government were bankrupt, the renewal would not depend upon the discretion of the bankers, but upon the ability of the Egyptian Government to repay the advances which have been made. But I should like to hear, if the Agreement were rejected, and the Powers of Europe were to take up the attitude which it is possible they might take up under the circumstances, whether the bankers would be found to advance any further sums—in the general confusion that might occur—for the payment of the tribute to Constantinople, and the other liabilities of Egypt. I think we should be deceiving ourselves if we were to refrain from contemplating seriously the results of a breakdown of this Agreement under existing circumstances, and in the present situation of Europe, and looking to the attitude which the various Powers of Europe have assumed. We have had Blue Books on this subject; we have read those Blue Books, and I must say we have not found in them any very conciliatory disposition on the part of Foreign Powers to make things easy for Her Majesty's Government. ["Hear, hear!" *from the Opposition.*] An hon. Gentleman cheers that sentiment; for my part, I deplore the fact. I presume that that cheer means that our embarrassment may be due to the policy of Her Majesty's Government. I do not think it right that a sentiment of that kind should find approval in the House of Commons for such a reason. We have on both sides alike to deplore the fact that there is not a conciliatory attitude with regard to Egypt on the part of the Foreign Powers. And if that is so, is that to be made an argument for rejecting an Agreement, when such rejection might heighten that unconciliatory feeling displayed towards this country by the European Powers? If the breakdown of the Conference has had an effect on Europe, so that it has been less disposed to treat fairly with this country than it was before; and if, after the breakdown of the Conference, there should be now a further breakdown of the negotiations, what may we anticipate would be the attitude of Europe towards us? If we were to stand upon our rights, we might say that we should be indifferent to the attitude of Europe towards us. But this is a point which has not been handled by all the Members who have spoken to-night. Several Members of the Legal Profession have addressed the Committee as if there were a *tabula rasa* in this matter, and they have ignored the powerful argument of the President of the Board of Trade, that what we have to consider is the diplomatic engagements and what other Powers may conceive to be their absolute rights, which we should have to set aside as one of the effects of the rejection of this Agreement. Can it be denied that the rejection of this Agreement means the non-payment of large sums due under International acts? It means the revival of that suit—that most embarrassing suit—before the Tribunals, which was brought by the Representatives of the various Powers; it means the condemnation of the Ministers of Egypt who have acted under our advice. That is the first difficulty which would have to be met, and I confess I have not heard any suggestion from hon. Members opposite as to the way in which that difficulty ought to be met. How should it be met? We cannot disguise this point from ourselves, that the rejection of this Agreement can only be followed by one great measure—a measure extremely bold, and I do not know whether the Committee would be willing to take the responsibility of approving of such a measure—and that is the suspension of the functions of the *Caisse de la Dette*, and the suspension of the action of the International Tribunals by England alone. I do not know

whether the hon. Member opposite would be prepared to face that difficulty. I did not observe that that suggestion was cheered by any responsible Member opposite. But I only wish to put this matter fairly before the Committee and the country. I say, do not let us blink this question—do not let us shut our eyes to it. We may dislike the Agreement, and I doubt whether there are many Members in this House—I doubt whether there are many Members on the Treasury Bench—who like this Agreement. But the alternative is one which in the present situation of Europe, in the present position of our diplomatic relations with other countries, the Committee would not, I think, lightly accept. In the able speech of the right hon. Baronet the Member for East Gloucestershire (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), he referred to it as being the first step towards the internationalization of Egypt. Well, if that were so, I think the Committee would reject the Agreement. If it were the first step towards the internationalization of Egypt, after the sacrifices which this country has made, after the preponderance which we thought at one time we claimed in Egypt, the first step towards the internationalization of Egypt would be one which I do not believe the country would approve. But is it the first step towards the internationalization of Egypt? I would rather call it the last step, and not the first, because this is the situation in which we find ourselves—that Egypt is already internationalized through the position of the *Caisse*, and through the attitude which Foreign Governments have taken up in regard to the position of the *Caisse*. I do not know to what extent the arguments of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade will prevail to show the advantages and the disadvantages, the pros and the cons, of this Agreement; but this is clearly established to my mind—that this is but a further step, and that it is not necessary for Foreign Powers to appeal to this Guarantee in order to have ample power to interfere in the affairs of Egypt. I will confess that there is another step in these transactions which I have regretted as much as, and I may say almost more than, the Agreement, and that is the claim put forward by Russia and by Germany to be represented on the *Caisse de la Dette* as well as the other Powers; for we cannot ignore this fact, that while it would surely have been the wish of this country to have loosened the trammels imposed by foreign countries generally on Egypt, the attitude of Foreign Powers during the last year and a-half has been intended rather to tighten these chains than to loosen them. It will be seen, from the observations I have ventured to place before the Committee, that I frankly say I look upon this matter more in an International and a diplomatic light, than merely from the point of view of the conditions and the provisions of the Agreement. It is looking to the state of Europe generally that I think we ought to act, and looking at it from that point of view the action of Germany and Russia cannot be passed over. We cannot and ought not to blind our eyes to what has occurred. The hon. Member who spoke last, alluded to the claim put forward by Germany with regard to admission to the *Caisse*, and the hon. Member based his suggestion as to the motive of Germany mainly upon the action which had been taken with regard to the Sinking Fund. Her Majesty's Government, I understood, last night denied that it was mainly due to that particular cause, and I think they are borne out by the Papers in holding that view. ["No, no!"] Well, I am afraid it is rather worse; I wish it had only been based upon that particular action. I will read what was said by the German Consul General, writing to Nubar Pasha, as to the motive of Germany in claiming a place on the *Caisse*. The first passage is this—

> "Considerable modification has now taken place in the state of affairs, and the Commission of the Public Debt has acquired from the force of circumstances very much greater importance than it had at the beginning."

Now, I should have thought that we might have traversed that declaration entirely. The *Caisse* was intended as a protection against the despotism of Ismail Pasha. I think Her Majesty's Government might fairly have replied to the German Government, that while this country is in Egypt, not more importance, but less importance, ought to be attributed to the *Caisse de la Dette* than had been attributed before. Let me read the following most significant passage to the Committee:—

"The importance at present attaching to the above-named Commission, no longer allows of the abstention of the Imperial Government from the direct international superintendence which is exercised by all the Great Powers as signatories to the existing Treaties with the exception of Germany and Russia."

[Mr. MARRIOTT: Read the next paragraph.] I am alluding to the Sinking Fund, because it is of great importance to note that they claim a direct International superintendence. This is claimed, the Committee will observe—and I think they will see the point at which I am driving—not in consequence of this Agreement, but before and independently of this Agreement; and if we reject this Agreement, we do not get rid of the claim of Germany and Russia, but, on the contrary, we intensify the position, and they can, under this claim, set up a right to control our whole action in Egypt, even at the present time. This, then, is the position in which we find ourselves. I admit to the full it is a deplorable position, that while we are still in Egypt, and practically responsible for its administration, Foreign Powers are setting up a claim for direct International superintendence. But we must look these matters in the face. We cannot ignore passages of this kind, and speak as the right hon. Baronet the Member for East Gloucestershire (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) did, as if for the first time by this Agreement we were making a move towards the internationalization of Egypt. It exists, and all we can say now is that it is possible it might have been practicable at some other moment during the last two or three years for Her Majesty's Government to have held language to Foreign Powers of this description—"You are claiming this direct International superintendence; so long as you claim it we cannot continue to be responsible for the safety of Egypt. Either you should withdraw your demands, or else we shall be free to withdraw our troops." And here we come to a matter which appears to me to be specially and extremely important with reference to our present situation. I should wish to say a word as to the victory, if I may so call it, in this compromise which has been gained by Her Majesty's Government in postponing the Commission of Inquiry. Hon. Members opposite, who have spoken, have ignored the advantages of the postponement of that Commission, which I think, was vital to the case of Her Majesty's Government. They could not have accepted an immediate inquiry into the finances of Egypt, while we were conducting military operations. While we were in Egypt, with English Administrators at the head of the various Departments, it was impossible for Her Majesty's Government to assent to such a demand, put forward by France in the first instance; and I think it ought not to have been ignored, in the criticisms which have been made of the arrangement, that this advantage has been gained. And in all these matters it has not been merely on financial questions that controversy has taken place. The Prime Minister, I think, argued this question too much as if it was a financial question. I believe that the Commission of Inquiry, as it was proposed by France, was not simply intended to ascertain what the financial position of Egypt was, but it was intentionally put forward by France in order at once to have her hand, as far as she could, in the administration of Egypt. And so I am bound to say this—I do not hold with the hon. Member opposite that the Agreement will materially strengthen the position of Foreign Powers, because that position is already legally so strong. At the same time, I admit that it is a symptom of the intentions of Europe, and that it is a fact of much significance which we are bound to take into account. My right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade has stated this evening a fact which I do not think was familiar to most of us—namely, that many of the Foreign Powers were not anxious for this Guarantee, but that it was mainly agreed to at the instance of France. But, nevertheless, the fact remains that this International Guarantee is readily claimed and assented to by Europe as a whole; and I take it that we should do wrong, as the House of Commons is bound to look this matter in the face, if we did not see in it a kind of proof and symptom of the desire of Europe to be in a position of equality with us in Egypt. That was assented to last night by my noble Friend the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, who said—

"It seemed to him that it was not unreasonable or unnatural to believe that the sentiment of equality which existed among great nations

—a desire not to appear to be left out from arrangements which were being made in regard to events of European importance—was one which naturally weighed, and had weighed to a great extent, with these Powers in making such a demand."

The "sentiment of equality!" Now, that is a remark which strikes me with some surprise and some regret; and this is a point on which I must say I differ from Her Majesty's Government. I do not think they have pushed sufficiently in argument, so far as these Papers disclose, the fact that our sacrifices in Egypt, and our whole position in Egypt, do entitle us to more than this equality which is claimed by the other Powers—that they entitle us to preponderance. I remember that in a diplomatic conversation which I had with one of the chief French Diplomatists, he admitted this to the full, citing by way of illustration the position of the French in Tunis. "Our position in Tunis," he said, "must be one of supremacy, in the same way as you will claim supremacy in Egypt almost as a matter of life and death." Now, that preponderance of ours in Egypt appears to me, I admit, to be almost given up. It is not given up by the Agreement which is before us this evening, but it has, I believe, been given up. And why has it been given up? I think I know the reason. It is because, while other countries are fairly unanimous in their wishes with regard to the policy which their Governments pursue in Egypt, this country has been divided in its views as to what would be the proper position for us to take up. And let hon. Members, and let the country, be just to Her Majesty's Government with regard to that point. It is almost impossible for a Government, when it finds that the country is divided upon a matter of such supreme importance as this—namely, what our position in Egypt should be, to act with the same vigour with which it would be able to act if it felt it had the country unanimously at its back. I regret to say it, and I say it not looking at the past, and not with any reflection upon Her Majesty's Government or upon any section of this House or of the country, but if we continue in this position, and the country remains divided as to the policy to be pursued in Egypt, we shall go from disaster to disaster, and much worse things than this Agreement will be put upon us. It is because we do not know our mind that we have been weakened in our position. Now, I want to know this. What is our position at the present moment? Do we wish to maintain our preponderance in Egypt, or do we not? I do not see in any of the Papers that a demand or a wish or a claim for preponderance has been put forward with any force by Her Majesty's Government. Possibly Her Majesty's Government themselves reflect in this matter the attitude of the country. ["No, no!"] Yes; you have not heard me out. They faithfully reflect the attitude of the country in this—that there is a section who are in favour of maintaining our preponderance, and there is another section which would be content to see the internationalization of Egypt. That is the position. But we have not only to take ourselves into account, and we have not only to reckon with the country. The Committee will remember the able argument of the President of the Board of Trade, that we have to reckon with Europe in this matter; and I think it would be folly on the part of this country, if, being divided, as I am inclined to think we are divided with regard to this question of policy, we should still continue at some times to act as if we were in favour of maintaining our preponderance, and at other times as if we were inclined entirely to abandon it. See what a bearing this point has upon the retention of the Army of Occupation in Egypt. Are we to maintain our Army there? That, as hon. Members will see, is entirely within the limits of this debate, because the question of the cost of the Army of Occupation in Egypt is part of the arrangements which are to be confirmed this evening. I am inclined to think that, if Her Majesty's Government find out that the country will not back them in claiming permanent preponderance in Egypt, the time will come, and soon, when they must hold language to Europe of this kind—"If we are not to have preponderance, we will not have single and individual responsibility. We have accepted your International Guarantee; we have accepted a compromise in which you have accepted some of our proposals and have rejected others; but in the main you have intended by your diplomatic action to claim what the Under Secretary calls the principle of equality.

Well, then, let us likewise have equality in the responsibility, because the country will not long be content to remain in the position of acknowledging the equality which is recognized by this Agreement, and, at the same time, of continuing unaided those sacrifices which are made by us." I have admitted that, therefore, this Agreement is one which I consider, in the present position of Europe, and looking to the rights and the legal position of Europe, we are almost bound to accept; and I do not mean to say that as for the financial bargain Her Majesty's Government have not attempted to do their best. But, looking at these facts, do not let us drift on during these two years without making up our mind whether we are to be supreme in Egypt or not. Let the country, and let the Government, make up their minds whether they really intend to claim the position which was originally thought to belong to us in Egypt; and, if not, let us not waste treasure, and let us not waste lives, but let us take the measures which are indicated by the acceptance of an Agreement such as this.

Mr. W. H. SMITH and Sir GEORGE ELLIOT rose together. Sir ARTHUR OTWAY called upon the former.

MR. W. H. SMITH said: I submit myself, Sir Arthur Otway, to your call. I was, however, prepared to give way to my hon. Friend, because I know that his great knowledge of the affairs of Egypt would have amply justified his intervention at this particular moment; but I am anxious to say that no stronger arguments could have been put in force against the ratification of this Convention than those which have just been stated by the right hon. Gentleman opposite. The right hon. Gentleman told us that the Convention was based upon the assumption that there is an International equality in Egypt between the Great Powers, and that the preponderance which has been claimed by England in Egyptian affairs is no longer to be admitted by the Governments of Europe. The right hon. Gentleman has told us that we are in a deplorable position in this matter—that we are responsible for the administration of the Government of Egypt, and that while, at this moment, we are incurring great sacrifices, while we are holding Egypt by ourselves, and incurring vast sacrifices in men and treasure in protecting the frontiers of Egypt against an enemy whom he terms courageous and warlike, our actions in that country are to be subject to the control of Foreign Powers. The right hon. Gentleman also tells us that by entering into this Convention we have admitted the right of Foreign Governments to interfere in Egyptian affairs, and that in giving our assent to this Agreement, we shall be taking a further step towards the internationalization of that country—a step which he himself considers altogether objectionable. I do not think that any hon. Member could put forward any stronger arguments against this Convention than those which the right hon. Gentleman has submitted to the Committee. He has told us that the rejection of the Agreement means the non-payment of large funds payable under an International Guarantee, and the condemnation of the Ministers of Egypt, who would act under our advice in the performance of obligations which fall upon them under circumstances and conditions imposed upon them by the will of the Powers of Europe. But at this particular moment the security of Egypt rests only in the power exercised by Her Majesty's Government, and the very existence of Egypt itself is maintained by the authority and power of this country. I will pass from the speech of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, able as it was, because I am satisfied that the arguments he has advanced go far in the direction we ourselves contend for—that the Agreement submitted to our approval is not one which ought to be maintained. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade takes credit to the Government for respecting the legal rights of the Powers under the Law of Liquidation, which the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Bruce) desired to set aside. It is remarkable that the first act almost in the drama performed by Her Majesty's Government was an act of the Earl of Northbrook himself. I am glad to see that the right hon. Gentleman has had the courage to say that what was at first supposed to be the act of the Egyptian Government was the act of the Earl of Northbrook. It is quite right that we should recognize our responsibilities and our duties in

Egypt. There can be no doubt that at the present moment we are the Governing Power, and that what is called the Government of Egypt consists of a body of gentlemen who act by our authority and under our control and direction, and from that position we are now asked to recede. Has the right hon. Gentleman opposite thoroughly recognized the fact that the suspension was the act of the Earl of Northbrook and of Her Majesty's Government, and which they justified at the time on the ground of imperious necessity occasioned by the financial difficulties which beset the Government of Egypt at the moment? All that his hon. Friend the Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Bruce) desired was that the powers exercised under the Law of Liquidation should be suspended. Surely it is reasonable that my hon. Friend the Member for Portsmouth should take that view, when in doing so he certainly does not go beyond the view which Her Majesty's Government unquestionably took themselves, acting on the advice and representations of the Earl of Northbrook. But we are told that this Convention is a bargain which has been the result of negotiation. That may be so, but it still lies with us to say whether that bargain is a good or a bad one for this country; whether it is a bargain that ought to be maintained, or whether it is so bad in itself that the common sense of the country requires that it ought at once to be set aside. For my part, I maintain that it is a bad bargain for this country to enter into. The right hon. Gentleman opposite has told us that there is an alternative, and that the alternative to this Convention is that we should make ourselves responsible for the whole of the Egyptian Debt or annexation. I am not aware that any hon. Member on this side of the House has suggested that there should be a Guarantee of the whole Debt of Egypt or annexation. We are told that there was the alternative of bankruptcy and anarchy, and that under the Law of Liquidation the Powers will be entitled to put their legal rights into force. Then why should not Europe bear the burdens imposed upon England? If England is responsible for the position in which Egypt finds herself, under whose action and direction has she become responsible? Is it not under the action and under the judgment, if I may so say, of Her Majesty's Government during the last three or four years? And why should the Powers of Europe combined, step in now? Is it because Egypt is now incapable of paying the interest that may be due upon her bonds? Why should the Powers of Europe interfere? Is there any other Power of Europe that is prepared alone to take on itself the responsibility of restoring order and tranquillity in Egypt under present circumstances—is there any other Power in Europe that is prepared to step into our shoes and give the necessary guarantees for securing the occupation of that country which we are now carrying out for the advantage, not only of Egypt itself, but of Europe and the world? The third alternative is this Agreement, or bargain. We are told, with regard to this Agreement, that France has conceded much, and England something. We have conceded an inquiry in two years, and France has conceded the taxation of foreigners; but the taxation of foreigners was in force before the Agreement. England has conceded very much indeed, in principle, while France has conceded very little, and the other Powers for themselves nothing. Anyone dealing with a great difficulty, if he did his duty to those he represented, would prefer to deal with it at the present time, rather than adjourn it to the future. One of the great considerations which has been urged upon the Committee for the acceptance of this Agreement is, that instead of the inquiry proposed by France as to the ability of Egypt to bear the burden put upon her taking place now, it is to be postponed for a period of two years. What does that mean? It means that during the period of two years there should be an opportunity for intrigue and far more difficulty, which the experience of members of the European community in Egypt know well how to make use of, in order to throw obstacles in the way of the good government of that country. In his able, but audacious, speech, if I may so call it, the right hon. Gentleman opposite has succeeded admirably in exaggerating the statements made on this side of the House, and in minimizing the difficulties on his own side; but the country will feel that the circumstances are much too grave to permit the subject to be dealt with in a light-hearted manner between Parties.

The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has said that—

"Upon the rectification of the present financial situation depended the recovery of Egypt's financial prosperity."

I agree with him; but I regret that we have heard so much in this debate of the interests of Europe, and so little of the interests of the Egyptians. Throughout the whole of the Papers I have read, the most remarkable thing which has struck me is the entire absence of any reference to the material prosperity of Egypt, or of the steps which are necessary to insure that prosperity. It might be supposed that Egypt was a farm, on which so many slaves were engaged and occupied, that Europe had a claim upon it, and endeavoured to make the most out of it, no matter what the sufferings of the slaves employed upon the farm might be. I will now refer to the figures which have been laid before us by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and here I must make a complaint of the right hon. Gentleman. The figures in the Papers are most confused. I find that in no single case do the Papers tally with the figures in his statement. No single table agrees with the statement of the right hon. Gentleman. The Chancellor of the Exchequer put the administrative expenses of Egypt at £5,237,000, and there is no figure in the Papers which leads up to or makes anything approaching that sum of £5,237,000. He, therefore, obviously includes charges not embraced in the statements of Sir Evelyn Baring and the Earl of Northbrook, but they are not indicated in any way. I am obliged to make out as best I can what is included in this sum of £5,237,000. The right hon. Gentleman will, perhaps, correct me if I am wrong; but I assume they include £4,678,000 which the Earl of Northbrook put as the administrative expenses of Egypt; £200,000 for the Army of Occupation, variously stated at £120,000 and £160,000; also £175,000 due from the Egyptian Government for Suez Canal interest due to Her Majesty's Government; and £150,000 for Moukabalah. Assuming that to be the case, these figures make up a sum of £5,203,000, which is very nearly the sum mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman of £5,237,000; but it is an effort to trace the figures on the Paper, and I would ask the right hon. Gentleman to say whether I am right or wrong in my calculation. If I am right, there will then remain £3,275,000 for interest on Preference and Unified Debts, less 5 per cent for two years, amounting to £199,750. That leaves a sum of £3,075,250, added to which is the interest of £315,000 on the new loan, and £300,000 deficiency on the Daira and Domains. Altogether, I make out that the Expenditure of Egypt for the next year will amount to £8,927,250. But I find in one of these Papers a despatch from Sir Evelyn Baring, in which he says—

"At whatever sacrifices it is essential that the financial combination should present solid elements of stability and finality."

He tells us that, with a Revenue estimated at £9,000,000, a margin of not less than £200,000 should be allowed, so that the extreme estimate of which the Chancellor of the Exchequer avails himself is the Estimate of £8,800,000 as the Income to be dealt with. These are the proposals of Her Majesty's Government, for they are in effect the proposals of Her Majesty's Government, and not of the Government of Egypt, and they start with the deficit which the Earl of Northbrook expects in the ordinary course of things in the year 1885. Then let us fully realize what the effect of these proposals is as far as this country is concerned. Notwithstanding the warnings which the Government have received that their proposals should be final, energetic, and conclusive, they start, as I have said, with an annual deficit. The bondholders lose 5 per cent of their interest, with a title to recover that 5 per cent after the expiration of two years; and England loses ½ per cent on the interest of the Suez Canal shares, equal to one-tenth of the amount she ought to receive, with no power of recovery. Besides this, England has to pay the whole cost of the Army of Occupation, with the exception of a sum of £200,000 or so much of that sum as she may receive, and she has also to pay the whole cost of the Army in the Soudan. Practically and in fact, also, England guarantees the new loan, because the guarantee of the other Powers is in actual derogation of the financial value of the loan. As far as the actual financial operation is concerned, the joining of the five other Powers with England in the new loan will, it is notorious, reduce the amount which Egypt will receive from this loan.

Therefore, England has not only to pay for the cost of the Armies in Egypt and the Soudan, but she also incurs the liability of guaranteeing the new loan. In addition to that, England has spent much blood and millions of treasure in maintaining this condition of things for the benefit of the bondholders and in the interest of the other Powers. What is the actual condition of affairs? The Prime Minister himself said that at Tel-el-Kebir England effected the conquest of Egypt, and, after that, every act of the Egyptian Government in the maintenance of order and good government was done on the sole responsibility of England. Her Majesty's Government destroyed one Government in Egypt and set up another. Since that Her Majesty's Government have been responsible for every act of the machinery they created. An independent and responsible Government in Egypt must be held by every intelligent person to be absolutely impossible. The Ministers of the Egyptian Government hold their posts only by the act of Her Majesty's Government; they can be removed by Her Majesty's Government; they are merely marionettes of which the Government pull the strings. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade practically admitted throughout the whole course of his speech that it is England that is governing in Egypt. What are we to understand? The acts of the Government in Egypt are practically our acts, and they are to be checked, intrigued against, and thwarted by a Vigilance Committee of the European Powers, "in defence of their common interests," as M. Barrière says, but in defence of indefensible interests, as we were told with so much force in the powerful speech of my hon. Friend the Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Bruce). The Earl of Northbrook, in his Report, says, that in order to allow Egypt to meet the cost of her Administration and the interest on her Debt—

"It is indispensable, in my opinion, that Egypt should be set free from the trammels which now hamper the action of the Government, increase the cost of the administration, and diminish the resources of the country."

Only a small part, however, of this Report has been published, and it has been emasculated and deprived of a great portion of the interest which should attach to it, by the evident effort of Her Majesty's Government to prevent anything coming before the House which is condemnatory of the course they have pursued. After these words, the Earl of Northbrook tells us what are the encumbrances from which Egypt has to be set free. He says—

"The incumbrances to which I refer are:—First: the constitution of the Administration of the Daïra and Domain Lands and of the Egyptian Railways, in the supposed interest of the bondholders. Second: the difficulty of taxing foreigners equally with the natives of Egypt. Third: certain provisions of the Law of Liquidation, especially those which debar the Egyptian Government from making fiscal changes in the assigned Provinces and revenues without the consent of the Commissioners of the Caisse. I shall proceed to make some remarks upon each of the foregoing heads. I have placed the Administrations of the Daïra and Domain Lands and of the Railways first among the incumbrances from which the Egyptian Government suffers. The mere constitution of these Administrations, under which three gentlemen of different nationalities are made jointly responsible for the transaction of difficult and important business, is almost in itself a sufficient reason for making some change; the arrangement is not only unnecessarily costly, but its effect has naturally been to dilute responsibility and greatly to interfere with efficient and economical management . . . . I heard many complaints of the railway administration; for some time there was considerable risk of the permanent way not being properly maintained, and its present condition, as well as that of the rolling stock, leaves much to be desired. The Egyptian Government have no authority over the Board; they recently made some observations upon the railway budget, especially in regard to the increase of salaries, to which the Board replied, denying the right of the Government to interfere . . . . To conclude my proposals in regard to the removal of encumbrances upon Egyptian administration, it will be necessary to make some changes in the Law of Liquidation, and especially to provide that the Government should be free to introduce fiscal changes in the provinces and Administrations assigned to the Caisse. In order to place your Lordship in possession of the position of the Egyptian Government under the present provisions of the law, I need only observe that while they can exercise their discretion in respect to the modification of the land tax, or of any other taxes, in the provinces which are not assigned to the Caisse, such modifications cannot be extended to the assigned provinces without the concurrence of a majority of the Commissioners. Your Lordship will recognize that, if this arrangement is maintained, it must either render any fiscal changes impossible, or at least make them subject to the concurrence of a body of gentlemen who would naturally and not unreasonably be disposed to take a somewhat technical view of their duty, based upon their responsibility to the bondholders, and so hesitate to give their assent to any diminution of the gross receipts of the provinces and Adminstra-

tions assigned to the service of the Debt. The arrangements which I shall subsequently propose will dispense with the necessity of these provisions, which might have been required when the finances of Egypt were subject to the absolute will of the Ruler, but the reason for which has been removed now that the financial administration has been placed upon a more satisfactory footing."—[Egypt. No. 4 (1885), pp. 32-3.]

But what have become of those proposals? I have looked through the Papers carefully to find any proposals for the improvement of the *Caisse*, but I failed to find them. Why did I not find them? Because they were carefully removed from the despatches by Her Majesty's Government before they were submitted to the House of Commons. We are supposed to be dealing with the interests of Egypt and the interests of this country; and the Earl of Northbrook and Sir Evelyn Baring, in a subsequent Paper, tells us the removal of these trammels is absolutely indispensable for the good government of the country. Yet we find that Her Majesty's Government have concluded an Agreement ignoring altogether the recommendations of the Earl of Northbrook and Sir Evelyn Baring—two most important functionaries—after telling us, as Earl Granville does in his despatch, that, in respect of the proposals that the Daira and Domain Loans should be converted, and the lands held as security for our supposed loan—

"We are prepared to give it up in deference to the views of the French Government, but we are much impressed with the necessity, in the interests of the finances of Egypt, for some change in the system of the administration of those lands."—[*Ibid.* p. 111.]

Now, I want to know whether it is a reasonable and business-like or a proper course of proceeding, that when Her Majesty's Government have declared solemnly that the trammels which are imposed by these conditions upon the good government of Egypt are unendurable—that they hamper the resources of the country and prevent them from being developed, and that they prevent Her Majesty's Agents from doing their duty by that country—when they had made this declaration before the world, I ask, is it not inconceivable that they should enter into a Convention with the Powers of Europe in which all these conditions are confirmed, while nothing whatever is done to lend a free hand to the Government of Egypt? I maintain that we have entirely lost sight of the duty which attaches to us as the preponderating Power in Egypt. I say that the condition in which we find ourselves is absolutely unendurable. The noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs told us last night that there were four courses open to us; but I think there was a fifth. We might have said to Europe that a free hand must be conceded to us, that we had no selfish or exclusive aim, but that so long as our blood and our treasure are necessary to the existence of organized government in Egypt, the trammels and difficulties which intervene to prevent good government in that country must be removed. We have been told by Her Majesty's Government that England must be predominant in Egypt. We want no more than that. Sacrifice, responsibility, and power must go together. We are prepared to give every assurance that every legitimate interest of every foreign subject shall be preserved and protected. There is no desire on our part to upset or destroy the legitimate influence or the legitimate interests belonging to any European Power in Egypt, or of the subject of any European Power. There is no doubt that Earl Granville represented the views of the Government and the views of England when he said that although we have no desire to obtain for this country any exclusive power or advantage, yet that our influence must be predominant, because our responsibility is predominant, and we are charged, in the interests of Europe and of England, with the security of Egypt. But what have we done? We are asked to accept an accommodation bill, to submit to a Committee of Inspection for the next two years. We have two years' grace, two years' postponement; and, in the meantime, the blood and the treasure of England are to be spent, if not wasted. God grant that that blood and treasure may not be spent in vain! The military situation at this moment is worse than it was a year ago. Thousands of lives have been lost, millions of money have been spent, and what for? Why, Sir, that a Commission should sit in Cairo, jealously watching the projects that England desires to carry out, not for her own selfish aims and purposes, but for the building up of a strong, permanent, stable, and firm Government.

There cannot but be jealousies, difficulties, troubles, and cross purposes, if this divided and inspected Government continues. For peace sake it is desirable that we should end the opportunities for quarrel. I say that, in my own conviction, the country will not endure the continuance of this state of things. You will be face to face with demands for the withdrawal of our troops from Egypt, and for leaving Egypt to those who are now tearing the country to pieces. Do what you know to be right and necessary if you can. If you have not the courage of your principles, the anger of the country will be heard. If you cannot govern, you will be driven, and this responsibility and sense of coming trouble and difficulty belongs to every Member of this House. Any Member of this House who says "Aye" to an Agreement of this sort, which he knows or suspects to be bad, is by that act accessory to a wrong done to Egypt and to England. What is the alternative? I have no doubt hon. Gentlemen will say it is one too dreadful to be faced. It is a possible Conservative Government. Is Party, then, so tyrannical a monster? Are there none on that side of the House capable in their own mind of realizing the responsibility which belongs to this great country, and of taking it? At any cost, at any risk, I implore the Committee to take the right and straightforward course. I denounce this Convention, because I believe it to be unwise, unfair, and unjust at once to Egypt and to the people of this country.

SIR GEORGE ELLIOT said, he would not detain the Committee for more than a few minutes; but he had the advantage of being well acquainted with Egypt, and he should like to make one or two remarks before the debate closed. He confessed that there was a great deal of force in what he had heard from both sides of the House; but, in order to be brief, he did not propose to occupy the time of the Committee by any reference to figures. The financial portion of the matter had already been fully dealt with, and nothing he could say would make matters either better or worse. There was only one point which concerned him, and probably the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister would know very well what it was. As a matter of fact, it was the fear and apprehension he had entertained from the commencement of the Egyptian Question of finding themselves landed in a European Control, or a Multiple Control, or whatever hon. Members might please to call it. He had been in the habit of visiting Egypt regularly for 18 years, and he had spent a great deal of time in studying the affairs of the country. It was so fair a country, that if it only had a fair chance there was no fear of the bondholders not getting their money and everybody being well paid. But it seemed to be always destined to be embarrassed and harassed in regard to its administration. There existed, as the Committee well knew, a duplicate system of administration, whether in regard to the railways there, or the Domains, or any other description of property whatever; and the development of the resources of the country was consequently fettered, hampered, and crippled. Everybody interested in the administration was perpetually crossing and thwarting everybody else. The interests of property in Egypt, he was bound to say, were sacrificed to the cupidity of the persons who administered the affairs of the country; and he thought that if, instead of having French and English and Natives managing the railways, French and English managing the Domains, and French and English managing all the other property there, they could have a single and responsible administration, and could allot it, letting the French have the Daira Domains, the English the railways, and the Natives something else, matters would be improved. He had suggested that system of allotment to Sir Evelyn Baring, and he thought that the Government would do well to consider it. He expected after the bombardment of Alexandria that the English Government would have Egypt very much in their own hands; and up to the time that Tel-el-Kebir was fought he believed that that was the case. He remembered mentioning in the House, when the Conference of London broke up, that he felt he could breathe freer and better, because at last they were likely to obtain some degree of independence in the administration of the affairs of Egypt. He would make great allowances for International obligations; there was no doubt something in them, and they had been very ingeniously dealt with by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade.

But he took it that, if the Government had not been under the impression that they had that control in Egypt which he thought they ought to have, they would not have sent their Army up the Nile. He did not think, after all that this country had done, and all that they had still on their hands, that it was right or just that they should simply find themselves on equal terms in Egypt with France. He was in Cairo the other day when the news came of the fall of Khartoum, and, without specifying any particular nationality, he believed he might fairly say that there were at that time some hundreds of foreigners in that city who were quite as ready to throw up their caps as were the Mahdi's followers. There was no doubt a feeling in some quarters in Egypt against this country. The question was how that feeling was to be overcome, and how they were going to administer the affairs of so perverse a people amid all the intrigues and opposition they met with on every side. This country was bearing a great burden in Egypt and the Soudan; and his opinion was that before the war was over the £1,300,000 which was voted in November last would have to be multiplied by seven. The question was how all these burdens were to be borne by this nation in order to secure good government and the due administration of law in Egypt. No one could suppose that they were going to Khartoum and the Soudan for the mere purpose of revenge, but for the re-establishment of law and order, and the protection of life and property in Egypt. That was the sole object with which they were sending out their best men and spending their money. After all this, how were the Government to keep countenance with the English people if they consented to hand over Egypt to International Control? Were they to allow themselves to be handicapped at every move by France, who were circulating in the Native language every kind of rumour against the English people resident in that country and against their occupation? If they were to continue the occupation, how were they to avoid International complications? He was sure that the Government would do well, if this Agreement was to be carried out, to give some kind of authority which would justify the expenditure which was going on in Upper Egypt. This country could not continue to conduct the terrible business there, of which they had no definite idea what the result would be either in money or sacrifice of life, with all the Powers looking on as International friends, smiling at seeing England fighting and spending her money, while at the same time they were really nobody in the country after all. So far as he was able to judge, they had a very good man at the head of their affairs in Egypt in Sir Evelyn Baring. They had the best Native Administrator acting with him — Nubar Pasha; and they had a Khedive representing the Native Power, who was prepared to act cordially with them. What had happened in recent years? Notwithstanding the ravages of the cholera, and the cost of a great civil war, the produce of the Revenue in Egypt in 1884 had been larger than had ever been known previously. Could not, then, Her Majesty's Government advise the Great Powers to stand on one side and allow this state of things to continue? In spite of every drawback, and of all the difficulties which had been interposed, enormous improvements, thanks to the exertions of Mr. Moncrieff, had been effected in irrigation, and the works for raising water were more complete and successful than they had been for 20 years. He would not say any more. He was never very bitter against anybody, not even against a bad Government; and if it was felt that his observations had anything of value in them, he should be perfectly satisfied with the contribution he had made to the debate. He thanked the Committee for the patience with which they had heard him.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY said, that, irrespective of Party considerations, for his own part he should support the Convention, because he believed it to emphasize the great difference that existed between the policy of the Liberal Party on European questions and the policy of hon. Gentlemen opposite. The great merit of the Convention was that it restored the European Concert, which he believed to be the only safety for this country. It was impossible to suppose that England could continue to sing the same song of "Rule Britannia" all over the world which she had done before the great Empire of Germany was formed, and Italy had become a United Kingdom. The more

therefore they could maintain the Concert of Europe the better for this country, and that was the main ground upon which the greater number of Members would, according to their consciences, vote in favour of the Convention. Hon. Gentlemen opposite feared that this European Concert would degenerate, as they called it, into European Control. Would, however, anybody explain how it was possible that there could be concert among the Great Powers of Europe if there was not to be an European Control upon the subject in regard to which the Concert existed? How was it possible, if all the Great Powers of Europe were united in a common cause, that they could deny to that Concert the control over the subject for which they were united? If hon. Gentlemen opposite upset the control to which they now objected, would they substitute again the Dual Control of which they were the authors? The hon. Member for Greenwich (Baron Henry De Worms) endeavoured to make an arithmetical computation on this subject. The hon. Member said that if the Dual Control was objectionable, how much more objectionable must be an European Control in which there were six Members? He would give the hon. Member his opinion upon that subject. The Dual Control, to which they were indebted for almost all the evils to which Egypt had been subjected during the last few years, was a Control between two nations with separate and distinct interests in Egypt. They were always told that the interests of France and the interests of England in Egypt were totally distinct. Then, what did Dual Control mean? It meant merely strife, it reminded him of a game called the tug of war, where they had stalwart men tugging at one end of a rope against stalwart men tugging at the other. Instead of a control that was favourable to good administration in Egypt, it was a control by which that country had almost been ruined. No one supposed that when they had all the Powers of Europe introduced into the control, there would not exist opposite opinions upon different points? Of course there would be such differences; but then the majority would rule. He was anxious, therefore, to ascertain what they were really called upon to do in Egypt, and the question they ought to ask was one which had been asked throughout the whole of the debate—namely, what their real interests in Egypt were. He had listened to his hon. Friend the Member for Manchester (Mr. Slagg) that evening with some astonishment. The basis of the speech of his hon. Friend was an utter contempt for the Egyptian nation, and an utter denial of the possibility of ever forming a Native Government which would be of any use. He (Mr. Mitchell Henry) protested against that doctrine. He did not believe that Egypt was a mere appendage of this country. They had gone there from circumstances over which they had no control; but they had certainly not gone there solely for the interests of English commerce. They had gone there for Imperial objects; but the only justification they could have for remaining was to do good to the people of Egypt. He confessed that the speech of his hon. Friend, like those of some other Members, made him feel that the idea of England's duty did not prevail in this country, as it did in her greatest days. On the other hand, did anybody suppose that if France had possession of Egypt, it would contribute to the strength of the French Empire? They were told that they must not on any account permit France to obtain possession of Egypt. He had no wish that France should obtain possession of Egypt, because he did not think that it would be to the advantage of that country; but he did not fear the possession of Egypt by France mainly on the ground that it would strengthen the position of France. Everybody knew that the French Possessions in Africa were the source of the greatest weakness to her. In Algeria the French were never safe for an hour, and during the Franco-German War it was well known that France was greatly embarrassed by the insurrection of the Arabs. Would the possession of Tunis strengthen the resources of the French Empire? Nothing of the kind. The more the French had spread themselves out for colonization in the Mediterranean the weaker they had become. Another question he would like the Committee to consider was this—Did anybody suppose that they would be able to shut up Russia in the Black Sea for ever? In the magnificence of their strength and power, would the Russians be perpetually content to be shut up there? What would be the case with us? Would we sanction an

attempt to shut us up in an inland lake? Did hon. Members suppose that the English people would quietly submit to it? Then let them consider what the position of the great Empire of Russia was. For half of the year she was shut up by nature in the Baltic; and could it be supposed that by artificial arrangements it would be possible also to shut her up for ever in the Black Sea? He did not think that it was possible, and the policy he would recommend to the Government of the country was this—that they should no longer contend for mastery in the East of Europe; but throw that responsibility on the people to whom it naturally belonged, especially the Austrians and the Greeks. The condition of affairs on the frontier of Afghanistan was very critical, and probably they were not far from the most terrible war. Let them, then, at any rate, take care that in their combinations they secured that concert amongst the Powers of Europe which was the only hope of putting an end to the terrible strife they expected. He would not have made those observations except that he believed that the spirit which for years had been fostered on the opposite side of the House of supposing that they were the only nation who had any rights in the world was a spirit which would probably bring them to grief sooner than they anticipated. He should support this Convention, because he felt it to be for the benefit of this country; he should support it especially because he believed the concert of the European Powers, which implied the control of the European Powers in regard to Egyptian questions, was the only safeguard for the liberties of the Egyptian people.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Sir Arthur Otway, I had hoped that before this time we might have had the advantage of hearing the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Childers) upon this question. We have a peculiar right to ask for a full explanation from the right hon. Gentleman for more reasons than one. In the first place, he has been especially connected with all these negotiations. He has himself taken part in the proceedings which have led to the Convention which has now been laid before us. In the next place, we find that at the present moment we have some difficulty in making out what the views of the different Members of the Government are, and how far those views are to be brought into consistency one with the other; for though we have had the advantage of hearing the Prime Minister and the President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Chamberlain), and the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice), I think that those who have listened to those speeches, able and powerful as they undoubtedly were, each in itself, will agree they have hardly been entirely consistent one with another, and we wait very anxiously to hear what is the view of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and how far he will be able to reconcile the different views of his Colleagues, and I may be allowed to add how he will be able to reconcile also some of the expressions that have fallen from himself in the course of the last few days. Now, Sir, the question that lies before us is one of very great importance. The Government, after keeping us waiting, I am bound to say, for an inordinate length of time, have at last presented to us a Convention of the very highest importance, upon which they demand our judgment in the very hottest haste. It is a question of the highest importance to Egypt and to ourselves; but I am bound to say that the moment at which it is produced is by no means the most favourable that could have been chosen for a calm and quiet decision of such a question. It is a matter which does not refer only to a momentary exigency; it is a matter which is not to be dealt with as if it were to be all the same at the end of the next month or six months; but it is a question which we are to solve, upon the solution of which may depend the future of Egypt, and to a very great extent the future of this country's relations with the East. Now, Sir, what are we entitled to expect? We are entitled to expect a full and clear explanation from the Government, and to be led to understand what the effect of the Convention is to be in their judgment, and how far it is to be justified, and reconciled to the interests of this country and of Egypt. Our confidence in the Government—our absolute confidence—has I think been a good deal shaken even on that side of the House by some of their recent proceedings. They have made so many blunders in

relation to the affairs of Egypt, that it is impossible to accept simply upon their *ipse dixit* any proposals that may be laid before us. We are bound to look upon those proposals, and to ask for explanations. Now, let me contrast for a moment some of the sayings of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Childers) and of the President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Chamberlain) on this matter. As a matter of fact, we had from the Chancellor of the Exchequer some days ago, before the Convention was actually laid before us, a description of that Convention. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer said that the Powers proposed to us the arrangements which we have before us; but when the President of the Board of Trade, in his extremely lucid and able speech to-night, dealt with the question, he threw that all aside. He said—"Why do you talk about the Powers; you yourselves have proved that Austria, Russia, and the other Powers did not seem to care about entering into this guarantee. It was France that proposed it, and France only." Now, there is a great deal of difference between those two statements, and we want to know which is to be taken as the true one. Is it or is it not a question, the decision of which, as it were, has been forced upon us by the unanimous vote or desire of the different Members of the Conference, the Representatives of all the Great Powers, or is it simply a decision which has been adopted for the purpose of gratifying France? Again, there was another expression of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer which has given occasion for more than one remark. When he described the Convention to us, he told us that there would be a certain position established, and that under certain circumstances at the end of two years there would be a Commission of Inquiry, and he said that that would not be objectionable, provided it did not involve international interference. That expression of the right hon. Gentleman was gladly cheered by the great bulk of the House. We thought that the Convention, when we saw it, would contain some provision that would exclude international intervention; but now, not only do we find that there is nothing of the sort in the Convention, but we find that the President of the Board of Trade, when he speaks on the subject, tells us that the right of interference already existed, and that it was not a question of giving it by this arrangement, or by that arrangement, by this power of control or anything else; but that it was a right which already existed, and we need not trouble our heads about it, for there it was whether we liked it or not. Well, I am perplexed, and I think many Members of this House must be perplexed, when we have such inconsistent statements made to us, to know what the real state of the case is. Now, Sir, in order to get some little light on this matter we may cast our eyes a little further back. What was it that happened at the close of the Conference in July last? Why was it that the Conference broke up? I take Earl Granville's words. He said—

> "The additional powers proposed by the French would confer on the Commissioners of the *Caisse* a mastery over the Government and affairs of Egypt, and to this we would on no account consent."

Well, we are surprised to find that now they have consented, and we wish to know what has caused the change between July last and the present time? I venture to look a little further back still. Hon. Members will recollect the speech delivered by the Prime Minister last June, in which he first announced the meeting of the Conference of the Powers, and in which he explained the circumstances under which that Conference was to be called together. We have heard that this has really nothing to do with political affairs; it has nothing to do with anything except mere finances. The right hon. Gentleman said—"We have been in a difficulty for some time as to the course which we ought to take in Egypt; we had arrived at a point when it was impossible for us to stay any longer without moving, and it became absolutely necessary that we should move either forward or backward." He explained that when he spoke of moving forward he meant taking some greater responsibility on ourselves, and that when he spoke of moving backward he implied the taking of steps towards withdrawing from the country. He explained also the difficulties under which the Government laboured as to which course they should

take, or how they should move. And then, he said, came, as a sort of God-send, the difficulty in Egyptian finances, it was the pressing difficulty in Egyptian finance, which was the moving cause of their finding a way of escape from the embarrassment in which they were. That was an explanation which showed that the influence that would be exercised by anything in the nature of a multiple authority would not be an influence merely of a financial nature, but that it would be an influence upon the political condition of Egypt. It is very important we should bear that in mind. Everyone who has spoken with any knowledge of the subject has held much the same language with regard to the minor points of the pecuniary arrangement. They have said—"We are not agreeable to look too closely into these matters, and see whether we have got exactly as much as it was convenient, or right, or fair we should have got; we treat all that as a matter of minor consequence; what we do look to is what is to be the position that England is to hold under the arrangements which are here made." It is the political consideration that governs everything else—for what, after all, is our great interest in Egypt? Why have we taken all these pains? Why have we incurred all these great sacrifices? What is it we are aiming at? Why, surely it is nothing more nor less than this—that we may establish or maintain in Egypt a system of Government that shall be for the good, and peace, and quiet of the country. It is not that we are particularly anxious about the claims of the bondholders. What we are anxious for is to exclude as far as possible any occasion for the interference of other Foreign Powers in the affairs of that country; and we have endeavoured, as far as it has been in our power, to produce in that country a state of Government which would admit of a satisfactory regulation of the people. Well, now, Sir, what has been the result of that? We have found that in many respects we have been able to do many good things, and steps have been taken for the improvement of the condition of the country. But when the Earl of Northbrook went out to Egypt and examined carefully into the condition of the country, he arrived at the conclusion that there never was a country that was better suited to improve than Egypt, provided it could be relieved of the incumbrances that were weighing upon it, and the first of the incumbrances which he mentioned was the existence of the Multiple or Dual Control over certain portions of the Egyptian administration, —over the Daira and railways. He also mentioned the power which was given to the Commissioners in connection with the pressure of the Law of Liquidation. These are some of the incumbrances he mentioned, and with which it does not appear that we are about to deal at all, except in a way to strengthen and perpetuate them. I gladly admit that one of the incumbrances mentioned by the Earl of Northbrook has, to a certain extent, been dealt with by Her Majesty's Government, and I think we ought to thank them; it has been recognized as a matter of great importance ever since we have had to deal with Egyptian affairs—I mean the taxation of foreigners. We ought to acknowledge, and acknowledge with gratitude, the arrangement, so far as it has gone, for bringing foreigners under taxation. But though that is an excellent thing to do in itself, the effect of it is very much diminished by nothing being attempted to get rid of the other incumbrances of which I have spoken—indeed, they are made worse. Now, the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister has told us that this is a matter in which there is no real risk. Of course there is no risk in a pecuniary sense. No one thinks of guaranteeing so small an amount; but the Prime Minister also says that there is no real risk of the Powers which are guarantors obtaining any political influence over the country, and he quotes different cases in which there have been guarantees, and in which the guarantors have made no pretence of exercising an authority over the country to which they guaranteed the loan. But I do not think that those cases bear out or are on all fours with the case with which we have now to deal. I venture to think that if we were to look a little more closely into some of the cases he has mentioned, we should find that there was something in the position of the guarantor which gave him a claim—at all events, a supposed claim—to interfere with the Government

of the country with which he was dealing. I feel confident that if we were to look into the proceedings with regard to the Greek Loan, to which reference was made, we should find that there was in that case an attempt on the part of the guarantors to enforce the rights which they considered they had under the Treaty of Guarantee. I have had experience at the Treasury of cases in which we were called upon to express our opinion—and express it with pretty considerable authority — as to what Greece ought to do, or ought not to do, in regard to the relations of her finance with the interests and obligations of guarantors. There were communications between Russia, France, and England with regard to the duties of Greece, and the points which we ought to urge upon Greece; but, after all, those questions are not on all fours with this question, because those were guarantees which were given as incidental parts of other settlements, in which other objects were the supreme objects. For instance, when you made the Loan with Turkey in 1855 you claimed that Turkey should give a certain assistance in war. That was the object for which the money was advanced, and in this case you looked not for a general interference, but for so much interference as the circumstances justified. But here it is just exactly the point that you would interfere. You give your guarantee in order that the country may be able to get through its financial difficulties, in order that the country may be properly, and quietly, and safely administered; and you have a moral right to look into these matters, and to see whether the country is being properly governed, and whether the administration is being carried on in a manner as would justify the burden you have taken on yourselves. The Prime Minister told us that we have not a very strict right and not a very legal right, but that we had a moral and indeterminate right. Now, I do think, before we commit ourselves to all the consequences of this Agreement, we ought to get a little beyond this "moral and indeterminate right."

MR. GLADSTONE: That has nothing whatever to do with the guarantee; it was the moral and indeterminate right that grew out of our military occupation.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Well, Sir, I am afraid our right growing out of the military occupation, and the consequences that it has led to, has been very indeterminate, but not very moral. The right hon. Gentleman spoke about the autonomy of Egypt, and said that we were not going to interfere with it. It will be a new thing if we are not, because since he has been administering the affairs of this country he has interfered very materially with the autonomy of Egypt. When he found that the Government of Egypt were not willing to do that which he desired them to do, he made it a point that the Ministry should be dismissed. Well, the right hon. Gentleman made a good deal of the case of there being no risk. On the other hand, he urged upon us that there was a strong case for urgency. He said—"You are safe in what you are going to do, and it is absolutely urgent that you should do what you are asked to do." In regard to the question of urgency I think there are two opinions. The opinion of my hon. Friend the Mover of this Motion is one, in such a matter as this, which cannot be passed over without regard, and just as if it were not to be considered worthy of attention. I suppose there is not a higher authority in the whole country on the question of Eastern finance, and as to the bankruptcy of such a State as this. But the Prime Minister, no doubt, may say that there is urgency—urgency *sub modo*—as he made the distinction between being hemmed in and being surrounded—between the kind of urgency which makes it very desirable and pressing that we should come to a conclusion, and the urgency that brings you within a hair's breadth of a great calamity. I have not the smallest doubt that there is great urgency to bring about a settlement of this matter; but I am convinced that if the Parliament of this country, indicating with sufficient clearness its intention to deal with the question, and to make some provision for saving Egypt from bankruptcy, at the same time requires to look more carefully into the particular method adopted, and is indisposed to adopt that particular method, I believe there is no doubt whatever that means would be found to enable the government of the country to be carried

on whilst Parliament is considering the subject. We are asked—"If you reject this Convention, what is it you will substitute for it, or what will you do, and how are you to escape from the great dangers which may result from its being overthrown?" We have indicated plainly what our views on the subject are. We are taxed and twitted sometimes with having no policy for dealing with Egypt. I deny that we have no policy. But I say that, however serious for an Opposition to have no policy, it is much more serious to see that the Government of the country have none. Really, so far as I am able to judge, it is difficult to discover whether the Government have any policy, or, at all events, whether there is any on which they are agreed. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ripon (Mr. Goschen) urged us very earnestly to support the Government in fear of the consequences that might arise if they do not receive our support. Sir, I quite recognize the very great importance, if possible, of unity of opinions throughout England on a question of this sort; but I do not think that we ought to have a sham unity—that we ought to pretend to be satisfied, because we have plastered over the sore instead of attempting to heal it. You are by this Agreement, if it be entered into, laying up in store for yourselves in the future a serious condition of affairs that may lead to very unfortunate consequences. I say that we have no right to shut our eyes to these things, or to put them off, because we have got two years of breathing time. I believe myself that these two years of breathing time are no real benefit, because they will bring about fully as much harm as good; for they will keep the country in a state of agitation and of anxiety that will prevent anything from settling down, and prevent anybody from having any confidence. We shall find that there will be endless intrigues with a view to bring about that which some desire at the end. I confess that, for my own part, I would prefer to take the position which the right hon. Gentleman indicates—namely, that of maintaining the primary and, to a certain extent at all events, the exclusive authority of England in the management of the affairs of Egypt, at least so long as we remain there. I desire no annexation.

Sir Stafford Northcote

No one desires to annex Egypt in the territorial sense to the Dominions of this country. But as long as we are there, as long as we have to undergo all these sacrifices and are to maintain the power that we exercise, so long our duty and our right will compel us to exercise that authority on our own responsibility, and without the admission of anyone else. If we can bring ourselves to that point, we may do it with the most perfect good faith; we may do it without giving in the least degree any unnecessary offence to any other Power. We have no desire to give offence to other Powers. We desire to accomplish that which is for the benefit of every other Power as well as ourselves. We desire to see Egypt prosperous; so do they. We desire to see Egypt solvent; so do they. We desire to see Egypt in an independent position so far as she has strength to maintain her independence; so do they. And what we desire especially with regard to Egypt is to keep free and open the roads between the East and the West for the advantage of all other Powers as well as of ourselves. What I am afraid of is, that under an Agreement like this we may get into a state of relation between the different Powers that will be adverse to that which is the common interest of all concerned. The noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in the midst of the very excellent speech that he made last night—though I was sorry not to be able to agree with his proposition—spoke to us in regard to our dealings with Egypt, and in regard to the course that was adopted by the late Government at the time when, as he said, France was in difficulty, when she was weak and in a position in which she could not have interfered with you if you had chosen to annex or to take any other course as to Egypt; but, he said, you did not attempt to do it. He seemed to argue that as you did not attempt to do it when France was weak, why would you think of doing it now when France is strong? Why, Sir, we never thought of taking a mean and low advantage of any other Power. Certainly, the idea of taking any advantage of any temporary difficulty of France never could have weighed with us for a single moment; and I do not think there was a

time when it would have been possible for us to have taken any steps in Egypt that would have given umbrage to France. I say with confidence—and it cannot be contradicted—that there never was a time when the relations between England and France were more friendly or more cordial than they were during the time of the Earl of Beaconsfield's Government. I must say that it would have been in entire harmony with the principles of that Administration that when the matter of any alteration of our relations with Egypt might be under consideration it should have been done at a time when we were able to discuss it fairly and freely, and on an equal footing with France and with other Powers, and could satisfy them that what we proposed was not for any mere selfish advantage of our own, but for the benefit of Egypt and for the general good of the rest of the world. I will not trouble the Committee with any more remarks at present. I am anxious to hear what the Government has to say on the debate as a whole. I will not now enter on a point on which I had intended to say a few words—namely, in regard to the Suez Canal. I would only point out that you are going into a Convention with respect to the Suez Canal upon a basis that, as it seems to me, is full of dangerous pitfalls; and although the principles of it may work out rightly, it is very possible that they may be worked out so as to prove injurious to the interests of this country. I confess that I have no confidence in the Government in regard to that matter. I have not forgotten their proceedings in 1883 with respect to the Suez Canal Agreement. We ought to know how much they have conceded now in what appears to be a small matter, of the meeting taking place in Paris instead of London or Cairo. We know that the demand was made for it to be held in Paris on account of the Company being a French Company. We know how many difficulties there were. But this is not the convenient moment for discussing that point. I should be ready to discuss it, if an opportunity were given, at a later stage of the proceedings; and I will only say that we believe that in calling upon us so hastily to accept this Convention after deceiving us—I will not say deceiving, but after having lulled us by their apparent energy last summer, by the vigour with which they threw over certain proposals that were then made—after having lulled us, I say, into the belief that we might have confidence in them, they now bring forward an Agreement so as to give us little time to consider it, and they give the country still less. My belief is that the country is well awake to the dangers of these proceedings. It will be our duty to take care that these dangers are not forgotten and overlooked; and I believe that when the country sees and understands the issues involved, whatever the decision of the Committee may be to-night, it will not be slow to come to a decision for itself.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): The right hon. Baronet has been pleased to say he wished to hear my opinion upon some of the questions which have been discussed to-day and yesterday. I do not propose to address the House at any great length; and I, therefore, trust that hon. Gentlemen will bear with me whilst I reply, as well as I can, to the questions which have been asked me to-day and yesterday. One hon. Gentleman said that what has fallen from my Colleagues to-day and yesterday has not been always consistent with expressions that have fallen from myself. He had said he should like to hear how far I can explain the differences and reconcile these speeches. I will therefore allude at once to one or two observations of my own and my Colleagues which the right hon. Baronet quoted. He said, in the first place, that I had used the words that the Powers proposed to us a joint guarantee; whereas my right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Chamberlain) had said that the French had proposed it to us. He then attributed to me an expression which I certainly have no recollection of using, and which I find, having referred to the newspaper report, I did not use. He remarked that I had said that there would be a Commission, under certain circumstances, two years hence, to inquire into the finances of Egypt, and that it would be harmless provided it did not involve international interference. I did not say that; what I did say was, that an International Gua-

rantee would be so; I said nothing of the effect of the Commission of Inquiry.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I apologize for the misunderstanding.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): The right hon. Baronet asked me to explain a discrepancy between certain expressions that fell from Earl Granville and from myself at the last sitting of the Conference, and what I had said now on this question of the International Guarantee. I will explain that later on. But the right hon. Baronet, before he finished, used one sentence to which I must call the attention of the Committee. On the question of urgency he said that if Parliament indicated its willingness to look into the finances of Egypt, delay in the actual settlement would not be material. But Parliament has been indicating that willingness for years past. We have been commissioned by Parliament to look more narrowly as Ministers into the question. We have made a distinct proposition, and we have told the House that if it is not accepted very serious consequences will follow. What is the use now of saying that these consequences will be averted by Parliament merely expressing its willingness to look into the affairs of Egypt? The willingness of Parliament to act is in this Resolution, and it is only by passing this or some Resolution that we can meet existing difficulties. The right hon. Baronet told the Committee to remember what was done in the case of the Suez Canal in 1883. He said—"How can we have confidence in you? We have not forgotten what occurred in 1883." No, Sir; nor have we forgotten it. We distinctly remember that the right hon. Baronet brought forward a Resolution bearing upon our action with respect to the Suez Canal, which was defeated by a majority of 100. I think we have as good a reason to remember it as the right hon. Baronet. I will pass from the observations of the right hon. Baronet, which I thought it my duty at first to refer to, and I will say a few words upon the debate to which we have all listened, and which I must say, to my mind, has been illustrated by some very remarkable and able statements. I must refer for a few moments to observations which fell from the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Bruce), who may be said to have made this Motion in the interest of the Party opposite, and who fairly represented their views; and to what had fallen in the sense of distinct propositions from other Members of the Party opposite on the subject of what they would wish to see done in reference to Egyptian affairs. I will quote the words which the hon. Member for Portsmouth used. The hon. Member said that the conditions of the Law of Liquidation were absolutely unsuited to Egypt now; and he added that those conditions prevented the Egyptian Government from restoring its fortunes. He also said that this country was bound to free the Egyptian Government from the trammels which prevented them from using their Revenues in the way in which the interests of the country required. Later on, he said the Law of Liquidation had been followed by revolution and by conquest, and we could not escape from the liability which arose from those facts. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Guildford (Mr. Onslow) said that after we bombarded Alexandria Egypt ought to have been ours; and the hon. and gallant Baronet the Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) said that we alone ought to have dictated financial terms to Egypt. The hon. and learned Member for Brighton (Mr. Marriott) said that after Tel-el-Kebir we were despotic masters of the situation, and might have got rid of the Dual Control—which, I believe, we did—and he added that we should have reduced the number of Members of the *Caisse* from four to one, and that one should have been an Englishman. Now, I quote these words to remind the Committee of this—that while those hon. Gentlemen who do not sit on the Front Opposition Bench have used language which can mean nothing else than that this country ought on its own authority to have set aside in Egypt the International Law of Europe; to have taken the violent measure of acting in direct contradiction of what was the law then prevailing; not one word has fallen from the hon. and right hon. Gentlemen who have followed them—particularly from the right hon. Gentlemen sitting on the Front Opposition Bench—to repudiate the doctrines they expressed. That being so, we must take it to be the policy of right hon. Gentlemen opposite,

so far as they have expressed a policy, to repudiate International Law in Egypt, and to say that it was our duty to have acted by force after the battle of Tel-el-Kebir. Nor did the right hon. Baronet the Member for East Gloucestershire (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) use any language in his speech inconsistent with that which fell from the hon. Gentlemen I have referred to, because he spoke of the claims made in regard to Egyptian finance on the part of other Powers as claims which had practically fallen into abeyance. Let me repeat again, that that is the doctrine with which we are faced. We have done our best to act within the law. Hon. Gentlemen opposite would have pressed Parliament to dispense with International Law; they would have urged us to act in the teeth of International Law from the time we obtained mastery in Egypt. Now, let me remind the Committee in a few words what has actually been the history of this matter from that time. The Committee will remember that the object of the Law of Liquidation, which came into effect in a matured condition in 1879, was to establish in the interest of the bondholders certain International powers; and it was the object of the Dual Control, which was established in the previous year, 1878, to aid the Egyptian Government in its financial arrangements connected mainly with the Law of Liquidation. I am not going into the history of the later Dual Control, except to remind the Committee of what has been said before, that whereas the former Control and the system of two Ministers which the last Control superseded gave to England direct preponderance in Egypt—our Representative was the Finance Minister, and the Frenchman who took part in the affairs was only the Minister of Public Works—the Dual Control established by Lord Salisbury in 1878 took away from England her former preponderance in Egypt, and established two Financial Controllers upon exactly the same footing. That was a very serious change; but into that change I do not propose to enter now. But there is no doubt of this—that the Dual Control and the Law of Liquidation established this state of things, that with respect to a large amount of Egyptian finance the country was under great restraint, and that restraint was established by International Law, and International Law must be treated as of the same validity as any other law. Well, Sir, what happened in 1882? When it was proposed by Her Majesty's Government that the Fleet should go to Alexandria the French Government declined to take part in the operation. On the 30th of July in that year, M. de Freycinet asked for a Vote of 9,500,000 francs to pay for a Naval Expedition jointly with us; but he was defeated on that proposal, and was obliged to retire from Office. All combination of action between ourselves and France ceased from that day in 1882. It was evident that from that moment it was impossible for us to go back to the Dual Control. Parliament would not have sanctioned it, public opinion would not have sanctioned it, and the consequence was that we found ourselves from that time not only face to face with the whole of the financial difficulties which might arise in Egypt after that combination with France which the Dual Control established had ceased, but face to face, as I have said, with the whole of the Powers of Europe, without whose joint action we could not alter one single Article of the Law of Liquidation. Now, Sir, it became perfectly clear before the end of that year, 1882, that a very large sum, £8,000,000 sterling at least, would have to be borrowed by Egypt for her public purposes, and it was also clear that the Law of Liquidation prevented Egypt from borrowing one farthing of that money without the consent of the *Caisse*, or, in other words, without the consent of the Powers. We knew that by the end of 1882, or so soon as the amount of the indemnities had been settled by the Commission which had been appointed to inquire into the claims, we should be face to face with that difficult problem how to enable Egypt to raise the money, which required not our consent but the consent of all the Powers, and by what mutual concession or arrangement we could make an agreement with the Powers of Europe, without even the assistance of France, which, formerly, had been united with us under the system of the Dual Control, which could no longer exist. Well, Sir, what courses were open to us? The then state of things endured until the work of the Indemnities Com-

mission was completed in December, 1883. Early in 1884, therefore, it became absolutely necessary for us to confer with the Powers, and consider how we could enable Egypt to raise this large amount of money, then ascertained to be required for her public purposes. It appears to me, Sir, we might have adopted one of three courses. We might, as some hon. Gentlemen have hinted in the course of this debate, have given up all idea of coming to an arrangement with the Powers in regard to the loan, and have left Egypt to do what she could for herself. Well, as Egypt could not borrow a shilling, that would have meant bankruptcy. I know there are some Members of the House who would have wished us to adopt that course. The second alternative was this. We might have adopted, if we had thought fit, a course which *de facto* would have abolished the Law of Liquidation; and the Committee will ask me what that course was. We can only abolish the Law of Liquidation by enabling Egypt to pay off the whole of her Debt; and as that amounts to something like £92,000,000, I do not think there would have been much chance of success had we asked Parliament to enable us to raise the money to pay off the Egyptian Debt, and to raise a new Debt upon the security we could give. I put that, therefore, out of the question; and now I come to the third alternative. The only alternative to the two courses I have specified was to come to an agreement with the Powers, and to commence the negotiations which were commenced in the early part of 1884, when we summoned the Conference of London. Now, under what circumstances did the Conference meet in London; under what circumstances did we enter that Conference? To a very great extent we were at the mercy of the other Powers. Excepting in one respect, they had no great interest in the settlement of Egyptian financial affairs. We had a very large interest, and there was one weapon in our hands which we could use, and which it was well known we should use—namely, the payment of the indemnities could not take place unless a new loan was raised under the powers of the Law of Liquidation as amended by the Conference. In the payment of these indemnities we had but a small interest

The Chancellor of the Exchequer

—I think our entire interest was one-ninth of the whole amount. The interest of the other Powers of Europe jointly amounted to eight-ninths of the whole; and, therefore, when we entered the Conference, while we had very little to rely upon with which to persuade the Powers to adopt our views, we had that single weapon—that the indemnities could not be paid unless they agreed to a modification of the Law of Liquidation. The French Ambassador was very well aware of the importance of that weapon, because, when the Conference ended in the impossibility of bringing the views of England and France into accord, the French Ambassador proposed, as anyone will see on reference to the last page of the Protocol, a separate arrangement, dealing with the indemnities only. If, however, we had assented to that proposal, we should have lost altogether our power of settling the finances of Egypt. We declined to make a separate arrangement in regard to the indemnities; there was a good deal of excitement in Paris, in Vienna, and other places; and there was an idea that we might, perhaps, be squeezed into adopting that course. We strenuously held our ground; and the result was that when the Conference broke up there was a clear impression on the part of all the Powers that the question was only postponed, and that the Powers must come together in another shape to see what could be done to solve the difficulty. Now, Sir, what were the differences between ourselves and the French, Italy being with us, and the three other Powers saying they would not interfere, but would accept whatever France was willing to accept? In the first place, we agreed on one very important point—namely, that all the Sinking Funds ought to be suspended; but we differed as to the estimate of the Egyptian Revenue. Now, as these financial transactions must be founded upon Estimates, Estimates are very important matters, and I think the difference between our Estimates was as much as £600,000 a-year. We differed also in this respect—that we pressed for a considerable reduction in the interest paid to the bondholders, and that France refused, and they pressed for an immediate inquiry by Europe into Egyptian finance, and that

we refused. The matter, therefore, came to a dead lock, and the Conference was adjourned. Well, the Earl of Northbrook then went to Egypt, and one of the great benefits of the Earl of Northbrook's Mission—and the benefits we derived from it are many—was that our figures, with respect to the prospective Revenue of Egypt, were found to be practically right, and that the French figures were practically wrong. That was a great point established by the Earl of Northbrook's Mission, and we used it as an important factor in the fresh discussions, when we and the French and the other Powers again entered into communication during the months from November to February last. And now let me remind the Committee what it is we have gained in the new arrangement. In the first place, we have gained this—that the Powers have accepted, as the basis of the Budget Estimate, our figures of the Revenue of Egypt instead of the French; secondly, they have agreed to a reduction in the interest of the bondholders, though to the extent of £200,000 instead of £370,000; and, thirdly, they have consented to the taxation of foreigners in Egypt practically on the same basis as the taxation of Natives, which was our proposition. The fourth gain was that there should be no inquiry such as was proposed for two years; and the fifth had reference to some minor points—that the contribution to the Army should be settled at £200,000 a-year instead of the £120,000 a-year, as proposed before. These, I say, are five real advantages gained by us over the proposals made by France and adopted by the other Powers at the Conference of last year; and as against those advantages the single concession of importance which we have made is that the guarantee of the £9,000,000 loan, which had been proposed to be guaranteed solely by us, should be a joint and several guarantee by the Powers. Now, I ask the Committee—I ask any man of business—is there not a very considerable advantage gained by us in these five points? ["No!"] Well, I thought it would be a self-evident proposition. What I said before I will say again, that in gaining these five points we gain something substantial. The question remains—and I do not mean to prejudge it—whether the concession as to the joint guarantee was greater as a loss than the gain we have made. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith), and others who went before him, have asked me to state succinctly what is the position of the Budget of Egypt, as established under the arrangement we have made, and as compared with the previous Budgets which have been put before Parliament. Now, our proposals at the Conference were to this effect. We estimated a Revenue of £8,855,000; the cost of administration, £4,667,000; a charge of Debt, including the deficits on the Daira and Domain Loans, of £3,760,000; a charge for the Army of £293,000, and a surplus of £135,000. The Budget of the French Plenipotentiaries was very different. They estimated £9,582,000 as the amount of the Revenue of Egypt; they put the Debt at a much higher figure than we did—£4,021,000; the Army of Occupation at £293,000; and they left a surplus of £601,000. And the Budget proposed to us by the French Government, on the basis, to a certain extent, of the Earl of Northbrook's Report, took the Revenue at £8,947,000; the cost of administration at £4,678,000; the Debt, including the interest on the new Loan, the deficit and the other charges, less the 5 per cent tax on the coupons, at £4,003,000; the Army of Occupation at £120,000; and the surplus at £145,000. The final Budget, as now settled, giving the same Revenue, the same charge for administration, and the same deduction of 5 per cent, with £200,000 for the Army of Occupation, leaves a surplus of £65,000. I give these figures to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith) as the correct figures. I am asked, also, to state what the administrative expenses will consist of. The administrative expenses amount altogether to a sum of £5,237,000—made up as follows:—Administration, £4,678,000; Moukabala, £150,000; Suez, £175,000; Daira Khassa, £34,000; and Army of Occupation, £200,000. I have also been asked for the causes of the deficit. The deficit amounts altogether to a little over £10,000,000, £9,000,000 of which are included in the loan. The causes of deficit are as follows:—Deficits to end of 1884, inclusive, £2,657,000, included in which is an item of £394,000 con-

nected with Arabi and his insurrection; £1,337,000 for expenses in the Soudan; £1,011,000, the cost of the Army of Occupation; £258,000 for pensions, &c.; and £42,000 for other charges, making a total of £3,042,000; but deducting £385,000, with which we started, we have a balance of £2,657,000. In addition to this sum there is an estimated deficit in 1885 of £1,200,000; for irrigation, £1,000,000; for pensions commutation, £550,000; for cash balance to start, £500,000; and indemnities, £4,130,000; making a total of £10,037,000. Against this may be put the loan of £9,000,000, and £1,300,000 from the balance of the old Law of Liquidation, and from certain lands. I think I have answered the questions which have been put to me as to the figures. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for King's Lynn (Mr. Bourke) asks me to reconcile my statement about the joint guarantee not involving International intervention with what I said at the Conference last year. Now, Sir, I will tell the right hon. Gentleman what happened at the Conference last year. At an early stage of the Conference, the proposal of a joint guarantee was made by France. We made inquiry, and after examination we satisfied ourselves that the other Powers not only did not want it, but in all probability would not join in it, and that the effect of the French proposal would be that the joint guarantee would be that of England and France. When I satisfied myself of that I gave an answer, and those who quoted it only quoted the first part. I said that we did not ask for a joint guarantee, and that we had no reason to believe that all the Powers would agree to it. If we had come to Parliament for a joint guarantee on the part of England and France it would have been objected to; and at that time France was the only Power, as far as we knew, that was willing to join in a guarantee. Last year, therefore, France wished for a joint guarantee, and no other Power wished for it. This year the whole of the Powers unite in wishing for a joint guarantee. Therefore, the position of the matter is entirely altered. Then the hon. Member for Greenwich (Baron Henry De Worms) asked me to explain how what I said the other day about the effect of the joint guarantee agreed with the language Earl Granville used in summing up the rejection of the last proposal of the Conference. The proposal for a joint guarantee stood by itself, and the proposal made at the last sitting was not for any vague or possible interference, but for a distinct plan by which the *Caisse* was to be given direct authority, in the event of there being a deficit, to determine how the deficit was to be made good, and to decide from year to year about reduction of interest and so forth. We said that we could not consent to what, in our judgment, might be an improvident financial arrangement, and we said that we did not think that powers of this magnitude should be given to the *Caisse*. It was a totally different matter from the question whether there should be a joint guarantee. It was a distinct proposal for a joint intervention by the *Caisse* made by the French Ambassador, which we distinctly refused. Then the right hon. Gentleman the Member for King's Lynn (Mr. Bourke) asks me to explain how it was that Russia and Germany had not applied to be admitted into the *Caisse* until after the Earl of Northbrook's Mission. I have already answered that question. Russia and Germany applied to be admitted into the *Caisse*, and I believe in the clearest terms, two months before the Earl of Northbrook's Mission, and their application had nothing to do with the Earl of Northbrook's Mission. I have only a word or two more to add. The right hon. Baronet (Sir Stafford Northcote) asked, in the first place, how the Budget we prepared agrees with the Budget we proposed at the Conference? I have already answered that. He asks whether the Revenue agrees with the Estimate, and what has been done about what the Earl of Northbrook called the incumbrances? The incumbrances had reference to the general condition of the Daira and Domains, and if the right hon. Gentleman will turn to page 332 he will see that France has distinctly agreed with us to discuss that question. There is one matter more, and one only, of importance which has been alluded to. The question has been asked—Can we arrive at a solid inquiry and settlement from our point of view without the intervention of the Powers during the two years which the Powers have given us for the purpose? I can answer that question without hesitation. If we have, as we believe we shall have, a free hand in the matter, we shall be able to complete that in-

quiry into the financial condition of Egypt which is so important, and the result of which will be, I believe, to obviate any recurrence to the Powers after the end of two years. I give that as my opinion; but it is an opinion shared by many, and I give it with the greatest confidence. I can undertake to say to my right hon. Friend behind me (Mr. Goschen) that we shall not drift, and that our intention is to exercise thoroughly the powers which have been given to us, and to make a full and thorough inquiry both into the taxation of the rich and the taxation of the foreigner; and I firmly believe that by the end of the two years our efforts will have had a successful result. I am much obliged to the Committee for the patience with which it has listened to me.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 294; Noes 246: Majority 48.

AYES.

Acland, rt. hn. Sir T. D.
Acland, C. T. D.
Agnew, W.
Ainsworth, D.
Allen, H. G.
Amory, Sir J. H.
Armitage, B.
Armitstead, G.
Arnold, A.
Asher, A.
Ashley, hon. E. M.
Baldwin, E.
Balfour, Sir G.
Balfour, rt. hon. J. B.
Balfour, J. S.
Barclay, J. W.
Baring, Viscount
Barnes, A.
Barran, J.
Bass, Sir A.
Bass, H.
Baxter, rt. hon. W. E.
Beaumont, W. B.
Biddulph, M.
Blennerhassett, R. P.
Bolton, J. C.
Borlase, W. C.
Brand, hon. H. R.
Brassey, Sir T.
Brassey, H. A.
Brett, R. B.
Bright, right hon. J.
Bright, J.
Brinton, J.
Broadhurst, H.
Brown, A. H.
Bruce, rt. hon. Lord C.
Bruce, hon. R. P.
Bryce, J.
Buchanan, T. R.
Burt, T.
Buszard, M. C.
Buxton, F. W.
Buxton, S. C.
Caine, W. S.
Cameron, C.
Campbell, Lord C.
Campbell, Sir G.
Campbell, R. F. F.
Campbell-Bannerman, right hon. H.
Carington, hon. R.
Cartwright, W. C.
Causton, R. K.
Cavendish, Lord E.
Chamberlain, rt. hn. J.
Chambers, Sir T.
Cheetham, J. F.
Childers, rt. hn. H. C. E.
Clark, S.
Clarke, J. C.
Clifford, C. C.
Cohen, A.
Colebrooke, Sir T. E.
Collings, J.
Collins, E.
Colman, J. J.
Colthurst, Col. D. la Z.
Corbett, J.
Cotes, C. C.
Courtauld, G.
Courtney, L. H.
Cowper, hon. H. F.
Craig, W. Y.
Cropper, J.
Cross, J. K.
Crum, A.
Cunliffe, Sir R. A.
Davey, H.
Davies, D.
Davies, R.
Davies, W.
De Ferrières, Baron
Dickson, T. A.
Dilke, rt. hn. Sir C. W.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Dodds, J.
Duckham, T.
Duff, R. W.
Dundas, hon. J. C.
Earp, T.
Ebrington, Viscount
Edwards, H.
Egerton, Admiral hon. F.
Elliot, hon. A. R. D.
Evans, T. W.
Fairbairn, Sir A.
Farquharson, Dr. R.
Fay, C. J.
Ferguson, R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro-
Findlater, W.
Firth, J. F. B.
Fitzmaurice, Lord E.
Fitzwilliam, hon. H. W.
Fitzwilliam, hon. W. J.
Flower, C.
Foljambe, F. J. S.
Forster, Sir C.
Forster, rt. hn. W. E.
Fort, R.
Fowler, H. H.
Fowler, W.
Fry, L.
Fry, T.
Gabbett, D. F.
Gladstone, rt. hn. W. E.
Gladstone, H. J.
Gladstone, W. H.
Glyn, hon. S. C.
Gordon, Lord D.
Gordon, Sir A.
Goschen, rt. hon. G. J.
Gower, hon. E. F. L.
Grafton, F. W.
Grant, Sir G. M.
Grant, A.
Grant, D.
Grey, A. H. G.
Gurdon, R. T.
Hamilton, J. G. C.
Harcourt, rt. hn. Sir W. G. V. V.
Hardcastle, J. A.
Hartington, Marq. of
Hastings, G. W.
Hayter, Sir A. D.
Henderson, F.
Heneage, E.
Henry, M.
Herschell, Sir F.
Hibbert, J. T.
Hill, T. R.
Holden, I.
Hollond, J. R.
Holms, J.
Hopwood, C. H.
Howard, G. J.
Howard, J.
Illingworth, A.
Ince, H. B.
Inderwick, F. A.
James, Sir H.
James, hon. W. H.
James, C.
Jenkins, Sir J. J.
Jenkins, D. J.
Jerningham, H. E. H.
Johnson, E.
Jones-Parry, L.
Kinnear, J.
Laing, S.
Lambton, hon. F. W.
Lawrence, Sir J. C.
Lawrence, W.
Lea, T.
Leake, R.
Leatham, E. A.
Leatham, W. H.
Lee, H.
Lefevre, rt. hn. G. J. S.
Lloyd, M.
Lusk, Sir A.
Lyons, R. D.
Macfarlane, D. H.
Mackie, R. B.
Mackintosh, C. F.
Macliver, P. S.
M'Arthur, Sir W.
M'Arthur, A.
M'Clure, Sir T.
M'Coan, J. C.
M'Lagan, P.
M'Laren, C. B. B.
Magniac, C.
Maitland, W. F.
Mappin, F. T.
Marjoribanks, hon. E.
Martin, R. B.
Maskelyne, M. H. N. Story-
Mason, H.
Maxwell-Heron, Capt. J. M.
Meldon, C. H.
Mellor, J. W.
Monk, C. J.
Moreton, Lord
Morgan, rt. hon. G. O.
Morley, A.
Morley, J.
Morley, S.
Mundella, rt. hn. A. J.
Noel, E.
O'Beirne, Colonel F.
O'Brien, Sir P.
O'Donoghue, The
Paget, T. T.
Palmer, C. M.
Palmer, G.
Parker, C. S.
Pease, Sir J. W.
Pease, A.
Peddie, J. D.
Pender, J.
Pennington, F.
Playfair, rt. hn. Sir L.
Portman, hon. W. H. B.
Potter, T. B.
Powell, W. R. H.
Power, J. O'C.
Price, Sir R. G.
Pulley, J.
Ralli, P.
Ramsay, J.
Ramsden, Sir J.
Rathbone, W.
Reed, Sir E. J.
Reid, R. T.

Rendel, S.
Richard, H.
Richardson, T.
Roberts, J.
Robertson, H.
Roe, T.
Rogers, C. C.
Rogers, J. E. T.
Rothschild, Sir N. M. de
Roundell, C. S.
Russell, Lord A.
Russell, C.
Russell, G. W. E.
Russell, T.
Ruston, J.
Rylands, P.
St. Aubyn, Sir J.
Samuelson, Sir B.
Samuelson, H.
Seely, C. (Lincoln)
Seely, C. (Nottingham)
Sellar, A. C.
Shaw, T.
Sheridan, H. B.
Shield, H.
Simon, Serjeant J.
Sinclair, Sir J. G. T.
Slagg, J.
Smith, Lieut-Col. G.
Smith, E.
Smith, S.
Stanley, hon. E. L.
Stanton, W. J.
Stevenson, J. C.
Stuart, J.
Summers, W.
Sutherland, T.
Talbot, C. R. M.
Tavistock, Marquess of
Tennant, C.
Thomasson, J. P.
Thompson, T. C.
Tillett, J. H.
Torrens, W. T. M.
Tracy, hon. F. S. A. Hanbury-
Trevelyan, rt. hn. G. O.
Verney, Sir H.
Villiers, rt. hon. C. P.
Vivian, Sir H. H.
Vivian, A. P.
Waddy, S. D.
Walker, S.
Walter, J.
Waterlow, Sir S.
Waugh, E.
Webster, J.
West, H. W.
Whitbread, S.
Whitworth, B.
Wiggin, H.
Williamson, S.
Willis, W.
Wills, W. H.
Willyams, E. W. B.
Wilson, Sir M.
Wilson, C. H.
Wodehouse, E. R.
Woodall, W.
Woolf, S.

TELLERS.

Grosvenor, right hon. Lord R.
Kensington, rt. hn. Lord

NOES

Ackers, B. St. J.
Alexander, Maj.-Gen. C.
Allsopp, C.
Amherst, W. A. T.
Ashmead-Bartlett, E.
Aylmer, J. E. F.
Bailey, Sir J. R.
Balfour, A. J.
Baring, T. C.
Barne, F. St. J. N.
Barttelot, Sir W. B.
Bateson, Sir T.
Beach, right hon. Sir M. E. Hicks-
Beach, W. W. B.
Bective, Earl of
Bellingham, A. H.
Bentinck, rt. hn. G. C.
Beresford, G. De la P.
Biddell, W.
Biggar, J. G.
Birkbeck, E.
Blackburne, Col. J. I.
Boord, T. W.
Bourke, right hon. R.
Broadley, W. H. H.
Brodrick, hon. W. St. J. F.
Brooks, W. C.
Bruce, Sir H. H.
Bruce, hon. T.
Brymer, W. E.
Bulwer, J. R.
Burghley, Lord
Burrell, Sir W. W.
Buxton, Sir R. J.
Cameron, D.
Campbell, J. A.
Carden, Sir R. W.
Cecil, Lord E. H. B. G.
Chaine, J.
Chaplin, H.
Christie, W. L.
Clarke, E.
Clive, Col. hon. G. W.
Coddington, W.
Cole, Viscount
Commins, A.
Compton, F.
Corbet, W. J.
Corry, J. P.
Cotton, W. J. R.
Cowen, J.
Crichton, Viscount
Cross, rt. hon. Sir R. A.
Cubitt, right hon. G.
Curzon, Major hon. M.
Dalrymple, C.
Davenport, H. T.
Dawnay, Col. hon. L. P.
De Worms, Baron H.
Dickson, Major A. G.
Digby, J. K. D. W.
Dixon-Hartland, F. D.
Douglas, A. Akers-
Dyke, rt. hn. Sir W. H.
Eaton, H. W.
Eckersley, N.
Ecroyd, W. F.
Egerton, hon. A. de T.
Egerton, hon. A. F.
Elcho, Lord
Elliot, Sir G.
Elliot, G. W.
Ellis, Sir J. W.
Elton, C. I.
Emlyn, Viscount
Estcourt, G. S.
Ewart, W.
Feilden, Lt.-Gen. R. J.
Fellowes, W. H.
Finch, G. H.
Fitzwilliam, hon. C. W.
Fitz-Wygram, Sir F.
Fletcher, Sir H.
Floyer, J.
Folkestone, Viscount
Forester, C. T. W.
Foster, W. H.
Fowler, R. N.
Fremantle, hon. T. F.
French-Brewster, R. A. B.
Freshfield, C. K.
Galway, Viscount
Gardner, R. Richardson
Gibson, right hon. E.
Giffard, Sir H. S.
Giles, A.
Goldney, Sir G.
Gooch, Sir D.
Gorst, J. E.
Grantham, W.
Gray, E. D.
Greene, E.
Greer, T.
Gregory, G. B.
Gunter, Col. R.
Halsey, T. F.
Hamilton, right hon. Lord G.
Hamilton, Lord C. J.
Harrington, T.
Harris, W. J.
Harvey, Sir R. B.
Hay, rt. hon. Admiral Sir J. C. D.
Herbert, hon. S.
Hicks, E.
Hildyard, T. B. T.
Hill, Lord A. W.
Hill, A. S.
Holland, Sir H. T.
Home, Lt.-Col. D. M.
Hope, right hon. A. J. B. B.
Houldsworth, W. H.
Hubbard, right hon. J. G.
Kennard, Col. E. H.
Kennard, C. J.
Kennaway, Sir J. H.
Kenny, M. J.
Knight, F. W.
Knightley, Sir R.
Lalor, R.
Lawrance, J. C.
Lawrence, Sir T.
Leamy, E.
Lechmere, Sir E. A. H.
Legh, W. J.
Leigh, R.
Leighton, Sir B.
Leighton, S.
Lever, J. O.
Levett, T. J.
Lewis, C. E.
Lewisham, Viscount
Lindsay, Sir R. L.
Lloyd, S. S.
Loder, R.
Long, W. H.
Lopes, Sir M.
Lowther, rt. hon. J.
Lowther, hon. W.
Lowther, J. W.
Macartney, J. W. E.
Mac Iver, D.
Macnaghten, E.
M'Carthy, J.
M'Carthy, J. H.
M'Garel-Hogg, Sir J.
M'Mahon, E.
Makins, Colonel W. T.
Manners, rt. hon. Lord J. J. R.
March, Earl of
Marriott, W. T.
Master, T. W. C.
Maxwell, Sir H. E.
Miles, Sir P. J. W.
Mills, Sir C. H.
Molloy, B. C.
Monckton, F.
Morgan, hon. F.
Moss, R.
Mowbray, rt. hon. Sir J. R.
Muntz, P. A.
Newport, Viscount
Nicholson, W. N.
North, Colonel J. S.
Northcote, rt. hon. Sir S. H.
Northcote, H. S.
O'Brien, W.
O'Connor, A.
O'Connor, J.
O'Connor, T. P.
O'Kelly, J.
Onslow, D. R.
Paget, R. H.
Parnell, C. S.
Patrick, R. W. Cochran-
Peel, rt. hon. Sir R.
Pell, A.
Pemberton, E. L.
Percy, rt. hon. Earl
Percy, Lord A. M.
Phipps, C. N. P.
Phipps, P.
Plunket, rt. hon. D. R.
Power, P. J.
Puleston, J. H.
Raikes, rt. hon. H. C.
Rankin, J.
Read, C. S.
Redmond, J. E.

Redmond, W. H. K.
Rendlesham, Lord
Repton, G. W.
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Ritchie, C. T.
Rolls, J. A.
Ross, A. H.
Ross, C. C.
Round, J.
St. Aubyn, W. M.
Sclater-Booth, rt.hn.G.
Scott, M. D.
Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir H. J.
Severne, J. E.
Sexton, T.
Sheil, E.
Small, J. F.
Smith, rt. hon. W. H.
Smith, A.
Stanhope, hon. E.
Stanley, rt. hon. Col. F.
Stanley, E. J.
Storer, G.
Strutt, hon. C. H.
Sykes, C.
Talbot, J. G.
Thomson, H.
Thornhill, A. J.
Tollemache, hon. W. F.
Tollemache, H. J.
Tomlinson, W. E. M.
Tottenham, A. L.
Tremayne, J.
Tyler, Sir H. W.
Wallace, Sir R.
Walrond, Col. W. H.
Warburton, P. E.
Warton, C. N.
Watney, J.
Whitley, E.
Williams, General O.
Wilmot, Sir H.
Wilmot, Sir J. E.
Wolff, Sir H. D.
Wortley, C. B. Stuart-
Wroughton, P.
Wyndham, hon. P.
Yorke, J. R.

TELLERS.

Thornhill, T.
Winn, R.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolved, That Her Majesty be authorised to guarantee the payment of an annuity of three hundred and fifteen thousand pounds sterling for the purpose of a loan, to be raised by the Government of Egypt, in pursuance of the Convention signed at London on the eighteenth day of March 1885, between Her Majesty and the Governments of Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Italy, and Russia, with the authority of Turkey; and that provision be made out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, or the growing produce thereof, for the issue of such sums of money from time to time, as may be required, to pay any sums which may at any time be required to fulfil the guarantee of Her Majesty in respect of such annuity, conformably to the tenor of Her Majesty's engagement as specified in the said Convention.

Resolution to be reported upon *Monday* next.

ARMY (ANNUAL) BILL.—[BILL 104.]

(*The Marquess of Hartington, The Judge Advocate, Sir Thomas Brassey.*)

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*The Marquess of Hartington.*)

MR. KENNY said, he had given Notice to the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Judge Advocate General yesterday, when this Bill was under consideration, that he would propose an Amendment in reference to the enlistment of recruits in a direction which he had indicated at the time. He therefore proposed to move that the Bill should be re-committed, for the purpose of enabling him to bring up the Amendment of which he had given Notice. The object of the Amendment which he proposed to insert in the Bill was to repeal Section 81 of the Army Act of 1881, for the purpose of substituting a clause to provide that a recruit should be discharged from service if, within a week of the date of his attestation, he paid to the attesting magistrate a sum not exceeding £2; or within a month a sum of £5, or at any time within three months a sum not exceeding £10, "unless, &c." And there he took up the remaining portion of the clause as it stood in the Act of 1881. The change which he proposed to make would have this effect—that if within a week from the time of attestation the recruit wished to leave the Army, he would be entitled to do so on payment of a sum of £2, instead of £10, as at the present time; if a period of more than a week but less than a month should have elapsed, then he should be entitled to his discharge on payment of £5, and for any period over a month the Regulations should remain as at present. He thought an Amendment to this effect would meet an unquestionable grievance. It was generally admitted to be unfair and harsh to force the recruit who repented of his action the moment after he had enlisted to pay a sum of £10 for his discharge. If the Amendment he was going to move were accepted by the Government, it would do away with the grievance to a great extent; in fact, would leave nothing to be complained of. It was unnecessary for him to enter into any lengthened argument as to this claim. The question had been fully discussed that morning, and, he thought, had been generally admitted as a grievance by the Judge Advocate General. A remedy had been strongly urged by hon. Gentlemen on the opposite side of the House who knew a good deal about Army matters. He put the proposal forward for the consideration of the Government, and trusted they would see their way to accept it as a compromise which would suit the views of hon. Gentlemen on the other side below the Gangway. He begged to move that the Bill be re-committed for the purpose of inserting the clause he had read.

Mr. WARTON said, he begged to second the proposal. It was said that morning that an opportunity would be afforded for bringing the Amendment forward; but how that opportunity could be given, seeing that there was no Report stage, he could not imagine.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "be" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "re-committed in respect of a new Clause,"—(*Mr. Kenny,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: I have made some inquiry on this subject to-day, but have not had time to conduct the inquiry as fully as I could have wished. I am informed that there is usually a considerable interval allowed between the time a recruit is enlisted and his attestation, and that, under ordinary circumstances, he has every opportunity of changing his mind before he is finally admitted into the ranks. It is conceivable that in some cases there may be a grievance; but there is certainly, on the part of the Military Authorities, under the present system, no desire to obtain an advantage of recruits who are unwilling to enter the Service. I could not accept the clause moved by the hon. Member; but if it is not pressed I will undertake to look into the matter, and to endeavour, before next year, to frame certain Regulations, or to have them framed, or to have such provision made in the Act as will enable the recruit to obtain his discharge on payment of a small sum within the time he has put the country to no very considerable expense. But after a man has received his uniform, and has put the country to considerable expense, I do not think he should have undue facilities for leaving the Army out of mere caprice. So far as I can make out, there does not seem to be any real grievance in this respect at present; but, in view of hardship being possible, I will undertake to look into the matter.

Mr. KENNY said, that under the circumstances, the noble Marquess having undertaken to look into the matter, it would be unnecessary for him to press his Motion. He thought the undertaking of the noble Marquess would quite meet the necessity of the case. He might be permitted to point out that, under Clause 81 as it stood, Regulations could be easily made to provide for the case, because the wording was "a sum not exceeding £10." Any sum could be fixed that the authorities thought proper.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

MOTIONS.

—o—

COMMONS.

APPOINTMENT AND NOMINATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

Select Committee *appointed*, "to consider every Report made by the Land Commissioners for England, certifying the expediency of any Provisional Order for the inclosure or regulation of a Common, and presented to the House during the last or present Sessions, before a Bill be brought in for the confirmation of such Order."

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Committee, that they have power in respect to each such Provisional Order, to inquire and report to the House whether the same should be confirmed by Parliament, and, if so, whether with or without modification; and, in the event of their being of opinion that the same should not be confirmed, except subject to modifications, to report such modifications accordingly, with a view to such Provisional Order being remitted to the Land Commissioners.

Ordered, That the Committee do consist of the following Members:—Sir Walter B. Barttelot, Mr. Pell, Mr. Acland, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Bryce, Mr. Richard Power, Mr. Walrond; and Five Members to be nominated by the Committee of Selection.

Ordered, That Five be the quorum.

Mr. WARTON said, that five Members were to be nominated by the Committee of Selection. Surely that was a curious number. There were already seven Members nominated, and these five would make 12. He knew nothing at all about the Committee; but it appeared to him rather strange that two Members of the Government should make Motions for Committees on the same night, and that the numbers proposed by each to be appointed by the Committee of Selection should not be the same. He saw lower down the Paper a Motion in the name of the right hon. Gentleman the Post Master General for a Select Committee, four Members of

which were to be added by the Committee of Selection.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: This Committee was appointed last year, and I believe the numbers follow the example of last year. That is all I can say on the matter.

POST OFFICE (ACQUISITION OF SITES) BILL.

APPOINTMENT AND NOMINATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

Ordered, That the Select Committee on the Post Office (Acquisition of Sites) Bill do consist of Eleven Members, Seven Members to be nominated by the House, and Four Members to be nominated by the Committee of Selection:—Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, Sir JOHN LUBBOCK, Sir JOHN ELLIS, Mr. BRYCE, Mr. DIXON-HARTLAND, Dr. CAMERON, and Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE *nominated* Members of the Committee.

Ordered, That all Petitions against the Bill, presented not later than three clear days before the sitting of the Committee, be referred to the Committee, and that such of the Petitioners as pray to be heard by themselves, their Counsel, Agents, or Witnesses, be heard upon their Petitions, if they think fit, and Counsel heard in favour of the Bill against such Petitions.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.

MR. SEXTON said, he was not sure whether the right hon. Gentleman had given any explanation to the Committee of his object in moving for this Committee. If he had, he (Mr. Sexton) was not aware of it. Of the names on the Paper, six were of English Members, and one was that of a Scotch Member. He was not certain whether or not it was desirable that an Irish Member should be on the Committee; and he would therefore ask the right hon. Gentleman for some information on the matter. Were these sites indicated or marked out anywhere, and what were to be the functions of the Committee?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: This is the Select Committee upon the Bill which has been read a second time and referred to a Select Committee. The object of the Committee is to consider the question of selecting sites in Birmingham, Bristol, and certain other places. The Bill had nothing whatever to do with Irish Post Offices, and therefore it had not been thought necessary to put an Irish Member on the Committee. If, however, the Irish Members desired to have a Representative on the Committee, no doubt if the matter were referred to the Committee of Selection one would be put on.

MR. SEXTON said, he was quite satisfied with this announcement.

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

MOTION FOR LEAVE.

On Motion of The LORD ADVOCATE, Bill for the better Administration and Endowment of the Universities of Scotland, *ordered* to be brought in by The LORD ADVOCATE, Secretary Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, and Mr. SOLICITOR GENERAL for SCOTLAND.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 115.]

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he should like to ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman whether the object of this Bill was to enlarge any of the endowments of the existing Universities of Scotland; and, if so, for what purpose?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR): The Bill is identical as regards the endowments with the measure of last year.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: Does it increase the amount?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR): It is exactly the same as in the Bill of last year. The alterations in the measure are merely alterations of detail.

MR. WARTON: From what source do these endowments come?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR): They come from the same source as before. For two years the Bill has proposed the same thing.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: Before the second reading is fixed, I should like to ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman whether he will give the House a good many days to consider it, to give it an opportunity of looking into the measure?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR): Certainly; I will fix the second reading for the 20th of April.

TURNPIKE ACTS CONTINUANCE.

Select Committee *appointed*, "to inquire into the Sixth Schedule of 'The Annual Turnpike Acts Continuance Act, 1884.'"

The Committee was accordingly *nominated* of,—Lord EDWARD CAVENDISH, Mr. LAMBTON, Mr. WENTWORTH BEAUMONT, Viscount FOLKESTONE, Mr. BEACH, Mr. CLARE READ, and Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to inquire and

report to the House under what conditions, with reference to the rate of interest, expenses of management, maintenance of road, payment of debt, and term of years, or other special arrangements, the Acts of the Trusts mentioned should be continued.

Ordered, That all Petitions relating to the continuance or discontinuance of Turnpike Trusts be referred to the Committee.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the House, at its rising, do adjourn till To-morrow."—(*Lord Richard Grosvenor.*)

MR. SEXTON: What Business will be taken—will it be limited to merely formal matters, such as receiving the Queen's Assent?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: That is all. There is no Business whatever.

Motion *agreed to.*

House adjourned at a half after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Saturday, 28th March, 1885.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Army (Annual) * (62).

Royal Assent—Consolidated Fund (No. 2) [48 *Vict.* c. 6]; Cape of Good Hope (Advance) [48 *Vict.* c. 7].

ARMY (ANNUAL) BILL.

Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be *printed;* and to be read 2ª on the *first sitting day after the recess at Easter.*—(The Earl of MORLEY). (No. 62.)

House adjourned at a quarter past Five o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Saturday, 28th March, 1885.

The House met at a quarter before Five of the clock.

Message to attend The LORDS COMMISSIONERS:—

The House went;—and being returned;—

Mr. SPEAKER *reported* the *Royal Assent* to two Bills.

House adjourned at a quarter after Five o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 30th March, 1885.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Public Health Act) (No. 1) (63) *; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Labourers Act) (No. 2) * (64).

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (PUBLIC HEALTH ACT) (NO. 1) BILL [H.L.] (NO. 63.)

A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to Cootehill, Kildare, and Thurles: And

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (LABOURERS ACT) (NO. 2.) BILL [H.L.] (NO. 64.)

A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland under the Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1883, relating to the Dundalk, Mallow, and Trim Unions:

Were *presented* by The LORD FITZGERALD; read 1ª; to be *printed;* and *referred* to the Examiners.

House adjourned at half past Eleven o'clock, to Monday the 13th of April next, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 30th March, 1885.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

PRIVATE BILL (*by Order*)—*Withdrawn*—Westminster (Parliament Street, &c.) Improvements. *

PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolution* [March 27] reported—*Leave*—Egyptian Loan [House counted out].

Ordered—Telegraph Acts Amendment.

Committee—Report—Royal Irish Constabulary Redistribution [105].

Third Reading—Local Government Provisional Orders * [91]; Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) * [86].

QUESTIONS.

—o—

HARBOUR ACCOMMODATION—RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE.

MR. MUNRO-FERGUSON asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether, in view of the statement by the Select Committee on Harbour Accommodation, page 12, paragraph 17, that—

"Your Committee fully concurs in the principles laid down by Sir Thomas Farrer for the selection of harbours which may be aided by means of loans at a low rate of interest, viz. :—

(a.) That refuge and shelter should be considered more important than mere facilities to trade;

(b.) That fishery harbours, especially when belonging to, or promoted on behalf of, poor fishermen, should be very favourably considered;"

The recommendations of the Committee that a small Commission be appointed to inquire into this subject, with a view of determining the exact sites at which harbour works could be carried out, will be adopted; whether the recommendations to the same effect, given by the Crofters' Commission—

"That a competent officer should visit the several localities and report upon suitable sites and probable cost,"

will receive special attention; and, if so, how soon; whether he is aware that the Scotch Fishery Board have stated, pages 32 and 33, Report 1883, that it had intended to institute an inquiry with reference to the improvement of old and construction of new fishery harbours, but had desisted on account of the then prosecution of the investigations of the Select Committee on Harbour Accommodation; and, whether, in view of these combined statements and recommendations, he will undertake, at the earliest possible date, to appoint a Commission of Experts to select sites suitable for piers and harbours?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: With respect to the recommendations of the Crofters' Commission, I must refer the hon. Member to the Home Secretary, who, I think, has already replied to a similar Question on the subject. With respect to the recommendations of the Select Committee on Harbour Accommodation, there appear to be two different subjects contemplated by the hon. Member's Question. The principles laid down in Sir Thomas Farrer's evidence applied only to loans; whereas the recommendation by the Select Committee of the appointment of a small Commission contemplated grants of public money, and not loans. The question of how best to assist harbour works by a judicious system of loans is under the careful consideration of the Government, and I hope soon to be in a position to announce their decision in the matter; but the Government are not disposed to make any alteration in the policy of successive Governments, under which they have hitherto declined to make grants of public money for harbour construction, except in cases of Imperial and national necessity.

CUSTOMS—NORTH SEA FISHERMEN—DUTY-FREE TOBACCO.

MR. BIRKBECK asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, taking into consideration the serious results arising from the presence of "coopers" or floating grog shops with the North Sea trawling fleets, and the large amount of inferior tobacco and spirits they are accustomed to barter or sell, he will give permission that the crews of the deep sea fishing fleets in the North Sea should be allowed, through the medium of the five vessels belonging to the "Mission to Deep Sea Fishermen Society," to enjoy the same privileges with regard to duty-free tobacco as Foreign-bound sailors, with the view of putting a stop to dishonest bartering of their employers' property, drunkenness, and the prevention of smuggling?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): I have consulted the Board of Customs on the subject of the hon. Member's Question. I am afraid that he hardly appreciates the full extent to which his suggestion would lead us. Although he only mentions tobacco as to be made duty-free, his Question points to a similar privilege for spirits; and the result of the concession would be that through the privilege granted to this Society duty-free spirits and tobacco would be allowed to be purchased by all fishing fleets, first in the North Sea, and in the end everywhere. Having granted it to one we could not refuse it to others. I cannot consent to so serious an inroad on the Revenue, for which I see no justification. The abuses in the North Sea trawling fleets must be cured, I think, in other ways.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—SCIENCE TEACHERS.

MR. JUSTIN HUNTLY M'CARTHY asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether teachers holding the degree of any University in the United Kingdom are qualified to earn results on the teaching of all science subjects on the syllabus of the Department of Science and Art, South Kensington, without undergoing examination for the Department's certificate; and, whether this rule applies alike to all science teachers in England, Scotland, and Ireland?

MR. MUNDELLA: My answer to the first Question is, Yes; and this rule applies alike to England, Scotland, and Ireland.

NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS (IRELAND)—CASE OF MRS. SOPHIA HOWE, BALLYCASTLE, CO. MAYO.

MR. JUSTIN HUNTLY M'CARTHY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the case of Mrs. Sophia Howe, of Ballycastle, county Mayo; whether he is aware that her late husband, who had served as National School teacher for twenty-two years, had applied for his retiring gratuity, but had died a week or two before the warrant had been made out; and, whether, seeing that Mrs. Howe is left a destitute widow, with seven children, nothing can be done by the Government to secure her the advantages of which she has thus been accidentally deprived?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: This is one of those cases in which the teacher delayed in sending in his claim until his recovery was almost hopeless; and it has been frequently pointed out that to grant gratuities in such cases would turn the pension scheme into one of life assurance, thus throwing on the fund burdens which it has not been calculated to bear, as well as to defeat one object of the Pension Act by encouraging teachers to hold on to their schools when no longer able to discharge their duties efficiently.

POST OFFICE—LETTER CARRIERS.

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY asked the Postmaster General, Whether it is the case that the additional pay promised to all Civil Service men in the Post Office employ, after five, ten, and fifteen years' service as letter-carriers, is being withheld in many cases on the alleged ground of there being no vacancy on the list; whether he is aware that this is regarded by the men as a breach of faith on the part of the Post Office; and, whether he can hold out hopes of their claims being met without delay?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: The hon. Baronet clearly refers to good conduct stripes. These stripes are strictly limited in number, and no sort of promise has at any time been made that they would be conferred on the completion of a given period of service. What has been promised is this, and it is strictly adhered to—that after five, 10, or 15 years' service a letter carrier, provided his conduct has been good, shall be deemed eligible for one, two, or three good conduct stripes, and that as vacancies occur his claims to the distinction shall be considered wtth those of others.

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY: Will the right hon. Gentleman let that be known?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: Certainly.

SCOTLAND—TENURE OF LAND IN THE HIGHLANDS, &c.—LEGISLATION.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, considering the uneasiness in the Highlands, and the fear of regrettable incidents, if he cannot bring in a Bill, he will state the general lines on which the Government propose to legislate?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, that such a course as that contemplated by the hon. Member was not feasible. There was no Parliamentary method of making known the contents of a Bill before its introduction.

EGYPT (THE MILITARY EXPEDITION)—CANNED MEAT.

MR. RITCHIE asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether the attention of the War Office has been drawn to complaints of the condition of the American canned meat and biscuits supplied to the Army in Egypt; whether it is true that hundreds of tons of the canned meat have been found to be putrid when opened, and hundredweights of biscuits in a state of decomposition; whether the orders sent to

America for canned meat have lately been increased to a total of several millions of pounds; and, whether there are not firms in this Country who are prepared to make contracts for fresh preserved meat, to be packed in this Country, on terms equally favourable to those which the American contractors are prepared to take, due allowance being made for the difference in cost of transport; and, if so, why orders which would give employment to large numbers of working people in this Country are sent abroad?

MR. BRAND: No Report has been received showing any such extensive loss of preserved meats as that referred to. The loss of preserved meats is estimated at 1 per cent. Very large orders have been given in America. The War Office is not aware of any contractors in this country capable of competing successfully with the American contractors for this supply. On a recent occasion an attempt was made to encourage English competition; but it did not prove successful; in fact, it proved a complete failure. As regards biscuits, I would refer the hon. Member to my reply on the 27th instant to the hon. Member for Glasgow.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON: On what ground does the hon. Member assert that no English firms are able to compete for this supply with the American firms?

MR. BRAND: I thought I stated the grounds in the answer I gave. I said that we obtained a certain quantity of preserved meat from an English contractor; but, on inspection, it turned out bad, and we had to cancel the contract.

MR. RITCHIE: Has the War Office issued any tenders to the large manufacturers of this country?

MR. BRAND: I cannot reply to that particular Question; but I may say that every inquiry has been made, and we believe that no English contractor can compete with the American trade.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON: May I ask whether the Department are acquainted with the Messrs. Moir, who were large contractors for many years?

MR. BRAND: Yes, Sir; we are well acquainted with the Messrs. Moir.

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—DEGREE QUALIFICATIONS.

MR. JUSTIN HUNTLY M'CARTHY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland recognise the Arts degrees of the Royal University, Ireland, or of any other University in the United Kingdom as a certificate of competency to teach and earn results payments in Classics, French, and the several scientific subjects included in the Board's extra branch programme; and, whether it is a fact that inspectors are liable to be called upon to examine for results in several extra branches which are not included in the programme of examination for the office of inspector?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The answer to the first paragraph of this Question is yes; but for those subjects only in which the teacher passed creditably. The Inspectors are liable to be called on as stated; but they may, as in England, claim the services of a substitute for any branch in which they do not feel themselves to be competent to examine.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—BORRIS IN OSSORY PETTY SESSIONS DISTRICT.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is true that the services of two magistrates, Mr. Gibson and Mr. Walpole, have, owing to their having obtained Government appointments which take them elsewhere, been lost to the Borris in Ossory Petty Sessions district; whether it is true that, during the past year, on some occasions no Sessions were held in Borris in Ossory for want of magistrates; whether the administration of justice in Borris in Ossory Petty Sessions is practically in the hands of two relatives; whether a Memorial, signed by the Roman Catholic Ordinary of the diocese of Ossory, the clergy of the deanery in which Borris Petty Sessions are held, and by the people of the district, recommending two resident Catholic gentlemen for the Commission of the Peace, was forwarded to the Lieutenant of the county, and, on his failing to comply with its prayer, was sent direct to the Lord Chancellor; and, whether the Lord Chancellor has refused to appoint these two gentlemen to the Commission of the Peace for no other reason than the absence of a recommendation from the Lieutenant of the county?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: There is a very fair attendance of magistrates on the Borris-in-Ossory Bench, Petty Sessions having only failed there on two out of 26 occasions in the past year, and the business is stated to be very light. It is not true that the administration of justice there is in the hands of two relatives. There are one Protestant and one Catholic Justice residing in close vicinity. It is true the Lord Chancellor has declined to overrule the decision of Lord De Vesci with regard to the gentlemen named in the Memorial referred to; but he satisfied himself of the reasonableness of that decision beforehand.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked whether it was a fact that the Catholic Resident Magistrate referred to signed the Memorial in favour of giving the Commission of the Peace to two Catholics on the ground that he was not able to attend the Sessions at the place; and what had become of the promise of the late Chief Secretary that if eligible men were selected the fact that the Lord Lieutenant of the county did not recommend them would not bind the Lord Chancellor?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Neither does it.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—ELECTION OF GUARDIANS — DRUMFIN (SLIGO UNION), AND TYHOLLAND DIVISION (MONAGHAN UNION).

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the following cases have been submitted to the Irish Local Government Board; that in the Poor Law election for the division of Drumfin (Sligo Union) six votes were tendered and received in the name of Mr. Charles O'Hara of Annamore, although Mr. O'Hara is at present away from home, and his voting papers were not forthcoming when called for by the police, and were not delivered to the police, as is required by law; that objection has been taken to claims to dual occupation votes in the Tyholland division of the Monaghan Union, such claims being made by persons whose rents have been lowered by the Sub-Commission below the Government valuation of their holdings, and who submit that appeals lodged by the landlord do not affect their right to have the judicial rents regarded as the actual rents unless and until the judgment of the Sub-Commission be reversed; and, what is the decision of the Local Government Board in these cases?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No decision has yet been arrived at with regard to the first case referred to in this Question, which is under consideration. As regards the second case, the Local Government Board are advised that if the order of the Land Court fixing the rent was made before the statement of claim to vote was lodged, the voter is entitled to the additional votes, although no actual payment of the reduced rent has been made; and also that an appeal against the order of the Court fixing the rent does not affect the right of the claimant to vote in respect of the beneficial interest referred to.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT — SCHOOL BOARD DIVISIONS (METROPOLIS).

MR. CUBITT asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether it is the intention of the Government to rearrange the School Board Divisions of London, which were originally formed to correspond as nearly as possible with the Metropolitan Parliamentary Boroughs, so as to adapt them to the new Metropolitan representation under the Redistribution of Seats Bill?

MR. MUNDELLA: By Section 37 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, the members of the London School Board must be elected by the 10 divisions specified in the 5th Schedule, the boundaries of which are defined by an order of the Education Department. It would be impossible to re-arrange the School Board divisions to correspond with the new Parliamentary divisions except by a special Act of Parliament; and if Members of the School Board were elected in the same number, and for the same area, as Members of Parliament, the cumulative vote would be inapplicable. As a Committee has just been appointed to inquire into the working of the cumulative vote, I think it would be better to defer the consideration of any important changes until that Committee has reported.

INDIA—THE BANDA AND KIRWEE PRIZE MONEY.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT asked the Under Secretary of State for India,

Whether any portion (over or about £280,000) of the movable assets of the captured Princes of Kirwee has been retained by the Indian Government as not being legal booty, and has not been divided as prize money, and has not been entered in the Parliamentary Return, No. 213, of Session 1876, as the Order of this House, dated 23rd July 1874, calling for a Return of the whole movable estate of the captured princes, and of all their assets retained by the civil power, expressly requires; whether any further legal proceedings are being initiated for the purpose of eliciting from the India Office, in compliance with the strict and repeated Orders of the Legislature, a full and true account of all the movable estate of the captured chiefs which has been retained by the local government, and has not been distributed as prize of war; and, will any supplementary Return, accounting for all movable assets of the Kirwee Princes retained by the local government, whether officially recognised as booty or not, be presented to Parliament to satisfy the Order of the House?

MR. J. K. CROSS: I can only repeat what I said in May last, when replying to a similar Question of the right hon. and gallant Member for Wigtown (Sir John Hay). I then said that—

"The Papers presented to Parliament in 1876, in compliance with the Order of the House of July 23, 1873, gave a complete Return of the amount of all movable property of enemies or insurgents in the territories of Oude or Kirwee, or of the proceeds thereof, which passed into the possession of the authorities in India since the outbreak of the War in 1857, distinguishing the funds which have been distributed among the troops, and the funds which have been retained, or otherwise disposed of, by the local government. The promissory notes, representing the sum referred to by the hon. and gallant Member, never at any time passed into the possession of Government. They were, therefore, not included in the Return. Where any such notes were captured, as at Lucknow, they are shown in the Return. As, therefore, the Return was prepared in strict accordance with the Orders of the House, there is no ground for supplementing it. I may add, full information concerning these promissory notes was submitted to the House in an earlier Return, No. 298, dated July 5, 1869."—(3 *Hansard*, [287] 1300.)

It is the case that in a letter of the 19th of March, addressed by the Rev. A. Kinloch to the India Office, he has declared an intention of applying for a *mandamus* requiring the Secretary of State to furnish a Return in compliance with the strict Orders of the House. These Orders, as I have shown, have already been strictly complied with.

POST OFFICE—LETTER SORTERS ON THE IRISH PACKET BOATS.

MR. HARRINGTON asked the Postmaster General, Whether he received a memorial from the sorters of the Holyhead and Kingstown mail packet in December last relative to the delay in remunerating them for the Sunday work done by them; what steps have been taken to carry out the provisions of the late Postmaster General with regard to the remuneration of those employés; and, why the scale of pay for extra Sunday work given to the sorters on the London and Holyhead line is not to extend to the sorters who do the remainder of that journey to Ireland?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: The decision of the late Postmaster General was, that the sorters employed on board the Irish packets should not be specially remunerated for Sunday work, it being his opinion that, owing to the high trip allowance they receive, their present remuneration is ample. Against this decision they have appealed, and their appeal is under consideration; but I shall certainly not concede special remuneration for Sunday work without making some reduction in the trip allowance.

ARMY—THE FIRST LIFE GUARDS—CATHOLIC SOLDIERS.

MR. SEXTON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, on Sunday the 15th instant, Colonel Duncombe, commanding the 1st Regiment of Life Guards, ordered a parade of the Regiment, and, after the parade, marched the Catholic soldiers, with the rest, into the Protestant church attached to the barracks (Regent's Park), and kept them there until the conclusion of the service; whether the Catholic soldiers of this Regiment are obliged, by the dietary arrangement in force, to eat flesh meat on Fridays; and, whether steps will be taken to secure that Catholic soldiers in the British Army shall not be obliged to violate the practices of their creed, or to attend any religious services but those of the Catholic Church?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: On the date referred to the whole body of the 1st Life Guards was marched to the Church of England service in the riding school. Colonel Duncombe has explained that this was entirely through inadvertence; and he has expressed his regret that he forgot that the Roman Catholics were, contrary to custom, still in the ranks. Meat rations are issued to all soldiers. I cannot add anything on this subject to an answer I made to the hon. Member on the 22nd of May, 1883. I said—

"I am informed that by universal custom among Roman Catholics soldiers and sailors are dispensed from all obligations to fast or to abstain from flesh meat; and that this applies even in Catholic countries."

There is every desire to give Catholic soldiers all proper facilities for complying with the requirements of their religion.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE CALLING OUT OF THE RESERVES.

COLONEL STANLEY asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether steps will be taken, without delay, to cause it to be publicly notified what classes of the Reserve it is intended to call to the colours, in order to prevent unnecessary abandonment of civil labour, and the consequent breaking up of the men's homes; and, whether he will forthwith address, to the employers of Reserve men who are called up for service, and of Militia men belonging to battalions which are embodied, a request that they will, in the public interest, endeavour to take such men back into their employ when the present national emergency is at an end.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: The earliest practicable announcement will be made of the classes, or portions of classes, of the Army or Militia Reserve which it is intended to call out under the Proclamation. As Parliament was about to adjourn for a short time, and also as Her Majesty was about to be absent for a time from the country, it was considered desirable that the Messages to Parliament and the Proclamation should not be delayed; but the requirements of the Military Authorities, especially in India, have not yet been fully ascertained. There will be no delay which can be avoided in giving notice to the Reserve men concerned. I do not think that there would be any use in issuing such a Circular to the employers of Reserve men as appears to be suggested by the right hon. and gallant Gentleman; but I trust that they will, in a spirit of patriotism, make such arrangements as may be possible, in order to prevent men called up in discharge of their duty permanently losing their employment. Instructions will be issued to general officers and officers commanding regimental districts to take all possible measures in communication with employers of labour for promoting this object.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether, in case any men in the Reserve were also employed in the Metropolitan Police, he would consider whether they should not be reinstated in their proper places in the event of their not being required?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he would take the matter into consideration.

NAVY—PORTSMOUTH DOCKYARD—H.M.S. "MERCURY."

MR. E. STANHOPE asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether his attention has been called to a telegram from the Portsmouth Correspondent of *The Times*, (March 27th) headed "England and Russia," and referring to the armament of the *Mercury*; and, whether he will endeavour to prevent Dockyard Officials from giving information to the Press as to the armament of ships being fitted for active service, especially when, as in this case, it appears to be defective?

SIR THOMAS BRASSEY: There is no evidence that information was improperly given by a Dockyard official to *The Times* Correspondent at Portsmouth. The *Mercury's* armament is complete as originally planned for the duties which properly belong to an armed despatch boat. The armament consists of 64-pounders, which are powerful ship-guns.

ARMY—ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT—REPORT ON MACHINE GUNS AND RIFLES.

MR. GRAY asked the Surveyor General of Ordnance, If he will lay upon the Table of the House the report on

Machine Guns and Rifles from which he quoted on Friday in the House?

MR. BRAND, in reply, said, he did not think there would be any real advantage in presenting the Report; but if the hon. Member wished to improve his knowledge, and move for a Return, no objection would be made.

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS—DELAY OF PAYMENTS.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (for MR. SEXTON) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Why the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland have not yet paid the teachers of National Schools the gratuities due to them for instructing paid monitors for the year ended 30th June 1884, though the monitors were examined over six months ago; and, why the few old teachers entitled to good service salary have not yet been paid the amounts due to them for 1884?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am informed that with the exception of a few cases in which, from one sufficient cause or another, delay has been unavoidable, the monitorial gratuities to teachers for the year ended on June 30, 1884, were all paid in due course, and that of the 333 cases of good service salary only a few are outstanding which involve investigation and special consideration. These few will not be paid until the investigations have been decided.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—NORTH DUBLIN BOARD OF GUARDIANS.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the Irish Local Government Board have withdrawn, or resolved to withdraw, their veto against the resolution of the North Dublin Board of Guardians, appointing the Hibernian Bank their treasurer?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: This matter appeared to me to be one in which the points at issue, which were not quite clear, would be more probably brought to a settlement by a personal conference than by a continuance of the correspondence. The Local Government Board will accordingly arrange for such conference through their Inspectors; and though there may be a little delay in consequence of a recent change of Inspectors in the Dublin district, I trust a final decision will be come to before long.

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION—SUB-COMMISSIONERS.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is intended to remove the present Land Commission, consisting of Messrs. Reeves, Rice, and O'Brien from the Queen's County; and, if so, whether he will make careful and personal inquiries respecting the influences which are working for the change?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have ascertained that there will be a change of Sub-Commissions in Queen's County next Circuit, consequent on a redistribution of the work throughout the whole country. All changes of districts are made solely with a view to the public interests.

LUNATIC ASYLUMS (IRELAND)—INSUFFICIENT ACCOMMODATION.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether in eleven out of the twenty-two district lunatic asylums in Ireland the number of cases under treatment exceeds the limits of accommodation; whether the state of things in this respect is getting more and more serious; and, whether the Government propose to take any prompt steps to deal with the matter?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: There has not been time to ascertain the exact present condition of affairs in each lunatic asylum in Ireland; but I believe there is no doubt that in some asylums the number of patients is in excess of the nominal accommodation, although, taking the country as a whole, there is more accommodation than is actually required. The Lord Lieutenant gives immediate and full attention to any representations made to him on this subject. Several asylums have already been extended, and extensions are being or are about to be effected in others; but it is to be observed that a serious question of local taxation and consequent local opposition arises in nearly every case, which needs most careful consideration.

TURKEY (EUROPEAN PROVINCES)—DISTURBANCES IN ALBANIA.

MR. BRYCE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the attention of Her Majesty's Government has been called to the disturbances which have recently been reported from Albania and Macedonia, and to the dangers threatening the peace of European Turkey in that quarter; and, whether the Foreign Office have received any, and what, intelligence bearing on the subject?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Reports have been received at the Foreign Office that a feeling of dissatisfaction exists among the Albanians with the local Government, and that disturbances had taken place at Prisrend, which compelled the authorities at Salonica to send for reinforcements. Communication with Prisrend was at one time entirely cut off; but news has lately been received from there that a Turkish officer had arrived with troops. The outbreak is said to have been localized, and the foreign Consuls and Christian inhabitants have suffered no violence.

SPAIN—THE COMMERCIAL NEGOTIATIONS.

MR. MONK asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he is aware that the entire Correspondence with reference to the Declarations of the 21st of December 1884, and the Negotiations respecting the modus vivendi with the Spanish Government have been published in Madrid, together with the Confidential Correspondence of 1883 with reference to the Protocol of that year, none of which have appeared in the Blue Books; and, if so, whether Her Majesty's Government will present those Papers to Parliament without delay?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Yes, Sir; the Correspondence referred to will be presented to Parliament at an early date.

FRANCE—SHIP BROKERAGE.

MR. CHARLES PALMER asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the Director General of Customs in Paris has issued a Circular withdrawing some of the rights and privileges which have been enjoyed by the agents or consignees of ships entering French ports; if so, whether Her Majesty's Government, in the interest of shipping, have taken any diplomatic action upon such a retrograde proceeding on the part of the French Government; and, whether any, and what, progress has been made with the long pending negotiations to obtain a withdrawal or satisfactory modification of the oppressive monopoly conferred by authority of the State upon a limited number of ship brokers in most of the French ports?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Lord Lyons has again lately pressed the French Government for an answer to the representations made on behalf of Her Majesty's Government on the subject of ship brokerage in France. His Excellency's attention will be called to the Circular referred to by the hon. Member, who will be informed of the reply received.

EGYPT (EVENTS IN THE SOUDAN)—KASSALA.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If the Government have received any information from Kassala since he made his last statement with reference to that place?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I have no information from Kassala to add to that which I have already communicated to the House.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked whether Her Majesty's Ministers had any intention of endeavouring to relieve the garrison of Kassala?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I have already stated that Kassala does not come within the sphere of our military operations.

SUSPENSION OF EVICTIONS (SCOTLAND).

MR. MACFARLANE asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If the Government will follow the precedent in the case of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill of 1880, and introduce a Suspension of Evictions (Scotland) Bill of their own?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: No, Sir; we have no such intention.

NAVY—H.M.S. "CAMPERDOWN."

SIR JOHN HAY asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, If the completion of H.M.S. *Camperdown* is to be indefinitely

postponed; and, if this delay in proceeding to complete an armour-clad is in consequence of any imperfection in her design?

SIR THOMAS BRASSEY: In the ensuing financial year the number of men on the *Camperdown* will be reduced, not on account of any imperfection in the design, but for the purpose of completing certain ships in a more advanced stage of progress. The amount of construction proposed for the *Camperdown* in the Navy Estimates for 1885-6 will be carried out.

NAVY—TORPEDOES.

SIR JOHN HAY asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, If the 180 steam launches and pinnaces fitted with Whitehead torpedoes, and the 170 launches fitted with the spar torpedoes, are in addition to the boats of that character belonging to Her Majesty's Ships; how many of them are available for the defence of our Home mercantile ports, and are to be stationed there; and, how many Whitehead torpedoes have been actually supplied for the 180 steam launches?

SIR THOMAS BRASSEY: All launches and pinnaces are adapted for firing Whitehead torpedoes, and are fitted, or could be fitted, for the purpose in a short time. We have about 250 launches and pinnaces. Eighty-five are appropriated to sea-going ships, of which a certain number must always be in harbour. The remaining boats would be available for the defence of the ports. We have upwards of 170 cutters fitted for the spar torpedoes. The cutters appropriated to sea-going ships are about two-thirds of the total number. All the sea-going ships on foreign stations are supplied with their proper establishment of torpedoes. This includes the supply for their boats. I must decline to give any information as to the means which have been prepared for the defence of the Home ports.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—SPECIAL DRAFT FOR MAGHERA, CO. LONDONDERRY.

MR. COMMINS (for Mr. O'KELLY) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the local authorities of Maghera, county Londonderry, applied for the fifty extra constables drafted into the town on the 17th of March; whether any demonstration was announced in the town for that day; whether the relations of the different sects in the district are other than friendly; whether any demonstrations or processions have taken place in Maghera on the 17th of March for several years; and, whether the ratepayers will be obliged to pay any of the expense incurred in bringing extra police into the town without any necessity?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The extra police force was sent into Maghera on the 17th instant on the requisition of the local magistrates. There have been demonstrations in Maghera on the 17th March for several years; but they had not been attended with disturbance. Recently, however, the relations between the different sects have not been friendly, and two serious cases of a Party character have occurred; and the magistrates had reason to believe that the presence of an extra police force was necessary. A moiety of the cost will fall upon the county at large.

TENEMENT VALUATION (IRELAND).

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the latest Governmental printed publication of the tenement valuation of Ireland, sold in Government offices, dates back more than twenty years, and is sold at about 3*s.* 6*d.* per volume; and, whether he will order a publication of the present tenement valuation, and at a price to bring it within the range of average taxpayers?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The printed publication of the tenement valuation of Ireland dates back more than 20 years, and is sold at the price stated per volume. The valuation in force for public and local taxation and other purposes is in manuscript, and is amended annually, the total valuation of the land, however, remaining practically unaltered. I am not satisfied of the necessity to republish this work, which could only be done at heavy cost to the public.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND)—SURCHARGE ON THE CORPORATION OF DUBLIN FOR EXPENSES IN ATTENDING CORK INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland,

with regard to the undertaking given by the late Chief Secretary on the 22nd July 1884, in Debate on the Estimate for the Local Government (Ireland) Board, Whether that Board will insist upon their auditor's surcharge of an item of £40 in the accounts of the Corporation of Dublin for 1883, being the amount of expense incurred by the Civic officials of Dublin in attending in state with the Lord Mayor at the Irish Industrial Exhibition at Cork, in obedience to an order of the Municipal Council; and, whether this surcharge was made by the auditor on the ground that the expense in question could not be deemed to have been incurred for the public benefit of the inhabitants of Dublin?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is quite true that the auditor made this surcharge on the grounds stated; and the Local Government Board, who have recently taken advice on the question, have been informed that the reasons stated by the auditor for the disallowance are legal. In these circumstances, the Board had no other course open to them than to make an order confirming the decision of the auditor.

MR. SEXTON: Might I ask if the right hon. Gentleman is aware that the Dublin Corporation expended a sum of money for providing a banner for the London Exhibition; and whether this sum was surcharged?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am not aware.

MR. GRAY: Might I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it is not in his power, as President of the Local Government Board, to abstain from enforcing surcharges which may be technically legal, but which entail a hardship on individuals?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN was understood to say that the matter rested with the auditor.

CENTRAL ASIA—ENGLAND AND RUSSIA—PREPARATIONS FOR HOSTILITIES.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether Her Majesty's Government propose that Parliament should separate without receiving any explanations on the subject of the great military preparations now being made both in this Country and throughout Her Majesty's Indian Empire?

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Before the noble Lord answers this Question, I beg to give Notice to the noble Lord, as I have already given it privately to the Prime Minister, who is not now present, that it is my intention to-morrow, on the Motion for the Adjournment over the holidays, to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can give the House any information as to the present state of the negotiations respecting the frontier of Afghanistan? It may be convenient, as I cannot put the Question on the Paper, that I should give Notice of it in this form.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: In reply to the Question of my hon. Friend I have to say that it has been repeatedly stated recently in this House that, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, it is not desirable, in the interests of the Public Service, to give at present full explanations respecting the questions which are the subject of negotiations between Her Majesty's Government and the Russian Government. I do not know if that will meet the Question of the right hon. Baronet opposite, if I say that the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs will, in reply to the hon. Member for Lincolnshire (Mr. E. Stanhope), give such information as is possible respecting the present aspect of these negotiations. They are proceeding, and the latest intelligence from St. Petersburg is of such a nature as to strengthen our hopes of arriving at a satisfactory result. As to the military preparations, respecting which the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) inquires, I can say no more than that, as the House is aware, we are under certain engagements, on certain conditions, to the Ameer of Afghanistan; and, looking to the distance which separates our Military Forces from the regions to which those engagements relate, we are of opinion that it is desirable to make some preparations which would enable us, if the occasion should arise, to fulfil those engagements.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether he can state what force has been ordered to concentrate in the Pishin Valley; who is to command the army there assembled; and, whether any reinforcements are being sent to Sir Peter Lumsden at Herat?

MR. J. K. CROSS: After the reply which the Secretary of State for War has just given to the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy, I hope that the hon. Member for Eye will not press for an answer to the first paragraph of his Question. In reply to the second paragraph I may remark that, as Sir Peter Lumsden's Mission is diplomatic and not military, the question of reinforcements does not arise.

IRELAND—REGISTRATION OF PARLIAMENTARY VOTERS—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PREPARING THE LISTS.

MR. T. A. DICKSON asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Whether, having regard to the increased duties and the difficulties in performing them within the limited period allowed by law, any extension of time will be granted to the clerks of the peace and clerks of unions for carrying out the work cast upon them in reference to the Registration of Voters during the present year; if the necessary precepts will or can be issued in anticipation of the Registration Bill becoming law and thereby follow the course adopted at the passing of the Ballot Act; and, whether any steps will be taken to insure at an early date the performance of the duties and the service of the notices required by section nine of "The Representation of the People Act, 1884?"

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER): If necessary an extension of time will be granted; but I hope that the duties will be promptly taken up by these officers, and that an extension of time will not be necessary. Inquiries will be made as to the course adopted when the Ballot Act was passed. Steps are being taken to call the attention of the officers to the necessity of issuing notices under the 9th section early in April.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: Has the hon. and learned Gentleman seen that in England and Scotland they have raised the number of officers? Will the same thing be carried out in Ireland?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER) was understood to reply in the affirmative.

EGYPT—ZEBEHR PASHA.

MR. GORST asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether the Laws of England are generally applied at Gibraltar, and whether the Charter of 1830 provides that the Courts shall administer the Law as nearly as may be according to the practice of Westminster Hall; whether it is under the provisions of the general Law, as thus defined, or under some special statute or ordinance, that Zebehr Pasha is kept as a prisoner at Gibraltar without being brought to trial; whether the Attorney General of Gibraltar or the Law Officers of the Crown in England have been consulted as to the lawfulness of the detention of Zebehr Pasha by Her Majesty's Government?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES): I may answer the first paragraph of my hon. and learned Friend's Question substantially in the affirmative; but the application of the law of England in Gibraltar is now regulated by the Order of Council dated February 2, 1884, which declares that, except in matters provided for by local legislation, the law of England, as it existed in England on December 31, 1883, should be enforced in Gibraltar so far as it might be applicable to the circumstances thereof. But by virtue of the legislative power vested in the Governor of Gibraltar a special Ordinance has been enacted authorizing the detention in custody of Zebehr at Gibraltar, and by virtue of this Ordinance he is now detained in a house provided for that purpose. I must ask my hon. and learned Friend to relieve me from answering the last paragraph of the Question. It is both very unusual and inexpedient to dissect the responsibility borne by the different Departments of the Government in respect to any particular course of action which has been pursued.

MR. GORST asked if the Attorney General had any objection to lay a copy of the Ordinance in question on the Table of the House?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES) said, he must refer the hon. and learned Member to some other Department for an answer to that Question.

MR. GORST gave Notice to the Government that he would ask the Question to-morrow.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE MILITIA RESERVES.

MR. GREER asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is a fact

that the Militia Reserve consists of an actual twenty-five per cent. of the nominal strength, and includes a large number of non-commissioned officers not on the permanent staff; whether it is also a fact that, when the Reserve men are taken away, each battalion loses so many of its best men as to render it practically ineffective for months afterwards, if embodied; and, whether he will reconsider the determination of calling on the Militia Reserves?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: The Militia Reserve, when full, comprises in numbers 30 per cent of the establishment of gunners in Artillery corps, and 25 per cent of the establishment of sappers or privates in Engineer or Infantry corps. It includes in ranks a large number of volunteer sergeants. The withdrawal of this body from the Militia reduces for the time, and until their places can be filled by recruiting, the efficiency of the Militia. The Militia Reserve is maintained at a considerable cost for the express purpose of being withdrawn for Army service when required.

THE BOUNDARY COMMISSION — PARLIAMENTARY DIVISIONS OF THE CO. DOWN (IRELAND)—REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON asked the President of the Local Government Board, If he would lay upon the Table of the House the Report of the Commissioner appointed to inquire locally into the boundaries of the Parliamentary divisions of county Down?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Yes, Sir.

ARMY—ROMAN CATHOLIC CHAPLAINS AT SUAKIN.

MR. O'BRIEN asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is a fact that there are only two Roman Catholic chaplains at present attached to General Graham's army in the Soudan?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Yes, Sir; it is the fact, as I stated in my reply on the 5th instant to the hon. Member for Oxford University.

MR. O'BRIEN: Is it a fact that one of the Roman Catholic chaplains was very nearly being killed within the last few days; and does the noble Lord consider that one Catholic chaplain is sufficient for the necessities of thousands of soldiers?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, the matter had been considered, and the number of Roman Catholic chaplains had been thought sufficient.

NAVAL DISCIPLINE ACT—CASES OF ENDERSBY AND QUINN.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether the Board is now disposed favourably to consider the case of the seamen Endersby and Quinn, with the view of remitting the remainder of the sentence of penal servitude they are now undergoing for breach of discipline?

MR. CAINE: A sentence of five years' penal servitude was passed in each of these cases, and the term of each has already been reduced by the Admiralty to three years. A further reduction may be effected by good conduct on the part of the prisoners. The offences of which the prisoners were found guilty were very serious; and, in the opinion of the Board of Admiralty, no further remission of the term of imprisonment beyond that mentioned can be granted.

IRELAND — MEETINGS OF THE NATIONAL LEAGUE — ACTION OF THE POLICE AT ROSSCREA.

MR. HARRINGTON (for Mr. JOHN O'CONNOR) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is the custom of the police at Rosscrea to post themselves outside the house where Nationalist meetings are held; whether, on the 15th of February, a posse of police remained outside the hall of the Catholic Club, Rosscrea, and took down the names of persons who entered in order to attend a meeting convened for the purpose of establishing a branch of the Irish National League, and if a similar proceeding on the part of the police occurred on last Sunday; and, whether he will issue instructions restraining the police from continuing these proceedings?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I find that two constables attended as stated outside the meeting of the 15th February, which had been previously announced by placard. They were there in the ordinary discharge of their duty, and I do not think it necessary to issue any instructions to restrain them from performing it.

MR. HARRINGTON: Might I ask whether it is the ordinary discharge of a constable's duty to take down the names of everyone going into a legal meeting; and whether the police discharge that ordinary duty in the case of the meetings of Orange Lodges?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The instructions given to them are to watch any meeting.

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—CASE OF OWEN PATRICK AND THADY LANG *v.* PATRICK LYNCH.

MR. COMMINS (for Mr. O'KELLY) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, On what grounds the magistrates at Ballyfarnon, county Roscommon, dismissed the summons for assault brought by Owen Patrick and Thady Lang against Patrick Lynch, on Friday the 27th instant?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have no information on the subject of this Question, which only appeared on the Paper to-day.

RELIEF OF DISTRESS (IRELAND) ACT—LOANS TO LANDLORDS FOR PUBLIC WORKS IN DONEGAL.

MR. O'BRIEN asked the Secretary to the Treasury, If it is a fact that the Board of Works, in the year 1880, called the attention of the Special Relief Sessions held at Letterkenny, for the barony of Kilmacrennan, county Donegal, to the fact that certain loans having been made to landlords in the parishes of Tullaghobegley, Raymunsterdoney, and Clondahorkey, with the object of limiting the public works in these districts, where agricultural or other employment was by these loans provided; whether he will state the amount of employment given under said loans during the period of distress in said districts, specifying the locality and nature of the works on which employment was given; and, whether he has any objection to giving, for the small parish of Clondahorkey, particulars as to (1) the amount of loans approved, (2) of loans passed by the Board of Works, and (3) nature of work done from 1st January 1880 to the present time?

MR. HIBBERT: The hon. Member has not allowed me time to obtain full information on the subject to which his Question refers. I have ascertained the figures for the barony of Kilmacrennan, those for the separate parishes not being distinguishable. In that area 30 loans were sanctioned under the Relief of Distress Acts amounting to £27,310. The total amount advanced has been £21,038, and the certified expenditure £21,807. Of the latter, £16,083 is described as for drainage only, and the rest is mainly for drainage combined with road making, fencing, and planting.

PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—GREYSTONES BREAKWATER.

MR. W. J. CORBET asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Will steps be taken to ensure the construction of the proposed breakwater at Greystones on the monolithic principle so strongly approved by the Select Committee on Piers and Harbours; and, will the Treasury provide that the works shall be placed under the supervision of the local engineer who designed and carried out the Harbour works at Wicklow so successfully?

MR. M'COAN: With regard to this Question, I would like to ask the hon. Gentleman whether he will consider the advisability of making an investigation into Wicklow Harbour, which has been built in the way suggested?

MR. W. J. CORBET asked whether Wicklow Harbour had not already been inspected and highly approved of?

MR. HIBBERT: The Question of the hon. Member (Mr. Corbet) only appeared on the Paper to-day; but I take note of the hon. Member's two recommendations, and will transmit them to Ireland.

NORTH SEA FISHERIES—BELGIAN TRAWLERS.

MR. BIRKBECK asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether his attention has been called to the following report, which has appeared in the newspapers, of a depredation by a Belgian trawler on a vessel belonging to Hartlepool, and at present fishing from Lowestoft:—

"The lugger H. L. 333, Walter Cook, master, put into harbour on Tuesday morning, having been deliberately trawled into by the Belgian trawler O. T. 116, by which he had sustained a loss of twenty-two nets, warps, and bowls. The outrage took place about thirty-six miles north-east of Lowestoft, on Monday night, and unless the owner recovers his nets, of which there is but little probability, his spring voyage will be at an end. His loss is estimated at £50, at least;"

and, whether any cruisers are at the present time stationed on the fishing grounds referred to in the above report; and, if not, whether he will at once carry out the promise given of the 16th instant, on going into Committee on the Navy Estimates, "that the Admiralty would do all that lay in their power to give adequate security to the fisheries?"

SIR THOMAS BRASSEY: No Report has been received of a Belgian trawler having been seen fouling the nets of the lugger H. L. 333. The *Mermaid* and *Eagle* cruisers have been employed constantly on the fishery ground since the 14th of March?

LAW AND JUSTICE—CASE OF H. WILLIAMS, CONVICTED OF PERJURY AT POOLE.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the evidence on which detective Henry Williams (in the Poole perjury case) was convicted of wilful and corrupt perjury at the Winchester Assizes, and sentenced to seven years' penal servitude, was exclusively that of persons pecuniarily or criminally implicated by Williams's evidence; whether the perjury, as alleged to have been proved by such evidence, was anything more than a discrepancy between the statements of Williams and the prosecuting witnesses, as to the length of time spent in a public house by a police superintendent, and as to the quantity of drink the said superintendent consumed; whether, having examined the report of the case, he is able to state that for such a crime, even if conclusively proved, a heavier sentence than three months' imprisonment has ever before been passed; and, whether, having declined to interfere with the sentence, he is willing to lay upon the Table of the House the documents on which he based his decision?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, he had carefully examined, in consultation with the Judge, the evidence in the case referred to. He found no ground for interfering with the verdict of the jury, and did not see his way to lay Papers on the Table.

ARMY—THE RESERVE MEN.

COLONEL NOLAN asked the Secretary of State for War, If he would direct that soldiers of the Reserve, who hold situations in large towns, should be permitted to report themselves to some regiment or depôt in those towns, and where it can be effected be allowed to go through drill and instruction at times which might make it possible for them to retain their present employments?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: The men of the Army Reserve who may be called out will be required for service with their regiments. It will not, therefore, be practicable for them to retain other employment during the time of their Army service.

ARMY (THE MILITARY EXDEDITION)—THE CAMEL CORPS.

GENERAL WILLIAMS asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, in view of the fact that Lord Wolseley's Camel Corps is composed of picked men from the various corps d'élite of the Army, and that no further active operations on the Nile are contemplated for some months, he will consider the advisability of allowing these men to return to their respective regiments without delay?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: It is not possible to foresee when active operations may have to be resumed; and, as the Camel Corps are especially fitted for the rapid reinforcement of any threatened portion of the line now occupied, I do not think it would at present be advisable to withdraw them.

GENERAL WILLIAMS: I should like to know whether it is contemplated to reinforce the Camel Corps, and to fill the vacancies caused by death and disease?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: We expect very shortly to receive from Lord Wolseley a fuller statement than has yet been received what reinforcements for the whole Army under his command may be required. No doubt the Camel Corps will be included.

BOROUGH FUNDS ACT—THE DUBLIN COLLECTOR GENERAL OF RATES.

MR. DAWSON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the Collector General of Rates for the city of Dublin has directed that the names of occupiers of tenements rated under £4 per annum shall not be returned for the Poor Law franchise,

and, further, that he has decided, in regard to weekly and monthly tenants, to rate not occupiers but landlords in all cases where valuation is under £8 per annum; if the Law which enabled this latter practice to be carried on has not been repealed (see 12 and 13 Vic. c. 91, s. 63); and, if care will be taken that, in any such proceedings, nothing will be done to endanger the rights of occupiers to the Parliamentary franchise?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am informed that the Collector General of Rates, acting under the advice of eminent counsel, has given the direction referred to. I also understand that steps are being taken to test the legality of his action in a Court of Law. A provision has been inserted in the Registration of Voters Bill, now waiting for second reading, to secure that the right to the Parliamentary franchise shall not be endangered by any decision which the Courts may give.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—CASE OF SERGEANT DELANY.

MR. BARRY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary, If he has yet received an answer from the Inspector General of Constabulary with regard to the case of Sergeant Delany of Newtownbarry?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, Sir; I have not yet received an answer.

MR. BARRY: I will put the Question down for to-morrow.

PURCHASE OF LAND (IRELAND) BILL.

MR. T. A. DICKSON asked the First Lord of the Treasury, If it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to introduce, after the Easter Recess, the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Bill?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): My right hon. Friend has asked me to answer this Question for him. The question of the purchase of land by tenants is, in our opinion, of considerable importance, and we showed this by the introduction last year of a Bill on the subject, explained by my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. But, as the Prime Minister has said repeatedly, it is impossible to make known to the House what further legislation it is intended to propose on this or any other matter until further progress has been made with the Seats Bill.

MR. T. A. DICKSON: I wish to give Notice that after the Recess, and when the Seats Bill has made further progress, I shall repeat this Question, and, if necessary, ask the attention of the House to it as a matter of urgent public importance.

CENTRAL ASIA—THE RUSSO-AFGHAN BOUNDARY COMMISSION.

MR. E. STANHOPE asked the First Lord of the Treasury, If he can now hold out any hope of a day being fixed for the commencement of the work of the Afghan Frontier Commission, or if it is to be understood that, in accordance with the request of the Russian Government, the negotiations for the settlement of the Frontier are to take place in London?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The hon. Member asks if I can hold out any hope of a day being fixed for the commencement of the work of the Afghan Commission. An answer to the last communication of Her Majesty's Government has been sent by the Russian Government. We are not yet aware, however, of its exact contents, but it is understood that it contemplates an early meeting of the Commission, and looks forward to such a meeting as likely to allay the excitement on both sides. Having regard to what we believe to be the conciliatory character of the reply, Her Majesty's Government would strongly deprecate at the present moment the use of any language of a nature to cause irritation, and thereby to endanger the peaceful solution of present difficulties. I must be understood by these observations as in no manner to intend to reflect on the hon. Member opposite or those who act with him, as they have throughout shown the most extreme consideration for the position of Her Majesty's Government in this matter.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether Her Majesty's Government still adhere to their views, expressed on the 3rd March, that Pul-i-Khisti, Ak-Rabat, and Zulfagar, are Afghan Territory; and, whether the Russian Forces are still in occupation of these positions, and the Russian Government have refused to give orders for their evacuation?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I must again decline to enter into any discussion of these topics with the hon. Member. The Russians still occupy the places referred to.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: In consequence of that answer I wish to give Notice that, unless the statement promised with respect to this matter is satisfactory, I shall call attention to it on the Motion for Adjournment for the Holidays.

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—GENERAL GRAHAM'S FORCE.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether the operations of General Graham have fulfilled the necessity to which he referred on the 23rd ult., as to securing the proper and safe retirement of the British Army on the Nile; and, if so, whether Her Majesty's Government will consider whether it is desirable to advise the issue of a proclamation by the Khedive, similar to that of January 26th 1884, which was withheld by General Gordon, which announced the restoration of the Soudan to independence, the evacuation of the provinces by Egyptian employés and troops with all their belongings; their separation from the Soudan "on the broad principles of peace," and which finally called upon—

"All persons in arms to lay them down, and to endeavour by peaceable means to form independent Governments on our frontiers, and to do their best for their own prosperity, so that our intercourse may continue, and commerce be facilitated and civilisation be extended?"

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: In our opinion the operations of General Graham have certainly not yet proceeded so far as to fulfil the necessity referred to in the first part of the Question. In these circumstances the hon. Member will probably himself be of opinion that any answer to the second part of the Question would be entirely premature.

FRANCE AND CHINA—THE HOSTILITIES—CONTRABAND OF WAR—RICE.

MR. BOURKE gave Notice that he would ask, If the Government would lay on the Library Table any Correspondence with the French Government on the subject of rice being contraband of war, and whether it was a fact that the French Government had claimed to treat as contraband of war the food of the people, irrespective of the fact whether or not that food was immediately intended for the support of warlike forces; and whether any Papers would be laid on the Table on the subject?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I will reply to the right hon. Gentleman at once. Two answers have already been given to Questions of this kind—first by myself, in reply to the hon. Member for Bedford (Mr. Magniac), and next by the Prime Minister, in reply to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), and which practically cover this Question. I shall obtain a copy of the French Yellow Book and place it in the Library. Papers on the subject are being prepared.

ISLANDS OF THE WESTERN PACIFIC—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

MR. GORST asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether the attention of Her Majesty's Government has been directed to the report of Western Pacific Commission of October 16th 1883, in which the following passages occur:—

"The present arrangements for the control of British subjects, and the administration of justice among the Islands of the Western Pacific are highly unsatisfactory;"

"Any considerable delay in placing upon a more satisfactory footing the control over British subjects in the Western Pacific will be perilous, and in all probability attended with calamitous results;"

to the published reports of German officials on the labour traffic carried on under the British flag, e.g. that of the German Consul at the Marshall Islands:—

"I have made the most exact inquiries, and have arrived at the conclusion that the laws which have been enacted, and which are specially stringent for vessels from Fiji, are simply evaded, and that the labour traffic in New Britain and New Ireland is, with few exceptions, clean slave trading, as bad as any that was ever carried on in Africa;"

that of Captain Karcher, of the German Navy—

"The labour traffic is nothing else but slave trading. In it the captains of vessels not only buy persons from the chiefs for firearms, and even breech-loaders with ammunition, but they entice persons on board who come alongside in their canoes to trade and then detain them, or even simply kidnap the crew of a canoe met with on the high seas;"

whether Her Majesty's Government are prepared to accept the repeated offers of the German Government to come to

an "understanding for the common or identic control of the labour traffic" in the Western Pacific; whether it is intended to station a British man of war amongst the islands from which labour is recruited during the labour trade season, i.e. from May to October of the present year; and, what other steps, if any, Her Majesty's Government intend to take to carry out any of the recommendations of the Western Pacific Commission?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Yes; Her Majesty's Government are aware of the statements to which the hon. and learned Member refers. An Anglo-German Commission, consisting of Dr. Krauel, the German Consul General in Sydney, and Mr. Thurston, the Colonial Secretary of Fiji, both of whom are now in London, is about to consider this question, and to make recommendations for joint or identical action by Great Britain and Germany for the control of the labour traffic. Her Majesty's ships will give all practicable assistance to the High Commissioner in supervising the labour traffic and preventing abuses in it, but cannot be permanently stationed at any particular places. Until the Anglo-German Commission has reported, it will not be possible to decide how far and in what manner effect can be given to the recommendations of the Western Pacific Commission.

ENGLAND AND TURKEY.

MR. J. LOWTHER asked the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it was intended to lay on the Table any Papers respecting the Turkish special mission to this country?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE said, he could not answer that Question without Notice.

MR. J. LOWTHER: Then, Sir, in that case I will give Notice that I will take an early opportunity of asking the Prime Minister whether it is the case that the Ottoman Ambassador Extraordinary, in reply to certain questions addressed to him by Lord Granville, stated that it would be difficult seriously to entertain a proposal which involved an appeal to "the one anti-human specimen of humanity" to co-operate in retarding "the saintly mission of the Divine Figure from the North?"

FRANCE—THE MINISTERIAL CRISIS.

BARON HENRY DE WORMS asked, Whether the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs had any information respecting the reported resignation of the French Ministry?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Up to the time I left the Foreign Office no official information had been received. I understand that a telegram has appeared in the evening papers to the effect stated by the hon. Member.

IRISH INDUSTRIES—THE SELECT COMMITTEE.

MR. SEXTON: I wish to ask the noble Lord the Member for Flint, with regard to a statement made on Thursday last, and his reply to the hon. Baronet the Member for South Warwickshire (Sir Eardley Wilmot), how it is that the noble Lord has not yet given Notice of the Select Committee on Irish Industries, and whether the Select Committee will be nominated before the Recess?

LORD RICHARD GROSVENOR: I have been unable to complete the selection, but may be able to complete it to-night, and to place the Notice on the Paper for to-morrow.

MR. SEXTON: If that is so, the appointment will be made to-morrow?

LORD RICHARD GROSVENOR: The appointment may possibly be made to-morrow. I may not be able to complete the selection to-night.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE MILITIA AND ARMY RESERVES—THE QUEEN'S MESSAGE.

MR. CHAPLIN asked the Secretary of State for War, On what day the Government proposed that the House should take into consideration the Message from the Crown in regard to the Militia and the Army Reserve, and whether the noble Lord had any further explanation to give of the very unusual course pursued by the Government, by which the consideration of that Message, which was put down for that evening, had been postponed for an indefinite time?

MR. RITCHIE said, that before the noble Lord answered that Question, he wished to ask whether it was proposed to embody any more regiments of Militia?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: In reply to the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin), I may say that I do not think the hon. Gentleman was in the House when I stated, in reply to a Question from the right hon. and gallant Member for North Lancashire (Colonel Stanley), the circumstances under which the Proclamation had been issued somewhat before we were fully aware of the exact requirements of the Military Authorities. I would refer him to the answer that I gave to the right hon. and gallant Member. So far as Her Majesty's Government are concerned, we think that we shall probably be in a position to make a full statement as to the measures that are intended to be taken under the Proclamation on the day of the re-assembling of the House, on Thursday week; but as probably a good many Members will not have returned by that time, it would perhaps be more convenient to put down the further consideration of Her Majesty's Message until this day fortnight. The hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ritchie) has asked whether it is intended to embody any more regiments of Militia. I think it would be more convenient to defer any answer to that Question until the general statement is made of the measures intended to be taken under the Proclamation.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—o—

SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

PARLIAMENT—THE HOUSE OF COMMONS—THE LADIES' GALLERY.

RESOLUTION.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON, in rising to call attention to the condition of the Ladies' Gallery; and to move—

"That, in the opinion of this House, it is advisable to substitute for the present grating (or some portion of it) a railing so constructed as not largely to exclude sound, light, and air; and generally, that the accommodation of the gallery should be improved,"

said, this question was invariably received in that House, like the toast of the ladies at public dinners, with what the reporters described as "cheers and laughter." Ancient precedent was all in favour of reform. He reminded the House that 100 years ago ladies were allowed access to any part of the House of Commons; but these privileges had been gradually curtailed until the ladies were confined to the grated Gallery which they now occupied. Only a few years ago the First Commissioner of Works compared the Ladies' Gallery to the Chamber of Horrors; but he presumed that he addressed that description not to the figures inside, but only to the cage which contained them. He thought everyone would allow that the Ladies' Gallery as at present constructed was very inconvenient. The atmosphere was bad, and even those ladies who were able to obtain the most favoured places could see only very imperfectly, whilst to hear required a great strain on their attention; in fact, those who were in the back seats saw and heard as little of what was going on in the House of Commons as Mr. Sam Weller saw and heard of Mr. Pickwick's proposal. The farce was gone through every day of balloting for 40 seats in this Gallery, although practically there were only 15 or 16 seats from which ladies could really see and hear. Moreover, on any occasion when there was a great demand for seats the ladies had to come before the door was open, and had to stand outside, and physical strength was a great means of obtaining a good seat in the Gallery. Even those who formed the front row could see little more than one-half of the House, and those in the back row could not see as much as one-half. This was a serious disadvantage, because ladies were thereby forced to judge of the composition and demeanour of the whole of the House by the composition and demeanour of the Members who sat below the Gangway on either side. Their vision was confined to the Radicals below the Gangway, the Irish Members, and such remnants of the Fourth Party as still hovered around their old position. They never by any chance caught a glimpse of the Whig Members except on the occasions of critical divisions, when they might see one standing below the Bar preparatory to walking out of the House or into the Opposition Lobby. With very slight alteration the Gallery might be made more convenient for seeing and hearing,

and available for a larger number of ladies. A great deal might be done by removing the upper part of the grating of the Gallery. Some persons perhaps thought that injurious consequences might result if the ladies in the Gallery could be seen from the body of the House. But he did not believe they would be seen, and even if they were it was not found that the debates in the other House of Parliament were made much more exciting by the visible presence of ladies. They were told that if they were to make such an alteration as he had proposed in the Ladies' Gallery, whispering and conversation would no longer be possible. He believed that, at all events, the reporters, and probably the majority of those who came to the Ladies' Gallery, would be glad if that was to be the case. He thought this was a matter which should be decided primarily by the ladies themselves, and the question arose how they were really to ascertain the desire of the majority of the ladies who frequented the Gallery. He believed himself that a large majority of them were in favour of considerable reforms in the present state of things. He would suggest that a practical experiment should be made in the matter by making an alteration in the central portion of the Gallery, so that it might be left to the ladies themselves to prove whether they preferred the improvement. He hoped that the Government would look into the matter and see whether they could do anything to improve the present condition of the Gallery. If they would promise to turn their attention to the matter he would gladly withdraw his Motion, having once called attention to the subject. There were, besides the questions of hearing and seeing, many minor matters connected with the Ladies' Gallery, which had not been looked into for some time, such as that of the ventilation. The front seats also might be lowered, and the back ones raised. He believed that every Member of the House would be greatly obliged to the First Commissioner of Works if he could see his way to placing a telephone by means of which they could communicate from the Lobby with the room of the officials up in the Gallery. Another matter which might with advantage be considered was the present system of balloting. In conclusion, he begged to move the Resolution which stood in his name.

MR. PULESTON, in seconding the Resolution, said, that nothing connected with the House excited so much astonishment in the minds of a new Member as the condition of the Ladies' Gallery. There was no reason whatever why some change should not be made in it. The present Postmaster General had unquestionably made great improvements; but the grating still remained. It was said as one reason for allowing the grating to remain that the ladies themselves, as a general rule, were against its removal. He hoped he should not be wanting in gallantry if he suggested that that opinion was confined to those who were the more constant frequenters of the Gallery, and who knew how to secure the few front seats. As a matter of fact, only some seven or eight ladies in the Gallery were able to see and hear what was going on, those who sat at the back finding it impossible to understand what occurred in the House. He considered that if the grating were partially removed it would not really intefere with the privacy of the Ladies' Gallery. There was no reason, again, why the Gallery should not be extended on each side of the House wholly or partially. This could be done without interfering with the privacy of that part of the Gallery which belonged to Mr. Speaker. The accommodation for ladies in the House of Lords had been improved; and, so far as he knew, no inconvenience resulted from the ladies sitting in the open Galleries round the sides of the House. He thought that nothing was more annoying to hon. Members than the necessity under the present system of constantly trying to get seats for the Ladies' Gallery, and he thought that most Members would prefer not having the privilege of giving tickets at all. The House of Commons was the only Assembly in the world in which ladies were caged behind a grating. They did not wish to divide the House upon this question, if his hon. Friend the Member for Leeds (Mr. Herbert Gladstone) would not disregard the request they had made. In his (Mr. Puleston's) opinion, if his hon. Friend gave this question his serious consideration, he would add to his already deserved popularity. He had much pleasure in seconding the Motion.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it is advisable to substitute for the present grating of the Ladies' Gallery (or some portion of it) a railing so constructed as not largely to exclude sound, light, and air; and generally, that the accommodation of the gallery should be improved,"—(*Mr. Sydney Buxton,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, the hon. Member for Devonport, in taking upon himself the championship of the ladies, had put him in a very difficult and awkward position, because, of course, he could not hope to speak with the experience possessed by the hon. Member, or by his hon. Friend the Member for Peterborough. It was the duty of the Department which he had the honour to represent to carry out the wishes of the House; but it was also his duty, before making any change or alteration in the structure of the building, to ascertain as exactly as possible what really were the wishes of the House. Of course, it was their object to study so far as was reasonable the convenience of the ladies who used the Gallery, and he might say at once that the First Commissioner of Works would be most happy to consider any practical suggestions for the improvement of that Gallery, especially, for instance, in such a matter as the position of the benches. Several improvements had been made of late, and he might say that orders had been given to put up a speaking tube, which would connect the attendant of the Ladies' Gallery with the doorkeepers behind the Chair, so that Members would not be put to the trouble and inconvenience of going up to the Gallery when they brought ladies down to the House to find out whether there was or was not room. This, he thought, would meet one of the points raised by his hon. Friend. But the main point before them was the question of what was known as the grille, which, it was contended, prevented ladies from seeing. If hon. Members would look at the Gallery, they would see that the inconvenience was not so much caused by the grille, as by the stonework of the mullions. His hon. Friend implied in his Motion that the grille excluded sound, light, and air. He doubted whether it really did exclude sound, and he thought it was quite conceivable that the grille might even improve hearing by breaking the waves of sound. Then ladies did not want light. Of course, they had sufficient light themselves, and they did not want additional light to read documents and papers in the Gallery. Ladies came to the Gallery to hear and see what was going on in the House, and he did not think that the question of light applied in the matter. Lastly, they came to the question of air. Undoubtedly, the ventilation of the Ladies' Gallery might be improved. At the same time, he would point out that the position occupied by the Gallery made it very difficult to ventilate effectively. He did not think that the bars interfered in any appreciable degree with the ventilation, or that if they removed the grating there would be the slightest improvement. This question must be decided by the House, and he thought that the fact that no division had ever been taken on the subject seemed to argue that the general opinion of Members was against any change. There was no proof whatever that the majority of ladies who visited the Gallery desired the change. He knew a great number of ladies who did not, and he did not think that he was less an authority on that point than his hon. Friend. He did not know that the general opinion of hon. Members or of the ladies was in favour of the change, and he had taken the opportunity to consult many Members of the greatest authority and longest standing, and he might say that they were hardly without exception very much opposed to the change suggested. Under these circumstances, and until it was ascertained that the wish of the House generally was to make the change, it was not desirable to carry out the proposed alterations.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT said, he thought that the removal of the grating altogether was the reasonable view which would be taken by a large number of the Members of the House, and he believed it would be very much supported by the ladies who visited the Gallery. The hon. Member for Leeds could not have informed himself of the opinion of many of the ladies if he contended that there was not the greatest

was to come before the House that dissatisfaction with the present condition of the Gallery. He submitted that the Gallery was badly ventilated, stuffy, warm, dark, and badly arranged for sound. He did not know whether the removal of the gratings would improve the sound. That was an architectural question. But he thought that if the spaces were made larger and some of the centre mullions removed sound would be very much improved. He was sure that it was the opinion of most Members that some improvement should be made. He would suggest that there should be a new Ladies' Gallery altogether in the Gallery at the back of the Opposition. On important nights the Gallery at the back of the Ministerial Benches was generally full; but this was not so in the case of the Gallery behind the Opposition Benches, where there was always a great deal of room to spare. He thought that 24 seats might very well be set apart for ladies in the Opposition Gallery, which would be infinitely superior to the accommodation now given in the Ladies' Gallery. If this suggestion were adopted they would have plenty of light and air, and as they would be directly opposite the supporters of Her Majesty's Government, they would be able to hear all the oratory of the debate. He hoped that that point would be taken into consideration.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN said, that, some years ago, when this question was brought before the House by his hon. and learned Colleague, the late Serjeant Sherlock—now, he was sorry to say, no more—it was ascertained that the removal of the grille would be in opposition to the wishes of the larger number of the ladies who frequented the Gallery. The suggestion of the hon. Member for Eye to appropriate for the ladies part of the Gallery over the Opposition Benches was all very well, on the supposition that only the Ministerial Gallery was ever crowded; but that seemed to imply that there was more eagerness to see and hear the hon. Member for Eye than to listen to the Prime Minister. While some might be charmed with the oratory of the hon. Member for Eye, there were others who might wish as a happy change not to hear it.

MR. GIBSON said, he could not but think that it was an extraordinary satire on the way in which Public Business was conducted in this country that, in a grave and important crisis like the present, that House should be kept from serious and important Business by a Motion of this kind, which occupied a couple of the most important hours. This matter came before the House in July, 1869, when Mr. Layard was First Commissioner of Works. Mr. Layard was a very wise man, and, instead of making a speech, he read a letter from a lady on the subject, which was to the following effect:—

"The removal of the grating would be no remedy; on the contrary, the protection we derive from it enables us to sit as we like, to talk together, to hang up our shawls and bonnets, and dress as we please. These are many advantages, for you know we are compelled to sit quiet not to lose our places while bores are addressing the House. You will not take it amiss, dear Mr. Layard, if I say that there are some bores in the House of Commons. You cannot feel for us, because on these occasions you can go and talk to your friends, and write letters in the Library. The grating besides enables us to leave the Gallery in the middle of dull speeches, which we would otherwise be compelled to sit out patiently, especially if the orator were an acquaintance, and had obtained our seat for us. And, then, the grating is of enormous advantage to hon. Members themselves, who could not come and stretch, and sleep, and snore as they do immediately below us in the Galleries if they saw that we saw them."—(3 *Hansard*, [197] 1587.)

Any Member who had the temerity to think that he could add to that reasoning by any words of his own would, he thought, be a Member who was not alive to the importance and dignity of this discussion.

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, he wished to protest against the speech of his right hon. and learned Friend. The House would observe that his right hon. and learned Friend, who he presumed was in favour of the ladies' suffrage, and he believed had voted for it —[MR. GIBSON: No.]—then that made the case worse.

MR. GIBSON: I do not want my "No" to be taken in a wider sense. I have not voted.

SIR ROBERT PEEL observed that, at all events, his right hon. and learned Friend had raised a very narrow and barren issue when he pointed to the waste of time at a moment of great crisis in discussing a futile question of this nature, instead of proceeding with the Business of the country. Now, what was the important Business which

evening? The next Business after the present was with respect to the miscarriage of justice in the conviction of innocent men. He should like to know if the Government of this country cared one pin about the miscarriage of justice? Then there was a Motion praying Her Majesty to endeavour to induce the German Government to take charge of one of the Possessions of the Crown. To say, in view of these matters, that the time of the House was being wasted in the discussion of what he (Sir Robert Peel) considered a very momentous question, instead of discussing whether Heligoland should be handed over to the German Government, which, he was certain, no one would endorse, was, he thought, an unjust accusation against the hon. Member for Peterborough. The ladies of this country were almost universally Conservative. ["No!"] At all events, a very great many of them were Conservatives; and he should be glad to see the accommodation for them, which was now totally inadequate, enlarged and improved. He hoped the hon. Gentleman who represented the Department of Works in that House would not follow the advice of the lady who wrote to Mr. Layard in 1869. He remembered that letter being read in the House, and the universal opinion was that it was a case of the wolf in sheep's clothing—that it had not been written by a lady at all, but had been concocted for the occasion. It was ridiculous to suppose that the ladies were satisfied with the present cage, and, as he had said, the questions to come afterwards were insignificant compared with the due accommodation of ladies in that deliberative Assembly.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that, although the question might have occupied sufficient time, it was his duty to add that it was raised last year on the Estimates. He then stated that his own opinion was rather favourable to some change, but he did not think that any should be made, except with the general assent of the House. He then undertook to make inquiries among Members of the House, and also, as far as he could, of ladies who frequented the Gallery; and, so far as he could ascertain, the feeling of the majority both of Members and of ladies was adverse to the proposed change. It was represented to him that the removal of the grille would destroy the freedom that ladies now enjoyed. No doubt, there were some who would like a change; but unless there were a general concurrence of opinion in its favour, it would be unwise to make it.

MR. MONTAGUE GUEST said, he had never yet met a lady who was in favour of the Gallery as at present arranged. Indeed, the ladies had always said to him — "It is impossible to see or hear anything with that horrible thing in front of us." He thought it would be a great convenience to the ladies who frequented the Gallery if the Authorities would remove the grating.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 121; Noes 75: Majority 46.—(Div. List, No. 86.)

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," again proposed.

LAW AND JUSTICE—CONVICTIONS OF INNOCENT MEN—ESTABLISHMENT OF A COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. HOPWOOD, who had the next Notice on the Paper, in the following words:—

"To call attention to the frequent miscarriage of justice in the conviction of innocent men for murder and other crimes, and to the opinions expressed by the Home Secretary and the Attorney General in this House in favour of enacting some method by which doubtful cases of the kind may be re-considered; and to move, That it is necessary that an appeal from conviction in criminal cases be provided by Law,"

said: Since I placed this Notice upon the Paper, I have received an intimation from Mr. Speaker that the Motion is in contravention of the Standing Order which was passed in order to enable the House to get more rapidly into Committee of Supply on Mondays and Thursdays. Of course, I shall bow to the ruling of the Chair, and will, therefore, postpone the Motion; but I must express my regret at being unable to bring forward this question of social mischief, which is of great gravity to the community and productive of much private suffering. I hope before long to call the attention of the House to the subject, and will do so to-morrow, if possible, on the Motion for Adjournment.

MR. COURTNEY: This is a matter of some importance, and I was certainly not aware that you, Sir, had given any ruling upon the point of Order. I would venture to suggest that if, on the first occasion of moving the Civil Service Estimates, a question is ruled out of Order because it happens to apply to some other class of the Estimates than those which are down for consideration in Committee, the Standing Order would almost entirely deprive hon. Members of the power supposed to be reserved to them of entering into a general discussion on the first occasion of going into Supply upon the Civil Service Estimates, because it would be in the power of the Government to put down any particular class of the Estimates they chose, or any particular Vote of any particular class—for instance, Vote 1 of Class I. I wish, Sir, to know whether your ruling is that the debate on going into Committee of Supply on the first night of the Army, Navy, or Civil Service Estimates, must be confined to the particular Votes set down upon the Paper, or to the subjects comprised within a particular class of the Votes? I must confess that, if the Standing Order is to be so construed, it would very nearly deprive the House of the power supposed to be reserved to it of opening a general discussion on the first night of going into Committee of Supply. I would, therefore, submit to your decision this very important question—whether the privilege reserved to the House of raising a general debate on the Order of the Day for going into Committee of Supply (Civil Service Estimates) on the first night does not extend to any question which may be raised in discussion upon any matter comprised within the whole range of the Civil Service Estimates, or in any branch of them, just as upon the Army Estimates the debate may apply to any class or subject treated in the Army Estimates, and the same with the Navy Estimates, no matter whether the subject raised is irrelevant to the particular class of Estimates put down for consideration? If we are to be confined to the particular class of Estimates selected for consideration on the first night of Supply, I confess that we should lose altogether an important privilege which we are supposed to enjoy, and which was certainly not intended to be interfered with when the Standing Order was passed.

MR. SPEAKER: In reply to the hon. Gentleman, I have to say that he has, perhaps very naturally, misunderstood the reason which influenced me in the ruling which I privately conveyed to the hon. and learned Gentleman. It was not in reference to any particular class of Estimates which might be put down for the evening. That was not the reason on which I founded my ruling; but it was upon the terms of the Standing Order which provides that no Amendment can be moved, or any question raised, unless it relates to the Estimates proposed to be taken in Supply, which I take to mean in Committee of Supply generally, and not in reference to any particular class of Estimates. On looking at the terms of the hon. and learned Gentleman's Amendment, I found that it did not refer to any action of the Executive, and did not impugn the conduct of any officer whose salary is comprised in the Estimates to be taken generally, but that what the hon. and learned Gentleman proposed to do was to call attention to the propriety of introducing a general amendment of the law. If every question of a general amendment of the law were to be discussed on the first night of the Estimates, the House would see that there might be no end to the discussion; and I do not think that, in such circumstances, I should be keeping either to the letter or the spirit of the Rule if I permitted the hon. and learned Gentleman to move his Amendment.

HELIGOLAND—PROPOSED CESSION TO GERMANY.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. GORST, who had the following Notice on the Paper:—

"To call attention to the increased expenditure on Heligoland, and to the fact that that island is of no mercantile or strategical value to Great Britain; and to move, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty praying Her Majesty to endeavour to induce the German Government to take charge of the island,"

said, he was not sorry that he was prevented by the Rules of the House from making that Motion, since it would, perhaps, enable them to discuss it with greater freedom in the form of a general conversation rather than if they could be called upon to give a vote. The Island was formerly part of the Duchy

of Schleswig, and it came only into the possession of Great Britain at the beginning of the century, when it was taken by a Naval Force under Admiral Russell, but it was not formally transferred till the peace in 1814. If at that time the present German Empire had existed, Germany never would have consented to the transfer. The Island was not of great importance in itself, for it was only a mile long and half-a-mile broad, it was rapidly being absorbed by the sea, and was likely very soon to be reduced to a mere shoal of land in the German Ocean. It contained a population of only about 2,000 persons, who lived in less than 400 houses, and the male portion of which was engaged either as fishermen or pilots, the women conducting the small agriculture of the Island. The total expenditure on the Island was about £8,000 a-year, and towards that there was a proposed subsidy in these Estimates of £2,775. The situation of the Island was of no importance in the present advanced stage of artillery science; but situated as it was at the mouth of the Elbe and the Weser, and within 18 miles of the Elbe lightship, it was naturally productive of a strong feeling in Germany. It might be only a sentimental feeling; but it none the less applied, and he asked the Members of the House to consider what the sentimental feeling would have been in this country if Heligoland had been an island in the estuary of the Thames, and it had been occupied by the French or the Germans. Why, then, should we continue to hold an Island the possession of which by us was offensive to Germany when it was no possible use, and when its maintenance involved quite an appreciable charge on the Public Exchequer? He did not put the matter forward as though the Island was something they should barter away for a great advantage to be obtained from the German nation; but, looking at the value of the Island to this country, he thought it would be extremely mean to attempt to make merchandize out of the sentimental desire of the German people to possess it. His wish was that, by pursuing the course he suggested, they should gain what was of inestimable value to this country—the goodwill of the German people. He flattered himself that he had now made out his case that the Island was of no commercial or strategical value to this country. The Government must make up their mind as quickly as possible, because the island was rapidly disappearing. Ten miles out of 11 had disappeared since the last century, and it might not be long before the last remnant disappeared under the waves of the ocean. If, therefore, they wished to do a handsome thing, then let them do it at once.

SIR HENRY HOLLAND said, he had listened to the speech of the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Gorst) with some surprise, for there was a most extraordinary omission in that speech. The hon. and learned Member had spoken of the ardent desire of the German people to have possession of Heligoland; but he had quite forgotten to refer to the feelings of the Heligolanders upon this point. It was certainly a strange proposal to hand over this Island to the Germans without ascertaining the views and wishes of the Islanders. If the hon. and learned Member had inquired into this point, he (Sir Henry Holland) was afraid the omission to state the result of his inquiry must have been intentional, for he was satisfied that there was no desire on the part of the people of Heligoland for the proposed annexation. They had prospered aud thrived under English rule, and he was certain that they did not desire to come under German rule and German law, including conscription for military service. He was not prepared to sacrifice these people for the purpose of pleasing and conciliating the German people, however desirable it might be to do so. The hon. and learned Member had stated that from a strategical point of view Heligoland was no use to this country. He (Sir Henry Holland) was disposed to contradict this opinion, even upon the hon. Member's own statement, as to the position of Heligoland; but he (Sir Henry Holland) had the honour of having served on a Royal Commission on Colonial Defences and the Protection of Trade; and although their proceedings and Report were strictly confidential, yet it would be no breach of that confidence to say that, at all events, some persons of experience entertained contrary views to that of the hon. and learned Member. In truth, the very statement of the hon. and learned Member that Germany ardently desired the possession of this Island, though he said

this desire was only sentimental, might not unnaturally lead many to question whether there was not some other and deeper reason for that desire. Might it not be based on strategical reasons? Might it not be that they looked upon the possession of this Island as more important than the hon. and learned Member would lead this House to believe? He (Sir Henry Holland) thought that Her Majesty would have no difficulty in "inducing the German Government to take charge of the Island;" but he protested against this endeavour being made against the wishes of the inhabitants, and from the knowledge he had obtained when in the Colonial Office, and from Reports of Governors, he was satisfied that the Heligolanders would be averse to any such change. What were we to gain by such a change? The goodwill of the German people, and relief from a very small subsidy. The hon. and learned Member had admitted that the subsidy was very small, and this of itself was a proof of the prosperity of the Island under our rule. Were we to throw over the Heligolanders for such a gain? As to the gradual deterioration of the Island from the sea, he believed that whatever it had been in the last century it was less now than it had been. Upon the whole, then, he hoped the House would not assent to the proposed scheme, which appeared to him most unwise and uncalled for.

MR. FIRTH said, he could not agree entirely with either of the speakers. The feeling of a large majority in Heligoland was in favour of being joined to Germany or Denmark. It was not easy, however, to ascertain Heligoland feeling, because the language they spoke was Frisian. Scarcely 20 people on the Island understood English. He had not had the advantage of the hon. and learned Member in reading up books on the subject. They had been told that there were 60 cows on the Island. He believed there was not one. Then they were told something about horses. There were no horses.

MR. GORST said, he did not say that.

SIR HENRY HOLLAND said, there might have been cows on the Island at some period or other.

MR. FIRTH admitted that; but he disputed the hon. Member's figures as to the production of barley, and also the size of the Island. At present it was about one mile long and half-a-mile broad, and it was gradually getting less; therefore, there was something in the suggestion that if the Government acted at all they must act speedily. The Island was not, as stated, at the mouth of the Elbe. Again, if they were to give it to anyone they should give it to Denmark and not to Germany, as it originally belonged to Schleswig. Still, if in presenting it to Germany the Germans would give up any claim which they asserted to the Northern part of New Guinea, then the good relations between the two countries might be preserved and strengthened without any loss or disadvantage to this country.

SIR EDWARD WATKIN said, that before the Select Committee on Harbours, which sat and reported recently, evidence was given of the great importance of the Island of Heligoland to the British fishermen who went to the Dogger Bank and the German Ocean. If a proper graving dock were provided on the Island for the repair of the fishing fleet it would be a great advantage. Considering the importance of the Island to our fishermen, he thought it would be most unwise to surrender the Island for no other reason than to curry favour with the German nation.

MR. GREGORY said, the principle enunciated by the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) was capable of very large, if not indefinite, extension, and should not be adopted without very mature consideration. That principle seemed to be simply that if other people very much desired a piece of territory which we possessed, we should give it up to them. In the present instance, the Island which was supposed to be the object of desire to the German people might not be of any great importance to us. But in another case, or at some other time, a foreign nation might desire something which it would be very inconvenient to part with. He did not, therefore, think that we could accept the supposed wish of the German people for the acquisition of Heligoland as a reason for surrendering the Island to them. It must not be forgotten that our possession of this Island enabled us to import cargoes into Germany, during the wars of the Great Napoleon, much to the benefit of the German people; nor was it altogether impossible that it might enable us again to render

the same assistance to Germany which it enabled us to render to her in past times. He did not think that any case had been made out for giving up the Island, and he thought we might as well consult our own feelings by keeping it as consult the feelings of the Germans by giving it up to them.

MR. HENEAGE wished to bear testimony to the importance of Heligoland to the fishing interest of the East Coast. The fishermen of Grimsby would be very much astonished to learn of the proposal to put Heligoland in other than British hands. He would advocate the construction of a small harbour on the Island, which would be of the greatest use to the fishermen who went to the Dogger Bank to pursue their calling, and he hoped that, in the interests of fishermen in general, the House would reject the Motion.

MR. P. H. MUNTZ said, he thought that it would be much better to leave this Island alone than to surrender it to any Foreign Power, more particularly as there did not appear to be any desire on the part of the inhabitants to be transferred to another nation.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE said, that when the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) had mentioned that this Island was formerly part of the Duchy of Schleswig, he was afraid that he was about to re-open the Schleswig-Holstein Question. The considerations raised in the Motion before the House were very numerous, and involved principles very dangerous in their application to the scattered Dependencies of the British Crown. He was inclined to think that some of the doctrines applicable to this case were capable of very dangerous extension and ought not to be lightly adopted. If they were to talk about giving up places because they were not ancient Possessions of the British Crown, they would embark upon a discussion of what were the ancient Possessions of the British Crown. Again, he could not conceive the case for giving up the modern Possessions of the Crown any stronger than that for giving up its ancient Possessions. On the other hand, the probability was that the arguments in favour of surrendering the ancient Possessions of the Crown were stronger than those in favour of surrendering modern acquisitions, and for this reason — that in all probability in the case of modern Possessions some part of the reason for the annexation still existed, while in the case of ancient Possessions the change of circumstances might have rendered the reason for their acquisition non-existent, and they might have become of no value. If the argument of contiguity to another country were applied, it would be necessary to consider it with reference to other Possessions of the British Crown—for instance, in the case of the Channel Islands. The Channel Islands were much nearer to France than Heligoland was to Germany. It was true that, from time to time, some learned German Professor wrote an article with the view of showing that Heligoland ought to belong to Germany; but he was not inclined to think that the same feeling existed for the acquisition of Heligoland by Germany as existed with regard to other parts of the Duchy of Schleswig-Holstein. With regard to the inhabitants, there was no evidence before the House of any wish on their part to be surrendered to Germany. Some years ago, he presented a Petition to the House from the inhabitants of Heligoland regarding certain grievances under which they laboured; but, speaking from memory, he was almost certain there was no reference in that Petition to any desire to be transferred to Germany. The Petition expressed the desire of the inhabitants for certain extensions of the form of government in a popular direction; it sought a restoration of certain privileges, and contained a strong expression of opinion on the part of the inhabitants against rabbits being allowed to undermine the Island. The surrender of this Island might raise very important questions as to whether Denmark was not more entitled to Heligoland than Germany. These people were not Germans. They were of Teutonic race only in the sense that all the inhabitants of Germany were Teutonic. They were of Frisian origin, and spoke a dialect of a Frisian character. Then there was another point, which was the importance of the Island in connection with the great industry of the North Sea Fisheries. He hardly thought that the importance of the question was properly appreciated in the House, but those at the Foreign Office were very sensible of it. It would be a serious thing, without very careful consideration, to interfere with the very extensive fishing

industry of the East Coast of England. Besides, it would be impossible to hand over the Island to another Power except with the consent of Parliament. Unless at the termination of a war, when new arrangements might have to be made, the Possessions of the Crown could not be alienated by the act of the Executive. He would ask the House to consider what would happen if he or his hon. Friend the Under Secretary for the Colonies were to bring in a Bill for handing over Heligoland to Denmark or Germany. The Government would be denounced, they would be told that they were cowards, and that it would be a crowning of the edifice of their disgrace. He did not think that such a Bill would receive the support of the Party to which the hon. and learned Member for Chatham belonged. For these reasons, he thought the House would agree with him that we should do better to act on the old maxim, *quieta non movere*, and not adopt the proposal.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he was much astonished when he saw the Notice of Motion of his hon. and learned Friend, which appeared rather as a trap for Her Majesty's Government, and he congratulated them that they had escaped the snare. He was also very glad that the proposal had practically received no support in the House. Even if his hon. and learned Friend had proved his case, he should be sorry that the House should support any Motion for the surrender of one of Her Majesty's Possessions; and if the case had not been proved, as he thought it had not, it would be a bad thing if there were to be any doubtful voices in the matter. His hon. and learned Friend appeared to found his case on two points. In the first place, he said there was a very strong desire on the part of the German people to possess the Island. He had himself never been able to discover any trace of that desire. He admitted that there had been certain writings and speeches from Germans showing that Heligoland ought to belong to the German people; but he did not think that the German people attached any such importance to the matter as his hon. and learned Friend seemed to think. Then as to the other point, that the Island was of no use to us, it had been shown by the noble Lord and others who had taken part in the debate, that Heligoland was of great importance to our fisheries in the North Sea. His hon. Friend the Member for Midhurst (Sir Henry Holland) had been a Member of a very important Commission appointed to inquire into the defences of the country, and though his hon. Friend could not from the nature of the subject speak freely about it, yet he had said enough to show how valuable in certain circumstances the possession of Heligoland might be. As to the feelings of the people of Heligoland, when he was at the Colonial Office, so far from there being any desire on their part to sever themselves from the British Empire, they were exceedingly well pleased to be connected with England rather than with Germany. He did not know, considering the peculiar nature of the Island, and how rapidly it was diminishing, that it would be possible to do anything for it of the kind suggested by the hon. Member for Hythe (Sir Edward Watkin), without incurring more expense than would be repaid by any results that could be obtained; but he thought the Colonial Office might turn their attention to the subject, and perhaps, with the assistance of the Home Secretary, they might succeed in devising some Ground Game Act for Heligoland, which would at least have the effect of remedying the principal grievances felt by the inhabitants.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—DISTRICT INSPECTOR MURPHY.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. JUSTIN HUNTLY M'CARTHY, who had the next Notice on the Paper, in the following terms:—

"To move that the conduct of Earl Spencer and the Irish Executive with regard to the dismissal of District Inspector Murphy was unjustifiable and contrary to the regulations of the Constabulary code and to the interests of public justice,"

said, he had been informed by the Clerk that he would be out of Order in moving this Motion, because there had been a previous Notice put down upon the same subject. He now found, on consulting Sir Erskine May's volume, that after an hon. Member had given Notice of a Motion, if he desired to change the day for bringing it forward, he must change it for a later and not for an earlier day. He would like, however, to ask, as a point of Order, whether, in the event of an hon. Member withdraw-

ing a Notice of Motion, it would be in the power of another hon. Member to bring the question forward on an earlier occasion before the date originally fixed for the Motion?

MR. SPEAKER: In reply to the hon. Gentleman, I have to say that my remarks were rather personal to himself in so far as he had himself given Notice of a Motion for the 14th of April, but had withdrawn that Notice and put it down for to-night, knowing very well that Supply was coming on. The matter is one of extreme delicacy, the object of the Rule being to prevent the House from being taken by surprise. When a Motion is put down for a future day, if the hon. Member who gave Notice of it were to be at liberty to change the day, the House would not be aware of the day when the Motion was really to come on. It would, therefore, be quite out of Order for the hon. Gentleman himself, on the present occasion, to move an Amendment in terms almost identical with those which had been placed on the Paper for a future day. I am not, however, prepared to say that another hon. Gentleman—the Motion having been withdrawn and being now off the Paper—might not move it in general terms; but it would be quite out of Order for the hon. Gentleman on the present occasion to move it, and that is the reason why I have ruled the hon. Gentleman to be out of Order. I am certainly not prepared to say that a general reference to the case of this particular individual might not be brought on by another hon. Member.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

MR. BIGGAR said, it seemed to him that gross irregularity took place in the way in which District Inspector Murphy was treated. Mr. Murphy had given information to his superiors with regard to what was afterwards proved in a Court of Law to be the very gross misconduct of a certain officer of the Constabulary Force in Ireland, and by giving this information Mr. Murphy had drawn down upon himself the displeasure of the Authorities. Mr. Murphy had for many years been employed by the Government of Ireland as Inspector of Police. A man was not appointed Inspector at once. He got into the Force at first as a Sub-Inspector, and, having proved his capacity, he was promoted to the position of Inspector. That position was obtained by competitive examination, and not by favour. It came to Mr. Murphy's knowledge from several sources that very gross misconduct was taking place in very high quarters in the Police Force, and he thought it his duty to give information to the heads of the Police Force in Ireland. It seemed that the policy of the heads of the Force was the same as that of Earl Spencer—namely, to patronize as far as possible, and screen from any punishment, or even inquiry into their conduct, any persons against whom charges of an improper nature were brought. The County Inspector in the place in which Mr. Murphy happened to be treated him in the most offensive manner, and refused to acknowledge his salute. Mr. Murphy then ceased to salute his superior officer, the County Inspector, who complained of him in consequence. After a time a charge of drunkenness was brought against Inspector Murphy; but the charge was not brought in accordance with the rules of the Force, which provided that notice of the alleged offence should be given immediately. The charge against Mr. Murphy was framed by Mr. Bruce, who was, as a matter of fact, the final Court of Appeal in the case. The evidence given at the trial was of a very contradictory character; but Mr. Murphy was found guilty. He combated this decision, and appealed to the Government, who withdrew the charge, the Lord Lieutenant saying that the evidence of drunkenness was of a very slight nature. The Lord Lieutenant, however, called upon Mr. Murphy to resign without giving him a pension or compensation of any kind, not on the charge of drunkenness, but on the allegation that Mr. Murphy was guilty of insubordination and of writing offensive letters to his superiors. The real reason why Mr. Murphy was compelled to resign his position in the Force was, not because of his impertinence, but because he gave information against the pets of the Government. The person charged by Mr. Murphy had been found guilty in a Court of Law, and was now suffering the penalty of his misconduct. He (Mr. Biggar) believed it to be the duty of the Government to re-investigate the

case of Mr. Murphy, and either reinstate him in the position which he held before his perfectly illegal and irregular dismissal, or else to allow him the pension to which he was entitled. Instead of persecuting District Inspector Murphy, the Government should have rewarded him for giving information of so valuable a nature.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY said, that if any Members of the Government intended to speak, he would ask them to apply themselves to the leading points of the case. First of all, Inspector Murphy had as the only definite charge against him the imputation of drunkenness, a charge which was afterwards positively withdrawn. It was then stated that the dismissal was due to persistent and insubordinate misconduct on the part of Mr. Murphy; and the second point was, that no definite charge of insubordination was ever made against him, and he was never brought to answer any charge of the kind. The third point—and the important one—was this, that until Mr. Murphy sent the letters containing those astonishing charges against Mr. French, there was nothing heard of Mr. Murphy's drunkenness or insubordination; the whole charge against him began with that time. Mr. Murphy had been 18 years in the Force before that, had been steadily rising in reputation, and had received honours of various kinds. Nothing was heard of his insubordination until he sent those statements against Mr. French. However startling those statements might appear to the Castle officials, they had since been proved in a Court of Law, and French was suffering the penalty of his misconduct. Unless the public received a clear explanation of the whole case, they would say that Mr. Murphy had been made a victim because he made a serious and terrible charge against his superior, which serious and terrible charge had since been proved to be true.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said, he had been in the expectation that something more definite would have been said upon the subject than what had fallen from the two hon. Members. The *gravamen* of the charge was embodied by the hon. Member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) when he said that it was owing, first of all, to Mr. Murphy having denounced to his superior officers the iniquities committed by Mr. French, that he was found fault with. Perhaps, the shortest way in answering the statements and allegations made was to recount to the House what really took place. The fact was, that Mr. Murphy, against whose capacity he would not say a word, had been, for a long series of years, a cause of great trouble to those at the head of the Force of which he was a member. The Constabulary Force was a disciplined Force, and it was necessary that every man in it should observe those ordinary rules of discipline and that regular conduct which prevailed in every body of that kind. When he was discharged for insubordination, he said that it was a fresh charge, and that he knew nothing of it before. He (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) could read a number of such charges, in which his insubordinate conduct was pointed out, and after which he was remonstrated with and warned. It was said that all these charges arose out of certain letters Mr. Murphy forwarded with regard to French. Well, in that case, he should be obliged to go back some considerable time, for these charges had commenced in 1875, when nothing was known of French's misconduct. In 1875, he was reduced for making a false Return, and lost 12 steps seniority. That was on the 1st of August. In February, 1881—this was still before the question of French's misconduct had been heard of—he was informed that his conduct would require reform. There were several censures by successive Inspectors General against him on the following dates:—namely, on the 19th of November, 1875, December 12, 1876, February 13, 1877, March 5, 1878, September 28, 1878, January 14, 1879, September 10, 1880, and the 3rd of January, 1881. The House would, he believed, admit that this was a tolerably long list of accusations against him. He was censured, and warnings were noted against him that, if he persisted in insubordination, he would be severely dealt with. That was the Minute communicated to Mr. Murphy in February, 1881. He would give further particulars as to what was said to him on these occasions. He would begin in July, 1876. On the 26th of July, 1876, he was cautioned that if he was again brought under the unfavourable notice of Sir John Wood, the then

Inspector General, he would be seriously reduced upon the seniority list. On the 21st of September, 1876, he was again cautioned. In 1877 he was further cautioned. On the 10th September, 1880, he was again, by order of his superiors, cautioned. On the 3rd January, 1881, the Inspector General refused to submit to the Government a most improper representation made by Mr. Murphy, and he was cautioned with regard to it. On the 19th February, 1881, owing to the improper, disrespectful, and insubordinate nature of his correspondence, he was informed that, if he aggravated by such further conduct the charges against him, he would be dealt with. He, however, persisted in that insubordination, and later in 1881, notwithstanding this, some most insubordinate correspondence was sent in. On May 7th and 12th he was sent for, and was personally informed by the Inspector General (Colonel Hillier), in the presence of his deputy (Colonel Bruce), that his conduct had been censured, and that he was reduced 10 steps on the list; and it was only in consequence of his own admission of the impropriety of his conduct and his expression of regret, that he was not then recommended for removal from the Force. In 1884, Mr. Murphy, having been, on another occasion, the cause of some trouble, was dismissed. What he wanted to point out to the House was that Mr. Murphy had long been insubordinate, and that his correspondence had been, for years back, full of animadversion on those responsible for the rules of the Force. The House would understand, as he had before observed, that this was a disciplined Force, and that such unruly conduct of tone and temper was perfectly inconsistent with the proper maintenance of discipline and order. That being the state of the case, and no communication having been made, or any likely to be made on the part of Mr. Murphy, in the autumn of last year, a charge was brought against him of having been drunk on a certain occasion. That was a charge which depended upon evidence; and, therefore, a Court of Inquiry was necessary in order to enable the Inspector General to ascertain whether the charge was one which could be sustained or not. In regard to all these questions which he had been alluding to there was no necessity for a Court of Inquiry—the letters proved themselves, and were sufficient proof and evidence of Mr. Murphy's unfitness to stay in the Force. There was, therefore, no necessity for inquiry, because the facts were fully and entirely before the Inspector General. The Government had power to discharge any officer if they found him unfit for the Service, and they came to the conclusion that Mr. Murphy was unfit for the Service. Then he came to the charge of drunkenness. That was a matter of fact. He thought it was really unnecessary to go further into this case, because the Inquiry found that the case was proved, but that the offence was, however, of a slight character; and although it was quite true that the action of the Government towards Mr. Murphy followed upon the finding of the Court, and that he was dismissed for drunkenness, it was never even alleged that this step would have been taken but because of this accumulated series of incidents in his previous career, each leading up to a point when it was almost impossible for those responsible for the discipline of the Force to allow it to go further. He believed that the House would admit that the greatest forbearance had been shown to Mr. Murphy before this—if he was not in error, he had himself admitted this before his superior officers. This charge of drunkenness was therefore the last drop in the bucket, and he was called upon to resign his position in the Force, not because of this definite charge of drunkenness, but because his previous conduct had shown that he was not a desirable officer to be retained in the Force. He did not know that he need say anything more upon that point. He now came to the next point—a question which had nothing to do with it had been put before the House—a question with regard to certain communications on the matter of Mr. French's misconduct, which it was asserted he sent in. Mr. Murphy posed before the House and country as the victim of those persons in the Department who wished to screen Mr. French. Well, anyone who brought or entertained such a charge as was grounded on these alleged communications against Colonel Bruce, the Inspector General, could have no knowledge of the character of that officer. Colonel Bruce was a man of the highest rectitude, and of high character and stainless

life—[Mr. CALLAN: So was French.] He would leave the world to choose between a man of Colonel Bruce's position and the hon. Member who sneered at him. There was not a word about Colonel Bruce, who was perfectly incapable of such an act; and he could only repeat that anyone who knew him would be aware that it would be impossible to attack, or to attempt to fasten any charge upon him, except vain, idle, sneers. As a matter of fact, the case was this—Mr. Murphy said that in the summer of 1882 he had forwarded letters to Lord Spencer making a series of charges against French. He had seen different accounts given of these letters. They were either anonymous letters, or they were sent by "round robins." Whatever was their form, all he had to say was that they were never received, and that there was not a trace of them. Any document of that sort would have attracted attention; but they never had reached Lord Spencer or his private secretary. The gentleman who then acted as private secretary, whose name was Brackenbury, had no recollection in regard to it whatever. He (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) could therefore only say that he had the testimony of this gentleman, and the fact that no such accusatory documents could be found, if they were sent, against the assertions of Mr. Murphy. If Mr. Murphy knew anything on the subject of the charge, his duty was to report it to his superior officer. He did not do so; but having this knowledge, as he said he had, he adopted another mode of bringing it before the authorities. It was in the month of August in the following year—he did not know whether he was bound to justify the course taken in regard to French—but it was in August, 1883, that the first article appeared in *United Ireland*, and French was arrested upon a criminal charge on the 15th July, 1884, and the first communication received from Mr. Murphy on the subject of which anything was known was his Report on the following day in July, 1884. [Mr. SEXTON: Who received that letter?] He did not know. He presumed the Inspector General. That was on the 16th, the day after French was arrested. That Report was immediately examined carefully, and Mr. Murphy was "had up," brought to Dublin, and examined, and it was proved that he could not furnish any information whatever. There was a great deal of hearsay and gossip. This was his information in 1884, two years after he had furnished his original information. Even this information, which he gave, was of such a vague and indeterminate kind, that no additional light whatever was thrown upon that which the authorities already had. The whole contention, on his part, that he was instrumental in bringing French to justice was, therefore, absolutely without foundation. He brought nothing forward to prove it, except in 1882, when he stated that he sent an anonymous letter disclosing vague information. That communication—two years before the arrest of French—was never received, and having regard to the vague character of the information furnished by him in his Report in 1884, if he sent any information in 1882, it must have been equally worthless, and such as no action could be taken upon. Even had it been received, he had shown to the House that, so far from the attitude of the police authorities towards Mr. Murphy being due to his statements with regard to French, an attitude identical with it had been for years before adopted towards him. Long before anything was heard of the charges against French, Mr. Murphy had been over and over again warned and re-warned, that if he persisted in his almost mutinous, insubordinate, ill-tempered, ill-conditioned tone of language, he must be dismissed from the Force. No one could allege that, because he gave some information, that the whole of this business had been got up in order to punish him for having done so. It was very easy talking of screening.

MR. CALLAN: You screened French.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said, that if any definite charge were made, they should know what to do with it. There was not a tittle of evidence to support it. He had shown that Mr. Murphy's dismissal from the Force was on account of a series of acts of insubordination extending over years, and long before French's misconduct ever was thought of, either in that House or out of it. He had answered the charge that the accusations about drunkenness had been withdrawn. They were not withdrawn, but had been proved at the Court

of Inquiry, and that would have been sufficient in itself to lead to a man's resigning his commission, and retiring from the service. He had also shown that the warnings given to Mr. Murphy for his insubordinate conduct had not been confined to the present Inspector General, but several—Sir John Wood, Colonel Hillier, and Colonel Bruce. He believed that he had shown that three consecutive Inspectors General had had to remonstrate with Mr. Murphy and warn him, and at length it was found that his conduct was perfectly inconsistent with his continuing in the Force. So long as the Irish Constabulary continued to be a disciplined Force, it was impossible that such conduct as Mr. Murphy's could be tolerated. His conduct was such as to be inconsistent with his holding his position in the Force.

MR. SEXTON said, that the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman), by a surprising diversion from the subject before the House, had indulged in what seemed to be a comparison between the character of the Inspector General of Constabulary (Colonel Bruce) and the hon. Gentleman who had interrupted him (Mr. Callan). He (Mr. Sexton) would not follow the right hon. Gentleman into that matter, but would merely remark that the incident was one which tended so little to the profitableness of these debates that it was to be hoped it would not be turned into a precedent. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken about vague and idle sneers against character. The reproach or reproof, if such it were—though he (Mr. Sexton) could not imagine to whom it was addressed — would have come from the right hon. Gentleman with a better grace, if the speech he made in defence of the Government and in attack on Inspector Murphy — for the speech had borne both characters—had been more definite and more distinctly to the point. He had quite expected, when the Chief Secretary for Ireland rose, that he would have addressed himself to one or other of two objects—that he would have endeavoured to prove that the charge of drunkenness had been justly made against Inspector Murphy, or else that he would have come to the Table and set down definite proofs of such other conduct on the part of this officer as would have entitled Lord Spencer to dismiss him from the Force, even considering that the charge of drunkenness had been an ill-founded one; but he (Mr. Sexton) had listened to the right hon. Gentleman with strict attention, and must assert that he had done neither the one thing nor the other. He certainly had not endeavoured to make good the charge of drunkenness, and that was not surprising, for if the right hon. Gentleman had any intellectual faults, recklessness was not one of them, and it would have been reckless on his part to have endeavoured before that House to substantiate the charge of drunkenness levelled against Inspector Murphy. The first remark he (Mr. Sexton) would make upon that charge was that it was conceived in a spirit of cowardly intrigue, and that it was conducted and carried to a conclusion against that unfortunate officer in a manner clearly contrary to the Constabulary Act, to the Code which had grown out of that Act, and to the ordinary principle of common sense and fair play which had its abode in the bosom of every honest man. The rule of the Force—he (Mr. Sexton) called it common sense—was, that when a charge was to be made against an officer, it should be communicated to him at the earliest moment by the person who meant to make it, and that he should be asked, without delay, to put upon record whether he admitted or denied the charge; but what was the course pursued in the case of Inspector Murphy? Why this—the act of drunkenness was alleged to have been committed on 30th August; but this unfortunate gentleman was kept in ignorance of the plot against him until the 5th September. The County Inspector, instead of going to Inspector Murphy frankly, and like a man, and saying—"I am of opinion that you were drunk last night, and I intend to report the fact to the Inspector General, and I ask you, therefore, whether you admit or deny the charge," said nothing at all to him. Inspector Murphy was never allowed to know the plot that was hatching until a week had passed; and, as might well be conceived, it was more difficult for him to prove his innocence then than it would have been if he had received timely warning. He (Mr. Sexton) had said that it would have been reckless on the part of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ire-

land to have attempted to prove the charge of drunkenness, so he would proceed to prove that statement. The Report of the Court of Inquiry said—

"We have to state that, in our opinion, some explanation is required as to why we found the verdict we have——"

Inspector Murphy's temper might have been very bad; but it was not worse than the grammar of the Government inquiry—

"Seeing that the weight of evidence as regards numbers would appear to be in favour of the accused. For the prosecution, nine witnesses, including the County Inspector, were summoned, but six of whom were examined. Of these, two would depose to no facts at all as regards the date in question, two more were hostile; and of the other two, one corroborated the County Inspector, while the other——"

That was to say the man Pyne, who, for some mysterious reason unexplained, spent his evenings in the County Inspector's kitchen,

"Deposed to facts that occurred before Mr. Sheehan saw Mr. Murphy. The three witnesses produced for the defence, one being Mr. Murphy's own servant, swore that he was perfectly sober. As these were civilians, their evidence from a Constabulary point of view must be looked upon with caution."

This reflected upon Mr. Speaker, upon himself, (Mr. Sexton) and all assembled in that House—

"When we have the direct and positive evidence of a County Inspector, corroborated by the evidence of the man Pyne, that the accused, by his manner and action, was under the influence of drink, and this is strengthened by the fact that the County Inspector's attention was specially directed to his movements at the time when the others were but casual observers, we feel bound to add that the case of intoxication exhibited by Mr. Murphy was of a slight nature; and we are of opinion it would have been more judicious if the County Inspector had acted of his own motion, and charged Mr. Murphy without delay, and informed him of his intention to make a Report."

Why, the Report of the Court of Inquiry was a censure on the County Inspector, and not on Inspector Murphy. The impropriety of the course adopted against this unfortunate man, Inspector Murphy, was acknowledged even by the Court of Inquiry; and they had it on the face of the record that out of nine witnesses examined two knew nothing about the matter, six were in favour of the Sub-Inspector, and only one appeared to sustain the charge against him—namely, the person who appeared to be indebted to the hospitality of the County Inspector. This matter of the drunkenness was a vanishing point as they advanced in the case. How did it appear in Colonel Bruce's Minute of October 4th? Why, the Minute contained these words—

"The Inspector General does not place his recommendation on the case of drunkenness. This was proved, but was a slight case. Putting that case on one side, there is enough against Mr. Murphy to make it desirable that he should leave the Force."

Only on the 25th of January of this year, Sir Robert Hamilton, writing to Inspector Murphy, said—

"His Excellency, however, after consideration, thinks it right to inform you that your removal from the Royal Irish Constabulary was due to your persistently insubordinate correspondence and conduct, continued in spite of frequent warning, and to no other cause whatever."

Therefore the first fact he (Mr. Sexton) emphasized was, that it was clear that the charge of drunkenness against Inspector Murphy was abandoned by the authorities, was practically abandoned by Lord Spencer; and from that it appeared that Inspector Murphy had suffered what no man, policeman or civilian, should be compelled to suffer—he had been made the victim of a course of action which was repugnant to every man, which was to be correctly described by saying that he was accused on one charge; that that charge was not made out against him by the weight of evidence; and that that proceeding having failed, he was dismissed from the Force upon another charge, of which he had not been accused. But what should he (Mr. Sexton) say of that part of the right hon. Gentleman's speech which dealt with the other charge against Inspector Murphy? What was the nature of that other charge? Was it not impalpable? Was it not intangible? Was it not, as the right hon. Gentleman would say, "vague and idle to the last degree?" He (Mr. Sexton) had fully expected that, after the manner of the right hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) when he was Chief Secretary for Ireland, the right hon. Gentleman would have come to the Table, and if he relied upon Inspector Murphy's language in proof of his insubordinate conduct would have taken up a file of Reports, and would have read out the language which constituted the insubordination for which the dismissal had taken place. As the right hon. Gentleman himself

had said, the language itself was a proof. The whole of these Reports were upon the file in Dublin Castle; and if the language was so conclusive as to proof, as that proof could be so easily obtained, why was the House asked to take the whole case on credit—why was not a single one of these Reports produced? Inspector Murphy was no angel; he was human, like the rest of them, and it was to be presumed had his faults like other men. He (Mr. Sexton) was not there to say that the fault of temper might not have been one of them. He was not there to say that Inspector Murphy's language was conceived in the spirit and expressed in the phrase of Chesterfield; but it did not require a man to have passed through an official career to know and to understand how easy it was for an insolent and arrogant superior to produce an appearance of faults of temper in an unfortunate subordinate, who would have been humble and polite enough if he had been fairly treated. He contended that the right hon. Gentleman's speech that night was as fine and striking an example as ever came under his notice of how a man could be ruined by innuendoes. The right hon. Gentleman had gone back to the year 1875, and had given them not a record, but an allusion—a poor and vague allusion—to a record of a number of reprimands or warnings conveyed to Inspector Murphy in consequence of something which he could not define. At one time they were told that that officer's tone was impertinent; at another time that he caused embarrassment; and, finally, that he produced trouble; and it was such phrases from a Minister, void of direct evidence, that were to justify the taking away the reputation of a public officer and the ruining of his character. Was this the way to deal with a man who had given them 19 years' public service? He maintained that the right hon. Gentleman had evidently a deplorable want of frankness and candour when he gave them, at the Table, this trivial entry of want of temper and want of taste, and had not suggested to them, on the other hand, as an impartial Chief Secretary for Ireland would have done, that the whole career of Inspector Murphy, since he entered the Police Force, was studded with favourable reports. Here was one account which, he (Mr. Sexton) presumed, would not be questioned—there had been public records, and in them this had not been questioned—and it was so circumstantial, and contained so many precise facts, that it bore on its face the appearance of credibility—

> "When serving at Arva, County Cavan, I was recommended for a favourable record arresting a man who discharged a pistol shot during a riot. When serving at Ballycastle, County Antrim, I obtained a first-class favourable record, and was twice recommended. I was four times recommended for favourable record when serving at Ballina. I was also recommended at Listowel, Kerry, also in Galway, when on special duty; and in the County Monaghan, as well, I invariably got favourable minutes when my district was inspected, by superior officers from headquarters, particularly so in 1883 and 1884."

The evidence, therefore, was, that in 1883 and 1884 there were favourable records for Inspector Murphy, and that the last complaint against him was in 1881, when he was found offending against the canons of taste at Dublin Castle.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It was the last before he alleged he brought any complaint against French.

MR. SEXTON said, he was obliged to the right hon. Gentleman—that was his case exactly. The last warning before Murphy professed to have intervened in French's case was in February, 1881; and in 1882, 1883, and 1884, at a period much later than the date of the last complaint made against him by the right hon. Gentleman, according to his own account, Murphy had obtained favourable records. Would it then be contended, for a moment, that if Inspector Murphy, after he had passed two or three years of perfectly blameless life, had not intervened to make a charge against a formidable personage like French — if he had kept his mouth closed, and kept the evidence of French's guilt in his own bosom—that these old charges of 1876, 1878, 1879, and 1881 would be raked up against him as an alternative case, after the case that had been brought against him had been abandoned, in order to ruin the man for life? The Chief Secretary for Ireland proceeded to say that, in 1882, no complaint was made by Inspector Murphy against French; and, in fact, in the ardour of his argument, he went further, and discredited—he (Mr. Sexton) might almost say pooh-poohed—the notion that Inspector Murphy was at all the

cause of the revelation of French's guilt. Now, he (Mr. Sexton) was there to say that Inspector Murphy was the cause of it; and, for his own part, he ventured to maintain that if Murphy had kept silence he would to-day have been an Inspector, and French also would have been receiving the emoluments of his office. Inspector Murphy it was, and no one else, who, acting on a noble impulse to vindicate the law, and hunt up base and unspeakable crime in high places, first brought to light the charge for which French was now wearing a grey jacket in prison—that was, if the tenderness of Irish prison officials would allow them to inflict that indignity upon a gentleman who had occupied the distinguished position of Detective Director in Dublin Castle. Murphy, in his letter, says—

"Fully impressed with the truth of the allegations which reached me from so many different and independent sources, and knowing that French could not be safely grappled with owing to the enormous influence which he exercised in the Castle, I, at length, in the interests of decency and morality, posted, in conjunction with seven others, two documents in the nature of a round robin, one to Earl Spencer and the other to Colonel Brackenbury, who was then the Under Secretary for Crime."

The right hon. Gentleman now desired the House to believe that that document never reached either Lord Spencer or Colonel Brackenbury, a proposition which he thought the right hon. Gentleman would find some difficulty in getting the House to accept. If the fact was doubted, the matter was one perfectly susceptible of proof, as the persons who signed the document were still in the Force. But District Inspector Murphy, finding that a communication to Lord Spencer and Colonel Brackenbury was of no avail, addressed a letter to a Member of that House, and it was a curious circumstance that about this time Colonel Brackenbury retired from the service in Dublin Castle. Colonel Brackenbury was a soldier—he was a man with a soldier's nature—he was a frank and honourable gentleman, and there was a growing suspicion in Ireland that Colonel Brackenbury wiped the dust of Dublin Castle from his shoes, because he found that pliancy to the ruling Powers there meant degradation and self-abasement. The letter addressed to a Member of that House by Inspector Murphy was more fruitful than the round robin addressed to the Castle. An article had appeared in *United Ireland*, then the Government had been dragged on to prosecute, and in the chain which had dragged them to that prosecution Inspector Murphy had been the first link. In daring to obey the impulse of his honesty Inspector Murphy had pronounced his own sentence of condemnation; and he (Mr. Sexton) thought the House would agree with him in saying that if Inspector Murphy had allowed crime to go unpunished in official places in Ireland he might have gone on to that day indulging his temper, and he would not have been dismissed. But no—he had the courage to impeach crime where he found it in high places, and the lesson of his career and his fate was this—that in official circles in Ireland, while the knave thrived the honest man—for the fault of Inspector Murphy was his honesty—who dared to obey the impulse of his honesty, and endeavoured to point the finger of justice at corruption in official places, drew down upon himself thereby only his own condemnation and his own official ruin.

Mr. HARRINGTON said, the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland impressed him (Mr. Harrington) forcibly with the hopelessness of anyone sent over to govern Ireland clearing himself of the foul atmosphere he found in Dublin Castle. He thought that the punishment inflicted upon Inspector Murphy had been sufficient, without the additional injustice of the right hon. Gentleman's speech. A miserable conspiracy had been got up against Inspector Murphy, simply because he had been instrumental in exposing the iniquity of Dublin Castle officials. If when the trumped-up charge of drunkenness had failed, the Chief Secretary for Ireland desired to show that District Inspector Murphy was insubordinate, why then did he not give the evidence on which that charge was founded? Knowing as he did something of the circumstances connected with this alleged insubordinate correspondence, he (Mr. Harrington) must confess himself utterly surprised at the manner in which it was treated by the Chief Secretary for Ireland. Would the House be surprised to learn that the insubordination referred to was contained in letters regarding a matter in which the County Inspector had endeavoured to interfere

with the private rights of Inspector Murphy? When the public learned the facts of this matter—for they could not be kept secret after the insinuations made by the Chief Secretary for Ireland—they would be surprised indeed to find that the insubordination alleged was due to the interference of the Inspector General, who objected to Murphy's acquaintance with a lady who happened to be a friend of that official. When the public found that his insubordination rose from an attempt on the part of that official to interfere with Murphy in the selection of a person whom he desired as a partner for life—that it arose from an attempt unduly to prevent him from visiting a certain house—when the public learned these facts, and saw the grave charge which the Chief Secretary for Ireland endeavoured to base on them, he thought the right hon. Gentleman would be more discredited than Inspector Murphy. It had also been said that the round robin regarding French had never reached the Castle; but he (Mr. Harrington) thought he was able to prove, by the manner in which the Dublin Castle officials themselves acted, that it must have reached their hands. When the charge against French appeared in *United Ireland* an inquiry was held at the Castle, and there were summoned to that inquiry the very men who signed the round robin. If there was no knowledge of the round robin in the Castle, why were these men summoned to the inquiry?

MR. CALLAN said, the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) must have lost his usual caution in presuming, in the course of an argument in that House, to sneer at Members of the House, and in presuming to compare an official of Dublin Castle to Members of the House. He hoped it would take at least a Royal visit, and the cleansing that must ensue, before any Minister on the Treasury Bench could presume to set in opposition to a Member of that House the character of a Dublin Castle official like Colonel Bruce, contaminated as Colonel Bruce was by contact with the "French" case. Who was Colonel Bruce that the right hon. Gentleman had the effrontery—he (Mr. Callan) would say the audacity—to sneer at Members of that House, because they would not endorse the hyperbolical expressions of respect of the right hon. Gentleman for that official? Colonel Bruce was aware of the charges against ex-Detective Director French, years before they came before that House. Would the Chief Secretary for Ireland grant a sworn inquiry; and he (Mr. Callan) would prove, by the evidence of Mr. Bracker, of the Depôt, by the evidence of Mr. Mallon, the Chief Detective in the City of Dublin, that Colonel Bruce had official knowledge of the misdeeds and the charges against ex-Detective Director French, long before one word of them appeared in the columns of *United Ireland?* Was the Chief Secretary for Ireland going to follow the example of his Predecessor in Office? On June 17th, 1884, 12 months after Colonel Bruce held a private inquiry in his own office with respect to the abominable practices of French, what did the right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Trevelyan) say in that House? He said—

> "How, then, can the Government act against a man who may be innocent or may be guilty, when they have no evidence at all of any sort or kind, except what is contained in an article in *United Ireland*.—(3 *Hansard*, [289] 697.)

He (Mr. Callan) charged now, in the face of the country, that when the late Chief Secretary for Ireland made that statement, Colonel Bruce had full and ample evidence, documentary evidence, taken in his own office, at an inquiry specially held, evidence given by Inspectors of the Police Force, incriminating French as strongly as the evidence given at the trial. What now became of Colonel Bruce? If he had communicated that evidence to the Chief Secretary for Ireland, that right hon. Gentleman would not have made that statement; but Colonel Bruce, to shield the infamous scoundrel French, suppressed that evidence from the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and this was the man whom the present Scotch Chief Secretary presumed to compare to a Member of that House, and to sneer at hon. Members on account of.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: As it is a personal question, perhaps I may be allowed to say that I did not sneer at any Member of this House. What I said was, that I blamed hon. Members for sneering at Colonel Bruce.

MR. CALLAN said, even a Scotch intonation could express a sneer, and

the right hon. Gentleman had certainly contrasted the character of Colonel Bruce with the characters of hon. Members. Before the right hon. Gentleman had done with Colonel Bruce's suppression of evidence, he would be as heartily sick of Colonel Bruce as his Predecessor was sick of French. Mr. Murphy was discredited by Sir John Wood, who had been himself obliged to retire from the Force, and by Colonel Hillier, another tainted character. What were the facts about Mr. Murphy? Was the hon. and learned Solicitor General for Ireland, who was taking notes, prepared to deny that long before the article appeared in *United Ireland* two of the Sub-Inspectors whose names were signed to the round robin were examined by Colonel Bruce in his own office? How were the names of these men obtained except by the round robin? The Chief Secretary for Ireland had stated that Mr. Murphy had furnished a statement of a mere gossiping nature. Was he prepared to produce that statement? The right hon. Gentleman had sneered at the idea of Inspector Murphy having been in any way the cause of French's arrest. Was he aware that in 1883, 12 months before French was arrested, Mr. Murphy—he must be aware, because, by surreptitious and dishonourable means, the Constabulary authorities obtained the information—had supplied information to *United Ireland?* [Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, no!] He begged pardon—to an hon. and learned Member of that House, the hon. and learned Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy), in which county Inspector Murphy was stationed. The Chief Secretary for Ireland, knowing very well that his speech would be reported at full length, had either stated as facts that of which he knew nothing, or had not taken the trouble to look into the Dublin Office, and had thought nothing of maligning and traducing the character of Mr. Murphy, a most deserving public officer, on mere assertion. They knew but little in Ireland of the present Chief Secretary; but it was to be hoped that they would know something better of him than they were led to expect from his conduct that evening. If not, it would be unfortunate for Ireland and unfortunate for the right hon. Gentleman himself. Though they were Home Rulers, and agreed in some matters and politics with the right hon. Gentleman, they had a greater respect for the opinions of Irish gentlemen of character and position in Ireland than they had of Scotch interlopers.

MR. SPEAKER: I am bound to remind the hon. Gentleman that his language is extremely violent, and exceeds Parliamentary manners. I shall have to caution him very severely if he pursues this course of observation.

MR. CALLAN said, he would withdraw the expression "Scotch interlopers," and would say "gentlemen who had intruded, against the wishes of the Irish people, into official positions in Ireland." Lord Ardilaun, a Conservative nobleman in Ireland, had said he was happy to testify to the energy and ability displayed by Mr. Murphy after Lord Mountmorres' murder. That statement of Lord Ardilaun alone was sufficient to overbalance the offensive language used by the Chief Secretary for Ireland. Sir Charles Knox Gore, Deputy Lieutenant of the county of Mayo, had no hesitation in saying that he considered Mr. Murphy a zealous, efficient, and steady officer, and that from a personal knowledge of him. He would also call attention to several testimonials to Mr. Murphy's character from Irish gentlemen. One gentleman — Colonel Chichester—who had in last week's *Tablet* given a character to the Lord Lieutenant, had also given a testimonial of a similar character to Mr. Murphy. Captain Boycott, who had been the means of giving a new word to the English language, had also written very highly of Mr. Murphy, so had Mr. Blake of Galway, Colonel Hannay of the Antrim Militia, Mr. Gage of Ballycastle, and many others. After those testimonials, he thought Mr. Murphy's character came out scatheless from the ordeal and from the slurs which had been cast upon it; and he hoped the debate would be a warning to the Chief Secretary of Ireland not in future to place the character of any Dublin Castle official in comparison with that of a Member for Parliament, and not to put the character of Colonel Bruce in comparison with that of any man who was not a convicted felon.

MR. KENNY said, he thought the speech of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) must be characterized as being, if not disingenuous, at all events, entirely evasive of the point. The remarkable

change in District Inspector Murphy's official career took place just at the time when he had entitled himself to the good favour of the authorities. The correspondence between District Inspector Murphy and the officials was of a remarkably instructive character. The letter announcing to District Inspector Murphy what was virtually his dismissal was couched in somewhat modest terms. The Government felt, he presumed, the weakness of their case, and wished to do what they no doubt considered a necessary, but still an ugly job, in as nice terms as possible. Colonel Bruce virtually abandoned the case of drunkenness, and said there were sufficient reasons without that for Mr. Murphy's dismissal from the Force. It was upon hearsay evidence that the House was asked to support the decision of the Government in their endeavour to condemn District Inspector Murphy. It was perfectly clear to those who knew something of the manner in which the administration of Dublin Castle was conducted that this officer was really dismissed for exposing the iniquities and abominations of the system carried on by District Inspector French, and because he had committed the unpardonable offence of having tried to bring him to justice. His (Mr. Kenny's) contention was, that the officials at Dublin Castle were so implicated in each other's guilt, that they were determined to protect each other, and to crush those of their subordinates who endeavoured to expose them. Had Inspector Murphy consented to shut his eyes he would still have retained his office; but through doing his duty he had lost the advantages attending 16 years' public service, and had had to commence life afresh. It was hard to think that the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland could stand up in that House to defend a policy of revenge and spitefulness; and he trusted that the time would come when Ireland would have an official Representative in that House who would have the courage to expose the system pursued in Dublin Castle, and to sever himself from it.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER) said, that the pith of the charge brought by hon. Gentlemen opposite against the Government was, that there was no real ground of complaint whatever against Mr. Murphy, except that which they themselves had suggested, until the final charge was brought. His right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman), however, had already stated the real charge made against him over and over again—the insubordinate character exhibited in his writings to his superior officers, and his general temper being inconsistent with the discipline which ought to prevail in a Force in which discipline was an essential element. District Inspector Murphy served under three Inspectors General, and under many County Inspectors. Now, when a person was found incapable of agreeing with any of the superior officers under whom he served, there must be something to blame in the character of the man.

MR. KENNY: It was the fault of his superiors.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER): That is what they all say when they are dismissed.

MR. KENNY: It must have been very hard for anyone to get on with French.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER): As far back as 10 years ago, before Mr. Murphy was dismissed, on the 8th of July, 1874, he received a most friendly caution from Sir John Wood, who was then Inspector General, as to the tone of his communications to his superior officers; and that gentleman strongly advised him, if he was desirous of giving satisfaction, to alter that tone very considerably. Under the rules of the Code, the District Inspector was bound to visit his stations once a month; and it appeared that on October 4th, 1875, he made a false return, representing that he had visited a station when he had not done so. The offence having been proved, he was reduced in rank. District Inspector Murphy then made a charge of felony against the County Inspector, and was ordered by the Inspector General to withdraw the charge, or to submit it to the Duke of Abercorn, or to have it heard by a Court of Inquiry. He elected at once to withdraw the charge. In 1876, in Colonel Hillier's time, he was reprimanded for making highly improper and insubordinate statements.

MR. HARRINGTON: Read the statements.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER): If I were to read all the statements made by Mr. Murphy, I should occupy the time of the House until this time to-morrow.

MR. HARRINGTON: Read one.

MR. PARNELL: Will the hon. and learned Gentleman read one of the insubordinate statements?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER) said, if it would please the hon. Member for the City of Cork, he would give an instance. On the 20th September, 1880, he said—

"Lord Macaulay exactly describes the treatment I have received. True justice was meted out thus—first, execution; then, investigation; and last of all (or rather not at all) the accusation."

That was a sample of the way in which this gentleman wrote. [*Laughter.*] It might be very amusing and very clever; but he asked the House whether it was the way in which an officer of a Force should write to the head of the Force?

MR. KENNY: Why not?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER) said, then came the transaction in 1881, to which reference had been made, when he was further cautioned that his conduct was noted on the record; and if aggravated by any future conduct of a similar nature, it would be at once dealt with as continuous and persistent insubordination. In June of the same year he was again reduced for insubordinate writing, and gravely warned that if he were again insubordinate to his superiors, either in writing or in speaking, the Inspector General would report that he was unfit for the Force, and recommend his immediate removal from it. A point had been made by hon. Members on the other side that nothing was recorded against Mr. Murphy since 1881. But that was not the case. After that date, on July 15th, 1882, he was again reprimanded, the Inspector General informing him that there was a very improper tone in his official correspondence, and that, if persisted in, the strongest measures would be taken to bring his insubordination to an end, and that it would cause his removal from the Force. Again, on January 8, 1884, he wrote another letter of a similar character, and was transferred in the spring of that year. A month after his transfer he was informed that if he continued to cause so much trouble and to put forward such exaggerated statements, it would be necessary to consider whether his retention in the Force was for the benefit of the Public Service. In August, 1884, he made certain statements against County Inspector Sheehan, which he was given an opportunity of withdrawing, but refused. As he persisted in these statements, the papers were submitted to the Inspector General, and a little later the charge of drunkenness was made against Mr. Murphy. The fact of it having been made was communicated to him five days afterwards. A court martial found that the charge was established, and it devolved upon the Inspector General to decide what should be done. It was a slight charge, and would not of itself have been one on which the Inspector General would have dismissed him; but, in the opinion of that officer, it was the last straw added to the 11 or 12 cautions and warnings which Mr. Murphy had had, including, in one instance, at least, a reduction by way of punishment. It was felt that such an offence was ample, in a Force requiring discipline, to justify the removal of this officer. In forwarding the discharge on September 22nd, 1884, Colonel Bruce recommended that he should be dismissed not on the charge of drunkenness, but on his aggregate conduct. With reference to the charge of felony brought by Mr. Murphy against his County Inspector, it consisted in these facts only—that 27 years before, the County Inspector, when a candidate for the Force, reported his age incorrectly by a year or two. With regard to the transactions with respect to French, he might say that the first occasion on which Mr. Murphy made any statement to the authorities about French was on the 17th of July, 1884, after French had been arrested, and three months after he had been dismissed from the Force. The evidence was submitted to the Commissioner; but what he asserted proved to be hearsay only, and could not be used in evidence. Some very strong language had been used by hon. Members about Colonel Bruce, about Sir John Wood, and about Colonel Hillier—in fact, every official with whom Murphy had come in contact had been denounced in strong language by the hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Callan).

MR. CALLAN: I only used strong language in reference to Colonel Bruce;

and I am prepared to abide by it and to prove it if I am afforded the opportunity.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER): All I can say is that Colonel Bruce is a man of the highest character.

MR. HARRINGTON: And so was French.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER): He is a man who has held a high post for years with a character unstained, and I believe not one charge can ever be established against him.

MR. CALLAN: Give me the opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER): What has Colonel Bruce done? He has done nothing. I say that every word he heard about French he at once laid before the Lord Lieutenant. After the article appeared in *United Ireland* an informal inquiry was held, and nothing transpired against French.

MR. HARRINGTON: There was no article in *United Ireland* containing a specific charge against French.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER): His name was coupled with that of Colonel Connolly.

MR. HARRINGTON: There was no special charge.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER): But that was the article on which the action was afterwards brought. Everyone knew that it was directed against French. It was on that article that he was directed by Colonel Bruce to clear his character. What transpired at that informal inquiry was laid within 24 hours before the Law Officers of the Crown; and they took the responsibility of saying that there was not one word in the proceedings before Colonel Bruce to establish any case of guilt against French. Therefore, Colonel Bruce's character, at all events, ought not to be slandered in the way in which it had been. He was an honourable gentleman, as everyone knew, and a high-minded and upright official.

MR. JUSTIN HUNTLY M'CARTHY said, with reference to the fact that District Inspector Murphy had served under three Inspectors General, all of whom he had disagreed with, it would probably be found that he was all the more honourable for having persisted in that course of proceeding. However that might be, he (Mr. Justin Huntly M'Carthy) had to complain that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had drawn a comparison between Colonel Bruce and an hon. Member of that House.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I did not refer to any individual Member.

MR. CALLAN: Oh, oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I must be allowed to say that I am very sorry if that is the impression left on anyone's mind. I did not refer to any individual Member. When I mentioned Colonel Bruce, and said something in his favour, there was some deprecatory noise—I will not call it a sneer, but a sort of laugh, or something equivalent to that; and I then said that I would leave the country to judge between the character of Colonel Bruce and that of any hon. Member of this House. I did not refer to any individual Member of this House.

MR. JUSTIN HUNTLY M'CARTHY said, he would be glad to find that he had made a mistake in the matter; but he was quite content to leave the Irish people to judge which was the better man between District Inspector Murphy and Colonel Bruce. Lord Spencer, however, did not wish to retain an honest man in the Service, and Mr. Murphy was sacrificed. He had, however, done a great service to Ireland by helping to break up an infamous gang in Dublin; and the manner in which he had been treated by the Government would be remembered by the people of Ireland, more especially when it was borne in mind that he had really done nothing to justify that dismissal.

MR. PARNELL: I am often surprised, when listening to debates raised by Irish Members in this House, at the attitude which the defenders of Her Majesty's Government on such occasions as the present take up. To-night we have another example of the kind; and we find, as we have always found, that the two forlorn hon. and right hon. Gentlemen are left entirely to themselves to accomplish the task which

I cannot help thinking must have been odious to them from the beginning—that of defending their system of government in Ireland, and that they have not the slightest encouragement from any of those who support them on other questions. That is a significant fact. It appears to me that hon. Members of the House, who usually follow the Government on questions which they do understand, vote with them yet on occasions like the present. I cannot help thinking that hon. Members very frequently feel themselves that they are giving their votes with great reluctance, and that they are not going into the right box; and it is a remarkable fact that all through the discussion that we have had upon Ireland no single supporter of the Government finds a voice to speak on their behalf. Then I am entitled to draw the conclusion that, however much they may feel it necessary to support the Government by their votes, they cannot, for the sake of very shame, find it in their power to offer an articulate expression of approval. The House will recollect that District Inspector Murphy was not an officer of a few years' service; he was an officer of 18 years' service. But although we are told he had been guilty of acts of insubordination in corresponding with no fewer than three of the Inspectors General of the Royal Irish Constabulary, yet it was not until after 18 years, not until after he had written a letter, or round robin, in the nature of a Report, to the Lord Lieutenant and Colonel Brackenbury, giving information with regard to French's misconduct, and after a subsequent letter written by Mr. Murphy to the hon. and learned Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy), that these charges of insubordination were brought against him. It was then that a charge of drunkenness, which was subsequently abandoned, was trumped up against District Inspector Murphy; it was then that the acts of insubordination were fallen back upon, and made use of as an accusation against him. We have been placed at great disadvantage in this discussion by the extraordinary conduct of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland. He only gave one side of the case; and in the absence of official documents, to which he has access, and to which we have not access, it makes it unusually difficult for us to show the full strength of which this case is undoubtedly capable from our point of view. The hon. and learned Solicitor General for Ireland said a number of extracts from letters of Colonel Bruce, and also Inspector General Wood, complained of insubordinate passages in letters from Mr. Murphy to one or other of the Inspectors General; but though he gave us verbatim the accusatory passages from the letters to those officers, he did not give us a single one of the causes for which Inspector Murphy was dismissed. He has placed us, and the House also, in a very unfair position by this conduct. The charge of drunkenness against Inspector Murphy has been admittedly abandoned. It was abandoned by Colonel Bruce. We have his letter to that effect. It was abandoned by the Lord Lieutenant as his reason for dismissing Mr. Murphy—abandoned expressly, and in so many words. It was abandoned by the hon. and learned Solicitor General for Ireland. He said that the intoxication in the case was of a very slight nature; and there was some doubt about it, as there was only one witness. Then these acts of insubordination, running over 12 or 15 years, were those upon which Inspector Murphy was dismissed. Inspector Murphy was dismissed under circumstances creating the gravest suspicion against the Irish Executive in the case of French. It is alleged by the Castle authorities, and by their defenders in this House, that Inspector Murphy was dismissed on account of certain acts or words of insubordination contained in letters to his Inspectors General. Why were not these words given to the House to-night, if they were capable of supporting such a charge of insubordination? Why did the hon. and learned Gentleman carefully avoid quoting them? When he was at last asked to mention one of these acts of insubordination, the only reply he could make was to quote a passage from Lord Macaulay. One would have thought that the knowledge of such an ornate and distinguished author as Lord Macaulay would not have been considered offensive knowledge, even on the part of a District Inspector of the Royal Irish Constabulary. But we now learn from the hon. and learned Solicitor General for Ireland that it was on account of a quotation to the Colonel of a passage from Lord Macaulay that Mr.

Murphy was dismissed. At least, we have not heard any other passage. That is the only insubordinate passage, the only alleged insubordinate quotation on the part of Inspector Murphy that has been brought forward in evidence against him by the hon. and learned Solicitor General for Ireland. I am entitled to assume that such a distinguished master of prosecution and defence, for he has defended some of my comrades very ably in former days—I cannot believe that such a master of prosecution, as he has since unhappily become, could have omitted any other counts in the indictment. I am, therefore, entitled to assume that the worst and most hideous crime of Inspector Murphy was making this quotation from Lord Macaulay; and that passage will go down to posterity as a distinguished example of insubordinate language on the part of a member of the Royal Irish Constabulary. But even when the hon. and learned Solicitor General for Ireland gets up to defend so distinguished a man as Lord Spencer, he ought to deal with the matter seriously, and in accordance with the gravity of the case. This accusation against the Irish Executive is very serious. It is alleged by us—and we have brought forward proof of it—that Sub-Inspector Murphy was not dismissed for insubordinate conduct extending over any number of years; that the insubordinate conduct, if it ever existed, and whatever it might have been, was, practically speaking, condoned and forgiven, and is now only the pretext for the dismissal of this unfortunate man. But we allege that Inspector Murphy was dismissed because he, first of all, gave information to the Lord Lieutenant and Colonel Brackenbury of French's misconduct, giving the names of seven witnesses who had knowledge of his misconduct, and because he had written to my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy), asking him for assistance against the action of the police authorities, and had given to him the same statement which he had supplied to Lord Spencer and Colonel Brackenbury with regard to French's disgrace. I admit, if you like, that Inspector Murphy was guilty of an act of insubordination in writing to my hon. and learned Friend; but that has not been brought forward as a reason for his dismissal. The Government have not the manliness to make the charge. The Government cannot admit that which all the world knows to be the real reason for Murphy's dismissal—they cannot admit that he was breaking the rules of the Force in writing to the hon. and learned Member for Monaghan, and appealing to him as the arbiter of law and justice in the matter, after he had vainly appealed to his own superior officer and to the noble Earl who ought to be the foundation of justice in Ireland. They dare not admit that; because, if they did, they would have admitted the real reason why they had made themselves the instruments in defending the most infamous nest of villains which existed in Dublin. But if Inspector Murphy has been dismissed he has not been silenced. He has been able to put in print a narrative of the persecution to which he has been subjected after it was discovered by the Castle authorities that he had been in communication with my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Monaghan. We allege that there was a conspiracy between Colonel Bruce and Inspector Sheehan to get rid of Murphy. I shall be glad to know if the proceedings of District Inspector Murphy, which were found fault with and criticized by the Inspector General, were proceedings which he was not perfectly entitled to take as an honourable man, and also as an officer of the Royal Irish Constabulary? Secondly, whether his letters written to Inspector Bruce, in which the insubordinate passages not given to us by the Government were alleged to have occurred, were letters written to the Inspector General dissenting against a remonstrance made by Inspector Wood which he was not entitled to make? If that be so, the whole charge against Inspector Murphy vanishes into thin air. Inspector Murphy wants a simple inquiry before a simple tribunal in order to establish two things—first, that he has not been insubordinate; and, second, that he has been a victim of a conspiracy between Colonel Bruce and Inspector Sheehan because he gave information that led to the exposure of French. That inquiry has been denied; but I wish to ask the Government if they still maintain that attitude? Are they afraid to grant Murphy this inquiry? Do they believe that Murphy will be able to prove his

case? These are very serious questions for the Government, and questions which the Government will be asked again and again to answer until satisfaction is obtained. Recollect that neither the Irish Executive nor their defenders come into court with clean hands in this matter. The House will remember that the late Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Trevelyan) defended French in the House as long as it was possible to defend him. The Irish Executive used detectives for the purpose of defeating the efforts of Meiklejohn, and they acted in the most injudicious manner to defend these wretched men in this House. It will be remembered that when the Irish Executive was at last driven to take action that action was insufficient in the last degree; that the case against Cornwall and French and the others was got up in such a manner as to render it impossible for the jury to convict; and that no pains whatever were taken to secure convictions, although evidence or proof of the guilt of these men was abundant; and that while, in agrarian cases, all the resources and machinery of Dublin Castle would have been used without mercy and without scruple against the sought-for victim, in the case of these unheard-of criminals nothing was done to secure that justice was satisfied. The House will also remember that, during the whole course of these cases, the action of the Irish Executive was to excite the gravest suspicion that they thought it necessary to defend these wretched criminals, because they believed that the administration of what they called "law and order" was in the mind of the Irish people, and that the *prestige* of Dublin Castle and the Government would be deteriorated if it was found that some of the principal agents and instruments who were trying to bring home crime to innocent men were guilty themselves of the most unspeakable offences. Under these circumstances, I consider the conduct of the Government to-night doubly suspicious. No doubt, the right hon. Gentleman the present Chief Secretary for Ireland has to take up the burden of his Predecessors in this matter—a burden to escape from which the late Chief Secretary for Ireland resigned his Office. The right hon. Gentleman is obliged, to some extent, to defend everything that his Predecessor did, and all the acts of the present Administration in Ireland. It is one of the misfortunes of the Office which the right hon. Gentleman holds that while he is expected to be a regular Jack-of-all-trades, and to know everything, from the duty of a Field Marshal to the duty of a Sub-Inspector, and the duty of a clerk in a public office, he is also obliged to represent himself as sufficiently well informed upon every point to give answers in this House in relation to the 101 matters which we find it necessary to call his attention to, as if he himself were perfectly acquainted with all the details. We know how vast is the area encompassed by his Office, and how broad, and how deep, and how high is the mass of work which he has undertaken, and for which he is obliged to answer. We know that when he is defending such persons as Colonel Bruce, and when he is reading out here carefully-drafted replies, sent over to him from Dublin Castle, he is not speaking from his own convictions or knowledge, and that he is merely retailing at second-hand the views of a number of prominent officials, who know full well that the period during which they will be responsible for any portion of the system of government in Ireland will be very short indeed. He (Mr. Parnell) therefore sympathized to some extent with the right hon. Gentleman, but; while we sympathize with him, we cannot allow him to escape on that ground, and we say that in taking up, as he has done, the chain which his Predecessor had to drop, and in making himself the defender of such proceedings as those involved in the dismissal of District Inspector Murphy, and defending the doings of Colonel Bruce and County Inspector Sheehan in the persecution of this unfortunate man, he is undoubtedly doing a thing which will bring no credit to the Government to which he belongs, and will certainly not increase the respect of the Irish people for what is called "law and order," or increase their love for, and induce them to cherish friendlier feelings towards, the maintenance of British rule in that country.

MR. WARTON said, he thought that the gloomy and almost savage silence maintained by the bulk of the Party opposite, when complaints were made by Irish Members, was hardly calculated to

conciliate the followers of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). He (Mr. Warton) held that a disposition ought always to be evinced to hear patiently the accusations that were brought against the officials of Dublin Castle. As to Inspector Murphy, he ought to have been dismissed from the Force in 1881, if not before. The Executive was much to blame for having allowed him to commit seven or eight acts of insubordination with immunity from punishment.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR hoped that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) would now see the necessity of changing the manner in which Irish Business was debated in the House. His hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) in the course of his speech had asked various questions; but the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland and the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Walker) had previously exhausted their right to speak, and therefore there was no one to answer them. He (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) ventured to say there was no other Member of the House holding the position of his hon. Friend who would be left unanswered. That he considered a most inconvenient, and he might almost say unseemly, state of things, and the sooner it was mended the better. He should be very glad indeed if there were some Member left on the Treasury Bench who could supply some buttresses to the very shaky building set up by the hon. and learned Solicitor General for Ireland. He complained that though the hon. and learned Gentleman had said all he could against Mr. Murphy when in the service of the Government, he had mentioned none of the points that might be made in his favour, although he knew very well that Mr. Murphy was left without any resources, and had to begin the world anew. He thought that the number of times Mr. Murphy had been highly commended for his conduct when on special service should have been referred to, and also the fact that he was able to get a most remarkable series of testimonials from Lord Ardilaun, Mr. Blake, and others. He was surprised that the hon. and learned Gentleman had not alluded to this unbroken favourable record of services in the most difficult situations and trying times. The hon. and learned Gentleman had repeated, at least five or six times, the charge against Inspector Murphy of making a false return, although Inspector Murphy over and over again endeavoured to direct the attention of his superiors to that charge, in order to have it re-opened, and every time his request to be allowed to clear his character was refused. With regard to the charges of insubordination made against him, they amounted, when thoroughly sifted, to only two, and those of a very insignificant kind, in the course of 18 years. When pressed strongly to give particulars of the insubordinate statements which he attributed to District Inspector Murphy, the Solicitor General for Ireland at last offered to read one of those statements, and it turned out to be only a quotation from Lord Macaulay. That was the solitary instance of an insubordinate statement on District Inspector Murphy's part which was adduced to the House by the hon. and learned Gentleman. For himself, he believed that the real reason for District Inspector Murphy's dismissal was not the ostensible one that was brought forward by the Lord Lieutenant, and that that deserving officer was treated with an amount of unfairness and want of consideration which was a very bad return for all his past services. By the Police Code, any charges brought against a member of the Force had to be in writing in clear and distinct terms, and a copy of the charges must be given. It was also expressly stated that no general charges of misconduct should be brought against a member of the Force. In the case of Mr. Murphy the charge of insubordination had not been made at all, much less in writing, and he had been dismissed upon a general charge of misconduct, in direct antagonism to both the letter and the spirit of the Code under which he had taken office, and according to which he ought to have been tried. It had been said that Mr. Murphy had been reprimanded by three different Inspectors General; but no mention had been made of the fact that one of these three had himself been dismissed from the Force. In Ireland Mr. Murphy would be regarded as an honest and outspoken official, who had on that account been dismissed after an unfair trial. The defence of

the Government that night had left the matter precisely where it stood. They (the Irish Members) claimed that Mr. Murphy was treated with an amount of unfairness and want of consideration that were a very bad return indeed, not only for his personal services, but for the extraordinary services which he had rendered to the organization to which he belonged.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £29,057, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for the Maintenance and Repair of Royal Palaces."

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he thought it was somewhat surprising that the economical section of the Radical Party was not more numerously represented in the Committee on that occasion. He was of opinion that this item for the Royal Palaces ought never to be allowed to pass through the Committee without being distinctly challenged and carefully scrutinized. [MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Oh!] The hon. Member for Eye interrupted him when he made that assertion. He was very much astonished that in expressing that sentiment he should have been interrupted by the hon. Member, whose earliest infancy was spent under the banner of the Stars and Stripes in a country where there were no Royal Palaces, but which found itself very well able to get on without them. With the permission of the Committee he (Mr. O'Connor) would examine the items which were included in this Vote for the Royal Palaces. The total amount of the Vote was £35,057 for 1885-6, as against £36,865 for 1884-5, showing a decrease of £1,808. He thought the decrease was entirely due to the searching examination which took place into these items last year. The principal items in the Vote were £21,907 for ordinary repairs and maintenance, against £22,219 last year; £2,010 for salaries, wages, and allowances, against £2,015 last year; £4,776 for new works and alterations, against £6,623; £2,230 for furniture and fittings, against £1,923; £2,250 for fuel, gas, and water, and one or two smaller items. In spite of there being a decrease in some of these items, he ventured to say that these were monstrously exaggerated charges; and if any hon. Member could be found who was in favour of a general reduction of charges, he would find ample justification for any course of action he might feel disposed to take on the present Vote. No man of feeling or humanity could pass through the streets of London without having his heart wrung by the wholesale misery which existed among the labouring population at the present time. Constant appeals were made for alms by men who were willing to work, but found it impossible to obtain it. But notwithstanding the existence of this widespread misery and distress, the Committee seemed to have nothing better to do than to vote £35,057 for the maintenance and repair of Royal Palaces. He found a sum for Windsor Castle of no less than £4,182 for ordinary repairs and maintenance, and another of £6,109 for Hampton Court Palace. Everywhere was to be found the same extraordinary and profuse extravagance. He should like to hear what the Financial Secretary to the Treasury had to say in favour of £4,182 being spent upon Windsor Castle in ordinary repairs and maintenance. Last year the Committee, in discussing this Vote, had the advantage of the experience of the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill), whose absence they all regretted. The noble Lord was well qualified to speak on the subject, because there existed in the possession of his own family one of the finest Castles or Palaces in the country; and the noble Lord declared most positively that the outlay upon the Royal Palaces was incalculably and incredibly beyond all ordinary expenditure. He (Mr. O'Connor) trusted that the Vote would not be allowed to pass without further explanation, or otherwise they would encourage similar extravagant expenditure in the future. As he had said, there had been a decrease of £1,808, and

although that was not a very large sum, he believed there would have been no decrease at all if it had not been for the discussion which took place upon the Vote last year.

MR. BROADHURST said, that the other day he had addressed a Question to the Junior Lord of the Treasury with regard to some decorations at Windsor Castle, and the reply he had received was neither full nor definite, nor was it any answer whatever to the allegations he had made. He now found in the present Vote that Windsor Castle figured for upwards of £4,000 for ordinary repairs and maintenance, and he took it that the subject of his complaint was included in this Vote.

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, the present Vote had nothing to do with the decorations at Windsor Castle.

MR. BROADHURST asked the hon. Gentleman to say what the sum of £4,182 was for?

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: For the ordinary maintenance and repair of the exterior and interior of Windsor Castle.

MR. SEXTON said, he thought the most striking point of view in which this Vote could be regarded was afforded by the Table which appeared in the Estimates at page 4. That Table divided the Royal Palaces into Palaces wholly or partly in the occupation of Her Majesty, and Palaces not in Her Majesty's occupation at all. The Committee would see that the Palaces wholly or partly occupied by Her Majesty cost the country between £15,000 and £16,000, while the Palaces not in the occupation of Her Majesty cost upwards of £19,000. The places in the personal occupation of Her Majesty were Buckingham Palace, the Royal Mews, Pimlico, Windsor Castle, Windsor Home Park, with Adelaide Lodge, &c., Windsor Royal Kitchen Gardens, Frogmore House and Grounds, and White Lodge, Richmond Park. Assuming that the five residences were required for the regular occupation of Her Majesty, the items of expenditure upon them were not unreasonable; but the question remained whether all the rest of the Royal Palaces, including residences for the Duchess of Cambridge and other members of the Royal Family, should be maintained at the expense of the country. Among them were Kensington Palace, Pembroke Lodge, Thatched House, East Sheen Cottage, Richmond Park, Bushy House, and Hawthorn Lodge. No explanation whatever was given of the purposes to which those residences were applied; and he thought the country acted with sufficient generosity in keeping up at great expense the Palaces that were necessary for the occupation of the Sovereign. It was rather too much to add to them a number of other residences, the public use of which was not designated. Among the items was one of £40 for an allowance to the High Commissioner of the Church of Scotland for expenses attending the occupation of rooms in Holyrood Palace. Surely if the High Commissioner of the Church of Scotland was allowed the use of rooms in Holyrood Palace, free of expense, it was most unreasonable that he should charge the public with his expenses while occupying them. Then, again, there was another item for a ratcatcher at Buckingham Palace. There appeared to be no ratcatcher at Kensington Palace or Windsor Castle, or even at Holyrood, which was, perhaps, the most ancient Palace of the whole. Certainly the individual was a most reasonable ratcatcher, seeing that he only charged the small sum of £8; but it was anything but reasonable to charge even this small sum to the public.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT said, that he had ventured to express his dissent from the observations of the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) in the usual and Constitutional way known to that House, and for doing so he had drawn down upon himself a rebuke from the hon. Member. A great deal of the feeling expressed by certain hon. Members in regard to this Vote, and a great many of the objections raised to the Royal Palaces, were pure clap-trap. It was a cheap means of obtaining some attention and notoriety, and it never came to anything practical. The hon. Member for Galway was supposed to be connected with some of the Democrats who sat in that House, and would understand him (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett) when he said that the real question at issue was the comparative cost of Royal and Democratic Governments. That was what the whole question came to. This expenditure of a few thousand pounds was not really worthy of occupying the attention of the

Committee, especially when they considered that in the case of a neighbour across the Channel the expense of maintaining the Government was £40,000,000 in excess of the Expenditure of this country. If they went across the Atlantic to the United States they would find that the cost of the Civil Services was much greater than it was in this country, and that there was, in addition, gross corruption in the way in which the money was expended. It was obvious that these objections to the cost of keeping up the Royal Palaces were altogether unworthy of the House of Commons.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN was understood to say that other hon. Members were entitled to hold opinions as well as the hon. Member.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT said, he did not quite understand the observation of the hon. Baronet, who was generally humorous at that hour of the night. What he (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett) maintained was that these popularity-hunting objections to the expenditure upon the Royal Palaces were altogether unworthy of the House of Commons. On the whole, the cost of the Government of this country was very much less than that of any Republican Government that existed, and in that point of view the expenditure upon the Royal Palaces was anything but excessive. That was his justification for the slight groan with which he had received the remarks of the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), who began the discussion with the ordinary stock objections the Committee had so long been accustomed to hear.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he accepted the observations of the hon. Member so far as they applied to himself, and he felt that the hon. Member might have had some reason for making them. It was not, however, the first occasion upon which attention had been called to the total want of affinity between the remarks of the hon. Member for Eye (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett) and the question before the Committee. He had listened patiently to the remarks of the hon. Member, and all he had ventured to say was that other persons might have their opinions as well as the hon. Gentleman. The hon. Member said that anything he (Sir Patrick O'Brien) might say at that time of night would be futile.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: No; humorous.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN said, that as he had caught the word it was "futile." [*Cries of* "No; humorous."] Well, he had nothing to say upon the point of humour; but as to the word "futile," he must remind the Committee that they were considering a Vote which involved a very large annual expenditure. The hon. Member made a statement which he said ought to impress the public. Now, he (Sir Patrick O'Brien) was one of the members of the public, and there were other members of the public in that House; and certainly he was never very much impressed or interested by anything the hon. Member said. The hon. Member talked about the Republic across the ocean. His own impression was that the hon. Member read all the London papers carefully every morning, and having learned his politics from them, especially in regard to Afghanistan, he presented the House with a hashed up *résumé* of them every evening. But in reference to the Soudan, or Afghanistan, or anything else, the hon. Member was really more ignorant than nine out of every 10 men they might meet. Of all men who attempted to throw stones across the floor of the House the last should be those who lived in glass houses themselves—at any rate, if they were desirous of being safely preserved in such a costly arrangement. The hon. Member had alluded to the Republic across the Atlantic; but was he aware that the Democrats, who were the aristocracy of America, were now ruling there, and not the Republicans? It was not necessary to reply further to the hon. Member, because the laugh of the House was against him on every occasion, and ought to convince him of the real estimation in which he was held. That was the only reply he considered it worth while to make.

MR. BIGGAR regretted that no Member of the Government had evinced any disposition to reply to the statements which had been made by several hon. Members in regard to this Vote. He had no wish to make any reference to the expenditure upon the Palaces in the occupation of Her Majesty, or partly in her occupation, nor would he reply to the observations of the hon. Member

for Eye (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett) as to Republican Governments and their economy or otherwise; but there was an item in the sum set down for Hampton Court Palace upon which he certainly desired some explanation. Hampton Court Palace was a substantial old building, and he did not see why any money should be expended upon it for new buildings. In point of fact, the expenditure of money upon repairing and keeping up the Palace could scarcely be justified at all, because the apartments in it were allotted free of rent to the persons who occupied them, and the sum of £1,600 charged for new works and alterations certainly appeared to be excessive. Then, again, there was an item of £434 for Hampton Court Stud House; and he certainly should divide the Committee against it, because he regarded any expenditure for keeping up a breeding stud at Hampton Court as a most outrageous waste of the public money, which could not be justified at all. The horses bred there were scarcely fit for Hansom cab horses, and the Government were not only expending a lot of money there, but they were degenerating the breed of horses in a most mischievous manner, and setting a very bad example. He proposed, in the first instance, to await an explanation in regard to the Hampton Court Stud House before moving the rejection of that item of the Vote. He was certainly curious to learn what the explanation would be.

Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, that, although a general attack had been made upon the Vote, it showed altogether a decrease of more than £1,800 upon the Vote of last year, and a decrease of more than £4,000 upon the Vote of the preceding year. There was, therefore, on the whole, a satisfactory decrease. Most of these Palaces, as everybody knew, were exceedingly old, and old buildings required constant repair, and consequently a considerable outlay of money. In the case of Windsor Castle, for instance, it would be found that there was an item for re-facing the stonework of the outer walls of the Curfew Tower, and there was constantly work of that description going on. The hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) had called attention to Hampton Court Palace. Now, Hampton Court Palace substantially existed for the benefit of the people; and if the hon. Member would go down there he would not only enjoy himself, but would see thousands of other people enjoying themselves. But Hampton Court Palace was a very old building, and in order to keep it up properly it was necessary to undertake frequent repairs; and, owing to the great value of the furniture and the pictures, it was necessary to employ a large staff of attendants. The hon. Member for Cavan also objected to the sum put down for the Stud House. He thought the hon. Member was labouring under a misapprehension in regard to that item. It was for the maintenance of the building itself, and there was no charge for the horses in the Vote. The hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) had called attention to a charge of £40 in the shape of an allowance to the High Commissioner of the Church of Scotland in connection with the occupation of rooms in Holyrood Palace. He (Mr. H. Gladstone) was of opinion that that was a very fair charge to be placed upon the Votes, because for 10 days or a fortnight the High Commissioner was required to reside at Holyrood as the Representative of Her Majesty, during which time it was his duty to entertain large numbers of people, and so to incur a very considerable expense. So far as the rat-catcher was concerned, he presumed that when persons of that character were employed even in Royal Palaces it was necessary to pay them for their services.

Mr. ILLINGWORTH asked what was the amount of the salary paid to the High Commissioner of the Church of Scotland, that it became necessary to supplement it by the sum of £40 for the expenses attending his occupation of apartments in one of the Royal Palaces?

Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, he believed the High Commissioner's salary was £2,000 a-year.

Mr. BIGGAR said, the explanation of the hon. Member for Leeds (Mr. H. Gladstone) in reference to the expenditure upon Hampton Court Palace was altogether unsatisfactory. There was a large expenditure provided for in the shape of new works; and he was of opinion that no old building should require to be patched up with new work, and that, as a matter of fact, new work, under such circumstances, was positively mischievous, and only tended to spoil the appearance of the Palace. Whoever

the Commissioner of the Board of Works might be, it was evident that he failed to perform his duty when he allowed expenditure of this kind to be incurred. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. H. Gladstone) told the Committee that the item of £434 for the Stud House at Hampton Court included nothing for the horses; but surely the Stud House itself was for the horses, and any expenditure upon it was for the horses.

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: What I said was that no money was included in this Vote for the horses themselves.

MR. BIGGAR said, he was quite aware that the horses were merely ornamental goods; but the Stud House was rendered necessary simply on account of the breeding of horses at Hampton Court—and a very poor class of horses they were, too. He would move the reduction of the Vote by the sum of £434, the item for Hampton Court Stud House.

Motion made, and Question put,

"That a sum, not exceeding £28,623, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for the Maintenance and Repair of Royal Palaces."—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 23; Noes 66: Majority 43.—(Div. List, No. 87.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(2.) £1,120, Marlborough House.

(3.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £91,369, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for the Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens."

MR. BIGGAR asked for explanations with regard to the increase of the charge on account of Bushy Park and Hampton Court Gardens; also with regard to the charge for Holyrood Palace and Edinburgh Park. It was, in his opinion, a great question whether any expenditure on Holyrood Palace ought to be incurred at all. Although there was a considerable expenditure for keeping the public Parks in London in order, he was not aware that it was the practice to give large sums of money for that purpose in Provincial towns. On the whole, he thought the expenditure on these public Gardens was absolutely unreasonable and extravagant.

MR. R. N. FOWLER said, he might, perhaps, be in Order in referring upon this Vote to a question which he had intended to raise upon the last. Some years ago he had visited Hampton Court, and found that on that particular day the Palace was shut up; in consequence of that he suggested to his friend, Mr. Gerard Noel, then Chief Commissioner of Works, that a notice might be set up, and information otherwise given to the public as to the days on which the Palace was closed. He desired to call the attention of the First Commissioner on the present occasion to the circumstance, with the view of his making some arrangements for giving notice of the days when the places were open, which would prevent persons going down to those Royal Palaces and Parks and finding them closed when they arrived there.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, that when the Vote was taken last year for improvements at Hyde Park Corner, it was expressly stated that it was a contribution on account of such improvements; and they were told that the Prince of Wales's Committee was engaged in collecting a further sum of money for that purpose. He would be glad to know whether that Committee had succeeded in collecting the sum that was expected, because the House voted the £6,000 upon the distinct understanding that a much larger sum would be provided by public subscription.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, before the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) replied to hon. Members who had addressed the Committee on the Vote, he thought it highly desirable that the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Department (Mr. Herbert Gladstone), or, at all events, the right hon. Gentleman at his side, would state who was responsible for what were, by a misnomer, in his opinion, called the improvements at Hyde Park Corner. It was a misnomer, at any rate, in an artistic sense, so far as the Triumphal Arch was concerned, which by being placed sideways in a position it was never intended to occupy would be altogether an offensive object. Now, the hon. Gentleman below the Gangway on the opposite side of the House (Mr. Arnold) had frequently

raised this question; and he thought it desirable that some statement should be made to the Committee, and go forth to the public, as to what was actually going to be done, and who was to find the money for those alterations. They had been told last year that a subscription had been set on foot by a number of distinguished individuals; but he believed that a considerable number of the subscriptions expected had not been forthcoming, and it seemed probable that Hyde Park Corner would be left as it was at present. There was another point in connection with this subject which he would venture to place before the Treasury Bench. They were told last year that £6,000 was to be devoted to a statue which he understood was being now made by Mr. Boehm, to be erected at Hyde Park Corner, the old statue having been conveyed to Aldershot. He would like to hear from the present Representative of the Department or his Predecessor what was to be done with regard to the pedestal. Anyone who had paid the slightest attention to the works of the Old Masters, and the statues which they had erected, whether equestrian or otherwise, must be aware that they attached as much importance to the pedestal as to the statue itself. As an example, he would refer to the statue at Charing Cross—a statue placed upon a pedestal which was designed with the greatest possible care by Sir Christopher Wren; and although in his book upon the statues of the Metropolis the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had not mentioned the fact, if he had further prosecuted his investigations he would have found that so careful was Sir Christopher Wren about the pedestal that he made no less than four or five designs, which might now be seen at Oxford. He desired to impress upon the Committee the absolute necessity of this point being attended to, because otherwise there could be no doubt that unless it was placed upon a suitable pedestal the effect of the statue would be thrown away. He would like to know whether any plan had been adopted, or whether counsel had been taken with regard to the pedestal, and whether any sculptor of recognized ability had been applied to? He had suggested to the right hon. Gentleman the importance of employing an efficient architect for the purpose of erecting the pedestal, and he would be glad to hear whether anything had been done with regard to that matter. Finally, he would ask whether the alterations or so-called improvements at this "junction"—whatever it might be termed—were to be carried out under the original plan or otherwise?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, although the right hon. and learned Gentleman who had just spoken always disclaimed artistic experience and knowledge, they on that side of the House were prepared to credit him with a great deal in both respects. He (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) was quite ready to bear his share of responsibility for the improvements at Hyde Park Corner. The hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold) had asked him what had been done in the matter of the subscriptions towards the cost of those improvements. His Royal Highness had collected a large sum of money—he believed the amount was between £14,000 and £15,000—and as soon as the models were completed by Mr. Boehm it would be determined in what way the money collected by His Royal Highness would be expended. The right hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) had asked about the pedestal for the statue. He had no doubt that Mr. Boehm was perfectly cognizant of the importance of having a suitable pedestal to the statue. [MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK dissented.] The right hon. and learned Gentleman dissented; but it should be remembered that Mr. Boehm was a great artist, and there was, therefore, no doubt that he would deal with his subject in a suitable manner.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, if the right hon. Gentleman challenged him to speak of a particular case, he would refer him to the pedestal of the statue of Lord Lawrence, at the lower part of Portland Place, which after it was set up had to be taken down, and another substituted for it. With regard to the practice of the Old Masters, he said that the pedestal was as much a part of the work of the Old Masters as one thing could be of another. He was glad of having had the opportunity of mentioning this subject to the Committee; and he hoped that as Mr. Boehm was charged with the responsibility for the statue at Hyde Park Corner, it

would not in any way resemble that which was set up in Portland Place.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE pointed out that Mr. Boehm himself was dissatisfied with the statue, and had very generously removed it.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, that the right hon. Gentleman had spoken of the £14,000 collected by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales as a very large sum; but he had last year mentioned that it was expected that £40,000 would be raised.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: I intended to convey to the Committee that that sum might possibly be raised.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS asked who was responsible for the cutting down of the trees at Hyde Park Corner?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: They were removed with my authority. It was impossible to leave them there consistently with the improvements to be effected.

MR. DILLWYN said, the charge this year for the maintenance of St. James's, Green, and Hyde Parks amounted to the enormous sum of £37,118, and was an increase over the amount voted last year. No doubt their Parks were very well kept; but he contended that the expenses ought to be kept down rather than increased. He found there was an increase this year over last year of £1,023. The Parks should be properly kept up; but he considered that they cost the country too much money. Parliament ought to refuse the continual excess one year over another; and therefore he begged to move that the sum of £1,023 be deducted from the Vote, that being the amount of the increase over the sum voted last year for the maintenance of St. James's Park, the Green Park, and Hyde Park.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £90,346, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for the Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens."—(*Mr. Dillwyn.*)

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, that, in answer to his hon. Friend, he would point out that the increase he complained of was mainly owing to the laying of "the asphalte footpath between the Duke of York's Steps and Storey's Gate." That footpath was made chiefly on the strong recommendation of Members of Parliament; and, if he remembered rightly, among those Members was the hon. Gentleman's (Mr. Dillwyn's) Friend, the hon. Member for Northampton, (Mr. Labouchere). He (Mr. H. Gladstone) might also mention that new railings were being put up round the Green Park; but no money would be charged for the work. It was expected that the new railings could be paid for out of the Vote of last year.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said, he did not complain of the total expenditure upon the London Parks; but he did protest that the charge did not fall upon London exclusively. He did not propose to divide the Committee upon the question; but he wished to give the Government, through the hon. Gentleman who represented in that House the Board of Works (Mr. H. Gladstone), a word of warning. He (Mr. Illingworth) and others hoped there was a time coming when a change in regard to the London Parks would be seriously considered by the Government. They hoped that to the privileges which would be conferred on the Metropolis by the proposed London Municipal Reform Bill this very proper one would be added—namely, that London should pay for its own Parks. He knew it was contended that Provincial people came up to London and enjoyed the Parks; but he considered that the Provincial who came to London paid for his visit heavily in many ways. Now, there were many towns in England which, in proportion to their population and wealth, had expended as much upon their Parks and playgrounds for the inhabitants as had been expended upon the Parks of London. It was but reasonable that the Metropolis should pay for keeping up its own grounds. Of course, he did not complain of the annual expenditure upon the Parks; but he thought he was entitled to protest against the continuance of the present system. He anticipated that in the new Parliament a very much stronger feeling would be expressed on this point, so far as Provincials were concerned, than had hitherto been expressed; and more than that, he ventured to think that when the working classes of London were adequately represented, it would be found that they would not be so mean as to ask those who lived in the Provinces to pay for privileges London people enjoyed.

MR. TOMLINSON said, there were two questions he desired to ask upon this Vote. He noticed an item of £250 "for planting trees in lieu of others dead and decayed (continuance of work)" in Richmond Park. Was the work to go on from year to year, or would it only be confined to the present year? If it was to go on, how long was it likely to continue? His other question related to the Gardens at Kew. There was a charge made "for payments to experts for naming cryptogams." It seemed to him very curious that in such a well-arranged establishment for botanical instruction as Kew Gardens the services of persons who did not belong to the establishment should be required.

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, that in answer to the first question of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Tomlinson) he had to say that he believed the work of planting new trees in Richmond Park would go on from year to year. As to the second question, he did not think there was any room for complaint on the score of extravagance. The examination of cryptogams required to be made by very skilled men—men of very superior knowledge. It was very probable that few Members of the Committee knew exactly what cryptogams were. For the information of hon. Gentlemen, he might say that cryptogams were a class of plants whose stamens and pistils were not distinctly visible, and they included ferns, mosses, seaweeds, and mushrooms.

MR. R. N. FOWLER said, he was sorry the hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. Illingworth) did not speak earlier in the evening, because in that case there would have been some chance of his remarks being reported in the newspapers. He (Mr. R. N. Fowler) hoped it might happen that the hon. Gentleman's views would be set before the public, because he wished the inhabitants of the Metropolis, who, under the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill now passing through the House, were to receive a considerable addition to their Representatives, to note the attempt made by an eminent Member of the Liberal Party to fix upon them, through this Vote, increased burdens. In the matter of the Parks, the Metropolis only received justice, and nothing more than justice; and, therefore, he (Mr. R. N. Fowler) felt bound, as the Representative of a Metropolitan constituency, to enter his protest against the view of the hon. Member (Mr. Illingworth).

DR. CAMERON said, he was sorry that when the Junior Lord of the Treasury (Mr. H. Gladstone) made his explanation about cryptogams he did not say a word with reference to the question brought forward by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. Illingworth). The maintenance of the London Parks was a very important question, and he was glad his hon. Friend had introduced the question. He was, however, equally glad that the hon. Gentleman did not intend to divide the Committee, because he (Dr. Cameron) believed the Government were thoroughly pledged to deal with the matter. If they wanted any evidence of that, he thought they had it in the fact of the accession to the Government of the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. H. H. Fowler). He believed that hon. Gentleman had been the cause of the shifting of the incidence of taxation for the Metropolitan Police Courts, and he was quite certain that the promise of the Government——[*A laugh.*] Hon. Members seemed to think there was nothing in a Government promise. He and his hon. Friends who sat below the Gangway had faith in the Government, and they regarded a promise of the Government as something that it was intended to fulfil. Anyhow, he was quite certain that if the Government did not fulfil their tacit pledge upon the question of the London Parks, the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. H. H. Fowler) would resign.

MR. TOMLINSON said, he did not wish for a moment to imply that the charge for the naming of cryptogams was excessive. What he wished to ask, however, was whether the experts were persons who were outside the staff of the Kew Gardens? It appeared to him that the Superintendent of the Gardens ought to have on his staff a person capable of making these examinations.

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE remarked that the expert was a specialist in the Department of Kew. He (Mr. H. Gladstone) did not reply to the question raised by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. Illingworth),

because it had been brought up on this Vote year after year, and the hon. Gentleman said he did not mean to divide the Committee. Hon. Members were well aware that it was proposed in the Government Bill for the Municipal Reform of London to hand the charge of the Parks over to the Metropolis. ["Not the Royal Parks."] All but the Royal Parks. The Government had every expectation of having an opportunity for the introduction of the Bill next year.

MR. STUART-WORTLEY doubted very much whether there was any widespread feeling in favour of the proposal of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. Illingworth). He believed that, as a matter of fact, the people in the Provinces, so long as the thing was well done, liked to feel that they paid for it. He wished, however, to bring the attention of the Committee down to a very much smaller matter—to ask his hon. Friend the Representative of the Office of Works (Mr. H. Gladstone) whether something more could not be done to render Kew Gardens not only a scientific, but an agreeable place of popular resort? The Gardens ought to be made a place where people could sit down as well as walk about. He went there a few years ago, and he noticed that very few seats were provided. He trusted the Office of Works would see their way to an improvement in that respect.

MR. MAGNIAC said, that before the hon. Gentleman (Mr. H. Gladstone) replied, he would like to support the request made by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Sheffield (Mr. Stuart-Wortley), with respect to Kew Gardens. He (Mr. Magniac) went to Kew once, and he found that seats were very much required. Besides, the climate of their country was such that they must be dependent upon shelter of some kind. It was very sad indeed to see the people in their best clothes flocking under the trees at Kew, endeavouring to obtain shelter from the weather. This was a matter which required to be taken up by someone outside the staff of Kew Gardens. There was another point upon which he wished to make an inquiry. Piccadilly, undoubtedly, was one of the finest streets in the world; but the upper end was far too narrow for the traffic. By extending the railings some feet into the Park—up to the trees—Piccadilly would be made the most splendid esplanade in any city of the world. The expense involved in the alteration would not be more than a mere trifle. He hoped something would be done to effect the improvement he had indicated.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN said, that a large sum of money was voted many years ago for Battersea Park, and the House was told that the Park would be more than self-supporting. They were told that a large amount of land would be built upon, and, in short, that the arrangements would be of such a character that instead of the Park being a charge on the public finances it would be actually remunerative. He would like to know how far, after 25 years' interval, that view had been carried out?

MR. WARTON said, it was, perhaps, as well that the attention of the Committee should be drawn to the Amendment now under consideration—namely, the very peculiar and strange Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn). During the few years he had been a Member of the House, he had noticed that the peculiarity of Amendments proposed by the hon. Member (Mr. Dillwyn) was that they never had the slightest reference to the subject it was intended they should refer to. It was the easiest and yet the clumsiest thing in the world to look at two items, the one in the Estimates of last year and the other in the Estimates of this year, to see whether there was any excess, and if there was any excess to move, without rhyme or reason, to disallow it. A little care ought to be exercised in scrutinizing the Estimates, because an excess might arise in a perfectly legitimate and proper way. If the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Dillwyn) had looked at the explanation given under "E" he would have seen two items there, of neither of which he had expressed disapprobation. If the hon. Gentleman had said he disapproved of the asphalte footpath between the Duke of York's Steps and Storey's Gate, and given a good reason for his disapprobation, he (Mr. Warton) could have understood his wish to reduce the Vote by £1,000, the charge for that footpath. If the hon. Gentleman thought it wrong to have a statue of the Duke of Wellington, he (Mr. Warton) could have under-

stood him moving to reduce the Vote by £2,000, the amount of Her Majesty's Government's contribution towards that statue. The hon. Gentleman, however, had simply fixed upon the excess between the Estimate of this year and that of last year, and moved to reduce the Vote by the amount of that excess. He was bound to say the hon. Gentleman gained a reputation for economy in a very cheap way. He (Mr. Warton) was not a blind economist, because he could conceive a reason for an increase of expenditure. It was the simplest thing imaginable to apply the rule which the hon. Gentleman had applied to this Vote to all the Votes, and thus move to reduce the Estimates by hundreds of thousands of pounds. He (Mr. Warton) considered that a most insane Amendment; and, therefore, he should record his vote against it.

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, he would take care that representations on the subject raised by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Sheffield (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) were made to the authorities at Kew. He was not sure, however, that it would be possible to put up shelters as suggested by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Bedford (Mr. Magniac); indeed, he failed to see why people should be sheltered more at Kew than at Hyde Park. New railings had just been put up in Piccadilly, and the improvement suggested by his hon. Friend (Mr. Magniac) would involve such a very large expenditure of money that he did not think the House would be inclined to sanction it. In answer to the question concerning Battersea Park, put to him by the hon. Baronet the Member for King's County (Sir Patrick O'Brien), he had to say that £100,000 had been repaid with interest out of the proceeds of the sale of surplus lands. In 1880 the estimated value of the remaining surplus lands more than covered the remaining moiety of the principal of the debt—namely, £115,000.

MR. DILLWYN said, he considered the expenditure upon the Parks was already very large; and, therefore, he should divide the Committee against any increase. He did not think the explanation given by his hon. Friend (Mr. H. Gladstone) respecting the asphalte footpath from the Duke of York's Steps to Storey's Gate was at all satisfactory. The hon. Gentleman had said the footpath was made at the request of one Member of Parliament. He (Mr. Dillwyn) demurred to that. If large sums were expended they should be expended upon the responsibility of the Government, and not upon the request of any one Member of Parliament.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 18; Noes 57: Majority 39. — (Div. List, No. 88.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."

MR. CAUSTON asked if the next Vote would be taken on the day Parliament assembled after the Easter Holidays. The Vote included a sum for the restoration of Westminster Hall, and he had some observations to offer on that subject.

MR. HIBBERT said, the Vote would not be taken on the 9th of April.

MR. TOMLINSON said, it would be convenient to Members to know what Votes it was proposed to take upon the day Parliament re-assembled.

MR. HIBBERT: All the other Votes that it is possible to take.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported upon *Thursday* 9th April.

Committee to sit again upon *Thursday* 9th April.

TELEGRAPH ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

MOTION FOR LEAVE. [ADJOURNED DEBATE.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [24th March], "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Telegraph Acts, 1863 to 1878."

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: Mr. Speaker, this Motion for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Telegraph Acts was adjourned at a late hour a few nights ago, in order that I might have a fitting opportunity of stating the intentions of the Government with reference to the introduction of 6*d.* telegrams. The House will recollect that two years ago it carried against the Government, and by a considerable majority, the Resolu-

tion of my hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) calling for a reduction of the minimum charge for telegrams from 1*s.* to 6*d.* In view of this Resolution, the Government promised to introduce a new tariff with a 6*d.* minimum. In the interval, preparations have been made for the increase of business which is expected from the reduction, and about £500,000 has been spent on increasing the plant and adding to the wires on some of the principal lines, and it has been decided that the new tariff shall come into force on the 1st of August next. My lamented Predecessor (Mr. Fawcett), who took the greatest possible interest in this subject, had not come to any determination as to what the new tariff should be, and he left no indication what his views were on the subject; but he had appointed a Departmental Committee to report on the financial effect of various tariffs which had been suggested in different quarters. I am sorry to say that in the interval which has elapsed since the Resolution to which I have referred was adopted the financial position of the Telegraph Service has not only not improved, but is very decidedly worse than it was. The profit on the Telegraph Service, which for some years had been very low, gradually increased till the year 1881; but from 1881 down to the present time there has been, again, a considerable reduction. Hon. Members may probably have seen the Financial Statement for the past year on the subject of the Telegraph Service laid before the House a few days ago. It is a financial account made in pursuance of the Telegraph Acts; and on comparing it with the account for 1880-1 they will find that, whereas in the former year there was a surplus profit of £325,000 out of which to pay the interest on the capital invested in the telegraphs, last year there was a deficit of £19,600. The comparison, however, is scarcely a fair one, as the account for the last year includes the sum of £175,000 expended in adding to the plant for the purpose of introducing the 6*d.* telegram, and is, therefore, capital expenditure. Both accounts also contain a considerable expenditure, which is necessary year by year for extending the wires. Every year extensions are made in all parts of the country which involve a fresh expenditure upon plant. In order, therefore, to ascertain what the real cost of the Telegraph Service is, it would be necessary to deduct from the account any expenditure which is in the nature of capital expenditure. Now, if these deductions be made in the two years I speak of, and if the annual accounts were made out on strictly commercial principles, it would appear that the profit of 1881 was £440,000, in 1883-4 £322,000, and for the current year ending on the 31st of March next about £255,000, which would pay interest at the rate of not quite 2½ per cent on the capital which has been invested by the State on the purchase of the telegraphs and on adding to the plant. It will be seen, therefore, that between the year 1881 and the current year there has been a decrease of profit of nearly £200,000, and that the profit on the Telegraph Service is not now sufficient to pay 2½ per cent on the capital sum of £11,000,000 sterling which has been practically expended by the State on the telegraphs. This considerable reduction of £200,000 has been due to two causes; in the first place, to the very considerable additions to the salaries of the telegraphists and other officers of the Department which were made two or three years ago very much at the instance of hon. Members of the House, and which Mr. Fawcett considered to be absolutely necessary; and in part, also, to the fact that the cost of the maintenance of the telegraphs has increased within the last two or three years, owing to the necessity of replacing some of the posts and other plant taken over by the State from the Telegraph Companies. The House will see, therefore, that the margin of profit at the present time is not large, and does not pay full interest on the capital invested. I should also point out that, owing to the depression of trade, the receipts have been very stationary the last two or three years, and that we are now subject to the competition of the telephone. The next point which I have to bring under the notice of the House is the effect of the present tariff for telegrams, and how far it leads to unnecessary and unprofitable labour to the Department in the transmission of superfluous and unnecessary words. Under the Telegraph Act of 1868 no charge can be made by the Department for addresses; and for words in the text the

tariff is 1*s.* for 20 words, and 3*d.* for every five words afterwards. Now, the House will see that there is no inducement whatever to senders of telegrams to compress their addresses within reasonable limits, or to compress or limit the words of their text, provided they do not exceed 20; and the result is that a large number of unnecessary words are telegraphed. The average number of words in addresses is a little over 11, of which four are devoted to the name and address of the sender, and seven to that of the addressee; and the average number of words in the text is 17—making a total average of 28. We differ in our method of charge from nearly every other country in Europe. Almost without exception their tariffs are based on payment per word, including the addresses, and with some low minimum charge; the result is that there is every inducement to compress the words and limit the length of addresses and text. In foreign telegrams sent from this country, where the charge is a purely word rate, the average number of words used in addresses is five; in Germany it is only four, and the average number of words in the text of these foreign telegrams is also much below our average, the average difference between the number of words used in the addresses here and the Continent is six, the difference between 11 and five. Under our system of free addresses, there is no inducement whatever to limit the addresses; many firms habitually stamp their telegrams with the full name of their firm, where one word would be quite sufficient. I received myself a few days ago a telegram in which 26 words were used in the address, and where six would have amply sufficed; so that the Post Office was put to the trouble of telegraphing no less than 20 unnecessary words. It is the same with the text of the message. Very few people take any pains to limit their words within 20, and a great many purposely fill up the 20, because they like to have their money's worth. Indeed, it has been estimated that at least 30 or 40 per cent of the words telegraphed are superfluous and unnecessary; and the plant of the Department and the time of the staff are occupied in transmitting these unnecessary words without any benefit to the Government or to the public. If the tariff were such as to give inducement to compress the words and to cut off what is unnecessary, it is certain that the same plant and staff would transmit a greatly increased amount of business. The present annual number of inland private telegrams is 24,000,000, and the average receipt from them is 13*d.*, showing how few exceed 20 words. A very careful estimate has been made of the cost of transmitting them; and we believe that 10*d.* may fairly be taken as the average cost of transmitting a telegram, without taking into account interest on the plant. It will be obvious to the House that if we were to reduce the rates all round by one-half, retaining the free address, our receipts for the present telegrams would be reduced by one-half, or about £650,000, and our expenses would remain the same; while the increased business due to the reduction would be carried on at a loss, and would mean financial ruin to the Service. Another suggestion is that we should retain free addresses, and allow five words in the text; but it has been calculated that, assuming an increase of 30 per cent in the number of telegrams under this scheme, the difference to the Department, as compared with the present tariff, would be £264,000, or considerably more than the whole of the present margin of profit on the commercial account. This tariff, also, would not be very favourable to the public, for while it would allow any number of words in the address the words in the text would be very limited; and it would not be open to senders to economize their words in the address, in order to add them to the message itself. The fact is, that if only a small total number of words can be allowed for the minimum charge, it is the interest of the senders of telegrams that they should be allowed to economize words in the address, in order to add them to the message itself. It becomes, therefore, the interest both of the sender and the public, as well as of the Government, that inducement should be given to limit the words of the address; and the only way of effecting this is to charge rateably for the words used both in the address and in the message. After careful consideration of all the various tariffs which have been suggested, I have come to the conclusion that of those which are within financial possibility, the best, both for the

senders of telegrams and for the Department—the one which will give the best return, while giving the greatest latitude to the sender, will be one by which 12 words will be given for 6*d.*, and 1*d.* for each additional two words, this to include the words in the address, free addresses being abolished. That will give five words for the address, and seven for the text. We believe that, under this tariff, the average number of words used in the address will be reduced from 11 to five, of which one word only will be the average of the sender's address, and four of the address of the receiver. In a very large number of cases it will be unnecessary to insert any address for the sender. The text will show clearly from whom it comes; in nine cases out of ten one word will suffice; and in the same way, though not in the same proportion, there will be great economies in the address of the receiver. There will also be great economies in the text of messages; a careful examination of great numbers of telegrams has convinced the officers of the Telegraph Department that 30 or 40 per cent of the telegrams now sent for 1*s.* will in future be compressed so as to be sent for the minimum charge of 6*d.* Of the new business attracted by this low tariff, a very much larger proportion will be at the minimum rate. It is estimated that there will be an immediate increase of business of 30 per cent. It is thus calculated that the average receipts for telegrams will be reduced from 13*d.* to 10*d.*, and that the average cost of transmitting them will be reduced from 10*d.* to 8¾*d.*, leaving a margin of 1¼*d.* The difference to the Department, therefore, partly in the shape of reduced receipts and partly in increased staff, will be about £180,000 per annum, which the House will see will leave us but a very small margin of profit; but it may be expected to improve. At all events, it will cost us for the first year £180,000. The tariff I have thus proposed is very much that which was suggested two years ago by a large majority of the principal Chambers of Commerce, and, I think, by the hon. Member for Glasgow. The only objection I have heard to it is that the abolition of free addresses may tell somewhat unequally upon the poorer classes of the community who live in our great towns, and whose addresses require fuller description than others. I should be very sorry if this class should not receive full benefit from any change, and, with this view, I have made inquiries. At present a telegram costing 1*s.* is a rare luxury to people in this class. I have made inquiries at the principal Telegraph Offices in the East End of London and other parts of the country where the working classes mainly live, with a view of collecting reliable statistics on this point; and I find that, out of 24,000 telegrams, only 167 can be attributed to persons in this class, or less than ½ per cent. These telegrams have been carefully examined; 156 of them were sent for 1*s.*; of these 71, or nearly one-half, could be compressed without any difficulty, and by the exercise of very ordinary intelligence, within 12 words, including their addresses, so as to come within the minimum charge of 6*d.* These figures have been carefully tested, and I have a Return which the hon. Gentleman the Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) can have if he likes, and he will see that what I have said is correct. The fact is, that the great bulk of these telegrams are of the simplest character, reporting the death or the illness of a member of the family, or reporting the movements of the sender, and require a very few words to tell their tale. I am convinced, from a personal examination of these telegrams, that the senders of them will derive at least their full share in the benefit which is to result from the tariff I propose, and that the 6*d.* telegram will be an immense boon to the poorer classes of the community, and bring the telegraph within the reach of large numbers to whom at present the sending of a telegram at 1*s.* is a very great luxury. I have, in conclusion, to say that the measure which I propose will repeal the provisions of the Telegraph Act of 1868, requiring that addresses should be transmitted free of charge, and will enable the Post Office to charge a word rate for addresses, as well as for the text of messages. In adopting this tariff, we shall bring our system into harmony with that of every other country in Europe; we shall put ourselves in a position to meet on better terms the competition of the Telephone Companies; and we shall

be doing the very utmost which the financial position of the Telegraph Service permits of, and we hope that the House will consent to adopt our scheme.

MR. STUART-WORTLEY said, he was glad to see the development of the telegraph system which the right hon. Gentleman had indicated; but he entered an early protest against the proposal to charge for the address of the consignee. He failed to see how such a charge could be justified, because the address contained the only words which enabled the Post Office to perform their part of the contract. He was well aware that in some extreme cases, such as had been referred to by the right hon. Gentleman, great inconvenience might be caused by a good many unnecessary words being in the address; but in the particular case the right hon. Gentleman had mentioned, he could see that the matter arose out of the desire on the part of the sender of the message to give the right hon. Gentleman all his titles and additions. He hoped, under all the circumstances, that this part of the scheme would not be pressed, although he fully admitted that the address of the sender was rather a luxury. He should like the right hon. Gentleman to inform the House, also, whether the present 1*s.* rate would be retained alongside the new rate?

DR. CAMERON said, he had listened to the statement of the right hon. Gentleman with considerable pleasure, although he thought he had taken a gloomy view of the financial side of the matter. He had told them that there would be a loss of £180,000 during the first year, and he gave them to believe that that was a pessimist estimate; but, for his part, he (Dr. Cameron) hoped that that amount of loss would not be come up to. The decreasing revenue of the Telegraph Department in late years was, to his mind, due to the fact that the increase under the 1*s.* rate had now reached its natural limit; and he believed that by a diminution in the cost of telegrams a great increase of revenue would be effected. He entirely approved of the proposal to charge a halfpenny per word rate; but he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider that portion of his scheme which related to the address of the consignee. It would not be very difficult to get into 12 words what might be got into 13; and it was certainly of much more importance that the address of the consignee should be given with sufficient fulness to be thoroughly intelligible, especially in the case of inland and cable telegrams. As a matter of fact, there had been three schemes submitted to Parliament. In the first place, it was proposed to allow the addresses both of the sender and the consignee; and it was said that that would be an expensive scheme, costing the country something like £600,000. By the second plan it was proposed that the address of the sender should be charged, while that of the receiver should go free; and it was estimated that that would cost £64,000. And now there was a third scheme proposed by his right hon. Friend. He should have preferred to have that scheme which would be most conducive to the interests of the public; but, of course, it was only to be expected that the Department would consider the cost. He was convinced that the business of the telegraph would become much developed in consequence of this Bill; and when that was the case the public might reasonably hope for the introduction of further improvements. On the whole, he thought the scheme very similar to that which was shadowed forth by the late Postmaster General; and he did not think that anything very much better could have been expected.

MR. TOMLINSON said, that it would appear, from the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General, that there had been a diminution in the receipts from the telegraphs; but he (Mr. Tomlinson) was very much inclined to believe that that arose from the enormous increase of the telephones. He did not think the Post Office were realizing how these telephones were interfering with the existing system. In the Metropolis the telephones had been developed to an enormous extent; and if inquiries were made of men of business, of the Railway Companies, and persons engaged in various commercial undertakings, who had been in the habit of using the telegraphs on a large scale, it would be found that the development of the telephones had very much diminished the telegrams. He thought the Post Office had missed a great opportunity in not taking up the telephones

and working them upon a large scale in conjunction with the telegraphs. He believed it would be much more beneficial to the country at large if they were worked by the Post Office instead of by private Companies.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR expressed dissatisfaction with the scheme as a whole. He would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General that there were two ways in which he might overcome the difficulty which appeared to confront him in regard to the question of addresses. One was to adopt a system of counting numbers as a word. For instance, in such an address as "241, Euston Road," the "241" might be counted as one word only. In the next place, they might adopt the system now followed in regard to cablegrams, and permit the address of the sender to be registered. He did not know whether that was the case in reference to inland telegrams; but, if not, he thought it ought to be made a necessary complement of the present scheme. The registration of the name would probably take away a certain proportion of money from the telegraphic revenue; but it might be made up by charging a small fee for registration. At present, he believed, a fee of a guinea was charged for the registration of a name in connection with cablegrams, and the same plan might be adopted in regard to the telegraphs. Then, again, the work of telegraphing would be much facilitated if a considerable change were made in the names of the streets in the Metropolis. At present there were a large number of streets with duplicate names, such as Oxford Street, King Street, Queen Street, Lansdowne Road, &c. To this fact might frequently be traced the difficulty of finding an address. So far as the mere number of words contained in a telegram was concerned, he could say, from personal experience, that there was nothing more easy than to cut down a telegram of 30 words to one of 10. The art of condensation, however, was only acquired by training and practice; but in future it would be largely stimulated by the fact that people would find they saved money by it. When people had to pay 1*s.* for 20 words they were inclined to think that it would be impossible to get full value for their money unless they put in the full 20 words, and made the address as long as possible. As a rule, under the existing system, the Post Office officials were put to from 20 to 30 per cent more trouble than was necessary. Although he was not altogether satisfied with the scheme of the Government, he was inclined to think that it might be made to work well.

MR. SEXTON said, he thought there was considerable force in the objection that under the new scheme, with the addresses charged for, the sender of 20-word telegrams would be placed at some disadvantage as compared with the position in which they stood under the present system. Under the 1*s.* rate the addresses of the sender and receiver were allowed to pass free, and the telegram itself might consist of 20 words. But in future, if the same individual wished to send 20 words, and the addresses contained six additional words, he would be a sufferer under the present scheme, and would have to pay 1*s.* 1*d.* instead of 1*s.* He believed that, as a matter of fact, the address of the sender and receiver usually required 10 words, and therefore the sender of a 1*s.* telegram would have to pay his 1*s.* for 14 words instead of 20. He thought it should be optional on the part of the public whether they selected the 1*s.* rate or the 6*d.* rate.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he did not think it would be possible to keep up the two scales of charges together. The hon. Member was quite right in saying that the sender of a 1*s.* telegram would be under a slight disadvantage under the new system as compared with the old. But the disadvantage would be very slight indeed. It was anticipated that the addresses would be reduced, on the average, to five words; and, assuming that to be the case, as 24 words were allowed instead of 20 for 1*s.* the sender of the telegram would be a sufferer to the extent of one word. He was prepared to admit that the competition of the telephone had had some effect already upon the Telegraph Service. The receipts from the telegraphs had been very stationary during the last two years, partly owing to the depression of trade, and partly from the competition of the telephone. The telegraph receipts had lately been decreasing, although there had been no decrease in the number of telegrams. It was hoped, however, that by the reduction of charge which was now proposed a more favour-

able return would be obtained. In reply to the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) he might say that the question of the numbers included in the addresses was under consideration.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE and Mr. HIBBERT.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY RE-DISTRIBUTION BILL.

(*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland.*)

[BILL 105.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Redistribution of the Constabulary Force).

MR. CAMPBELL - BANNERMAN moved an Amendment to provide that the Lord Lieutenant should redistribute the Force every three instead of every five years.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, at the beginning of line 8, to leave out "five," and insert "three."—(*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question, "That 'three' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clauses 2 to 4, inclusive, *agreed to.*

MR. SEXTON moved to insert the following new Clause:—

"A Return shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament one clear month before every such distribution, giving the number of sergeants and constables proposed to be distributed as a free quota for each county, city, or town specified in the Schedule to the said Act of 1865, and for the City of Londonderry."

The hon. Member said the object of the clause was to secure that on every occasion on which the Lord Lieutenant redistributed the Force the House of Commons should have an opportunity of expressing an opinion upon it. The result of knowing beforehand what the Government proposed to do would probably be a saving of time.

New Clause (Return to be laid before Parliament)—(*Mr. Sexton,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be now read a second time."

MR. CAMPBELL - BANNERMAN remarked that the clause moved by the hon. Member had not been placed upon the Paper, and he had consequently had no opportunity of knowing exactly what it was.

MR. SEXTON said, he would read it again if the right hon. Gentleman wished.

MR. CAMPBELL - BANNERMAN said, that was not necessary; but, as the clause had not been placed upon the Paper, he would suggest that it should be brought up upon the Report.

MR. SEXTON said, he had no objection to take that course.

Motion and Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Monday* 13th April.

EGYPTIAN LOAN.—REPORT.

Resolution [March 27] *reported,* and *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill upon the said Resolution."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he had no objection to the Motion for leave to bring in a Bill, which was a mere matter of form; but he would like to say a word or two upon another matter which was of very great importance. The Prime Minister had stated that he wished to obtain a definitive vote from the House upon the question of the loan before the Easter Recess. He had now obtained that vote, and he (Sir R. Assheton Cross) now wished to appeal to the Government, when the Bill founded upon the Resolution was brought in, not to press it to any further stage until such time as the House might reasonably be expected to be full of Members. He understood that the Government proposed that the second reading should be taken on Thursday week, the day on which the House would re-assemble after Easter. That he thought would be a very unsatisfactory arrangement.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 31st March, 1885.

The House met at Two of the clock.

MINUTES.] — PRIVATE BILLS (*by Order*) — *Second Reading*—Clapham and City Subway *; King's Cross, Charing Cross, and Waterloo Subway *; Mossley Improvement *; Weston-super-Mare, Clevedon, and Portishead Tramways * Whitehaven Town and Harbour *; Worcester; and Broom Railway (No. 2).*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered—First Reading*—Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 4) * [116]; Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 5) * [117]; Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 6) * [118]; Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 7) * [119]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) * [120]; Egyptian Loan * [122].

First Reading—Telegraph Acts Amendment * [121].

Second Reading—Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 2) * [107]; Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 3) * [108].

QUESTION.

—o—

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND) — THE RIOTS AT DERRY—FIRING AT A PROCESSION.

MR. LEWIS asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the fact that, during and after the Nationalist procession on St. Patrick's Day passing over the walls of Derry City, shots were fired by some of the processionists, on two different occasions in the day, in the direction of foot passengers, who on the second occasion consisted of little children; whether the name of a person alleged to be one of the offenders was communicated to the police many days since; and, whether any steps have been or will be taken for the prosecution of the alleged offender?

MR. O'BRIEN: Before the right hon. Gentleman answers I would ask the Chief Secretary if the newspaper organ of the hon. Member for Derry, *The Londonderry Sentinel*, on whose statement his Question is founded, is not the same paper condemed in this House by the ex-Chief Secretary (Mr. Trevelyan) for a gross attack on Mr. Justice Murphy, who sentenced the Apprentice Boy Doherty to eighteen months' imprisonment with hard labour for shooting and wounding with a revolver on the occasion of Lord Mayor Dawson's visit; whether *The Londonderry Standard*, the recognized Government organ in Derry, edited by a distinguished Presbyterian Professor, member of the Royal University Senate, has put on record of St. Patrick's Day celebration in Derry the following criticism, namely:—

"It is well known that we do not approve of Party processions in any form, owing to the unkindly feelings that they tend to excite in the general community. But if such things are to be, it is only right to express the almost universal feeling that nothing of the kind could have been better conducted than that which traversed the city and passed along the Walls on Tuesday last. That a procession consisting of from ten to twenty thousand men, with bands and flags and symbols, could pass along the street at a time when public feeling is so easily excited, without giving offence or taking offence, is eminently creditable to all who took part in it."

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have no knowledge of what appeared in the Londonderry newspapers, and I have as little knowledge of the source from which the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Lewis) derives his information. With regard to the Question of the hon. Member, I have to say that the Constabulary were informed that a man had fired off his revolver in the street at a time when there were children there; but it was not stated that the children were fired at. The witness declined to swear an information; but the police have summoned the man who is alleged to have fired, and they have also summoned the informant as a witness.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—CLERK OF THE PEACE, CO. DONEGAL—ALLEGED ABSTRACTION OF PUBLIC RECORDS.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, during the term of office of the present Clerk of the Peace in the county of Donegal, or that of his immediate predecessor his father, and to whom he was assistant, a number of public records have been made away with from the Peace Office in Lifford; and, whether the attention of the Government has been called thereto, and what steps they intend to take in the matter?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The records of the Peace Office at Donegal are not, and never were, under the control of the Government. I understand a question has arisen with regard to the custody of certain documents alleged to have been deposited in this office in 1847; but the present clerk, who was appointed in 1872, states that no records have been made away with in his time. I believe the Lieutenant of the County, as Custos Rotulorum, is the legal keeper of the records of the Peace Office.

POST OFFICE—IRREGULAR DELIVERIES AT WEST BROMPTON.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Postmaster General, Whether he has received complaints of letters misdelivered and gone astray in connection with the post office at 262, Fulham Road, West Brompton?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE, in reply, said: About four months since it was found that some circulars which had passed through the Post Office at 262, Fulham Road, West Brompton, were delayed in delivery. These irregularities were brought home to an auxiliary postman, who was proceeded against at the Hammersmith Police Court, on the 18th of December last, and sentenced to pay a fine and costs, or to suffer 14 days' imprisonment. No further irregularities connected with the office in question have since been brought to my notice.

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether in future Reports of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland a Return will be given containing information similar to that contained in a Paper printed by order of this House on 27th May, 1884, viz., a Return of the attendances made by each Commissioner at the ordinary or special meetings of the Board; the dates of such meetings; and the names of Commissioners present on each occasion, &c.; and, whether he can assure this House that the attendance of the several members of the Board is satisfactory to Her Majesty's Government, or in any degree commensurate with the importance of the charge committed to the care of the Commissioners?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The proposal in the first part of this Question is one which so obviously concerns the Commissioners of Education themselves, that until I have had an opportunity of learning their views regarding it I can make no statement whatever on the subject. I understand the Commissioners will consider the matter at their meeting to-day. As regards the general question, the Return quoted by the hon. Member shows that on no occasion during the year to which it relates did the attendance of Commissioners fall short of the number necessary to constitute a quorum, and the Government have no reason to suppose this state of affairs is other than the normal one. Speaking for the present Government, I can assure the hon. Member that in filling up any vacancies on the Board one of the main considerations we have in view is the ability of the gentleman selected to give a satisfactory attendance at the Board.

MR. SEXTON asked if the right hon. Gentleman was aware that there were 40 ordinary meetings of the Board held during the year; whether a large number of them were attended by only three members, and several by only two; and if the Government considered these attendances satisfactory?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have looked into the Return, and I have nothing to add.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, How many assistant teachers were in the service of the National Education Board (Ireland) on the 31st December 1883, whose places, if vacated, could not be filled under the average at present required for assistants?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I understand the number was 676.

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION—APPEALS IN CO. KERRY.

MR. HARRINGTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he is aware of the serious inconvenience caused to a large number of tenants in the county of Kerry by the great delay in the hearing of appeals from the decisions of the Sub-Commissions; whether, at the last sitting of the Head Commission in Killarney, not a single case from the Unions of Tralee

and Killarney was heard, though a great many have been pending for two years; whether the tenants concerned, in a large number of these cases, attended with their witnesses at Killarney for more than a week at great expense; whether a promise made by Judge O'Hagan to hold another sitting in Killarney early in the summer has not been kept, inasmuch as the official list of fixtures up to August makes no reference to Kerry; and, whether a remedy will be provided for this state of things, which presses so hardly on the tenants?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have just received a telegram from the Land Commissioners, which I will read in reply to this Question—

"It is the case that the Land Commissioners were unable from want of time to finish the cases listed for hearing at Killarney at the last sitting there in December, and the cases from the Unions of Tralee and Killarney remained unheard. Only two of the cases from these Unions had been pending for two years at the date of the last sitting. The Commissioners, as a rule, put at the end of the list the districts nearest to the place of sitting, so that if a postponement of some of the cases should become inevitable the least degree of inconvenience may be occasioned. They, therefore, think it improbable that tenants and their witnesses from places so accessible as the Unions of Tralee and Killarney remained in the town of Killarney for a week with the witnesses. Mr. Justice O'Hagan did not promise to hold another sitting in Killarney early in the summer. The official list of hearings fixed in the several parts of Ireland up to August referred to in the Question had been issued before the Killarney sitting in December took place, and have since remained unchanged. What Mr. Justice O'Hagan did say was that the Commissioners would, after having gone through the hearings at the several places named in the list, go in August and hear the cases not heard in the County Kerry, and this the Commissioners intend to do, though it may encroach upon the vacation."

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE CROWN SOLICITOR, CO. KILKENNY.

MR. HARRINGTON asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Is it a fact that the Sessional Crown Solicitor for Kilkenny resides in Dublin, and is paid his travelling expenses for attending to the duties of his office in Kilkenny, whether on ordinary or special occasions; and, whether the duties would be more efficiently performed if the said Crown Solicitor resided in his district; and, if so, whether Mr. Attorney General will permit the present practice to continue?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER): The Sessional Crown Solicitor for Kilkenny resides in Dublin. It was no part of the conditions of his appointment that he should reside in his county. Like every other Sessional Crown Solicitor, he is only paid the actual travelling expenses incurred by him within his county when on special duty—that is, duty other than attendance at Quarter Sessions. He is not paid his expenses for going to Kilkenny. The Attorney General informs me that the duties are efficiently discharged, and that he sees no reason to alter the conditions of the appointment.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) BILL.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the Government will introduce into their Registration (Ireland) Bill a provision to oblige objectors (to the right of claimants) to specify the ground of their objection; also a provision to cast the onus of proof on the objector to a claimant or voter, and to render liable to a penalty in respect to each objection proved to be groundless; and, what provision will be made in view of the declarations of clerks of unions in Ireland that the time allowed by present arrangements for preparations of the new registers is wholly insufficient?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The hon. Member is no doubt aware that the Irish Government are anxious that the amendments of the Registration Law suggested in the first part of his Question should be extended to Ireland, and that in 1883 they brought in a Bill accordingly, which, however, did not become law, although it was carried through this House. The present Registration Bill was introduced with a view of facilitating the arrangements for the next revision, and I fear that its passage would be imperilled by the introduction of a clause which might fairly be expected to lead to much opposition. If the Registration Bill passes on an early date, and the local officials commence their preliminary proceedings without delay, and exercise a reasonable diligence, they ought to be able, in the opinion of the Government, to complete the registration within the time limited by law.

MR. HARRINGTON: The Question of my hon. Friend refers to the state of the law in Ireland, whereby every per-

son entitled to the franchise may be compelled to come up to prove his claim; and I would ask whether, having regard to the fact that at the approaching Revision Sessions the registry will be doubled, the right hon. Gentleman does not consider it necessary to introduce some provision for putting an end to that anomalous condition of things? Does the right hon. Gentleman think it will be carrying out the Franchise Act to leave it in the power of any person in Ireland to oblige every single claimant to come up to prove his claim?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said, the intention of the Government was that a General Election should take place in the early autumn, and in order to provide for that it was necessary to pass the Bill without delay. It would not be possible to pass the Bill in time if any debatable matter were included in it.

MR. HARRINGTON: The right hon. Gentleman does not understand my Question. I may remind him that at the approaching Revision Sessions the number on the register will practically be doubled.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is only entitled to ask a Question, which he is not doing now.

MR. HARRINGTON: I am asking a Question, Mr. Speaker. I am asking the Chief Secretary whether, having regard to the fact that the constituencies in Ireland will be practically doubled, nay trebled, at the approaching Revision Sessions, the right hon. Gentleman thinks that the intention of the Franchise Act will be carried out if he leaves untouched the anomalous condition of the law by which every person entitled to be placed on the list of voters may be arbitrarily compelled to come up to prove his claim?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The hon. Member can suggest any Amendment which will secure the object he has in view, and at the same time will not delay the Bill. The Government will be prepared to give it every consideration.

MR. SEXTON said, clauses would be proposed in Committee. Was it true that the Solicitor General for Ireland had stated to a company of barristers that it was the intention of the Government to go to the country on November 15th?

[No reply.]

POOR LAW (ENGLAND AND WALES)—SMALL-POX—RE-VACCINATION AS A PREVENTIVE.

MR. HOPWOOD asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether the statement in the pamphlet entitled "Facts concerning Vaccination," sanctioned by his Department, that—

> "None of the nurses at any of the London small-pox hospitals who have been duly re-vaccinated before entering on their duties have ever caught small-pox,"

is accurate; whether the Department is aware that at Stockwell Hospital, in 1877, three nurses, at Fulham Hospital three nurses at one time, and four at a later period, at Deptford Hospital one, within eight days after re-vaccination, were all attacked with small-pox; whether he is aware that at Halifax Hospital, in 1881, the matron and a nurse, at Sheffield Hospital the medical officer and a nurse, at Lewes Fever Hospital, 1881, a nurse, all contracted small-pox after re-vaccination; whether he is aware that Dr. Bakewell, of the Trinidad Hospital, took the disease after six re-vaccinations; whether it is the custom to employ, as nurses, as many as possible who have suffered small-pox; and, whether he will restrain such statements from being published with the sanction, in any degree, of his Department?

MR. GEORGE RUSSELL: The Board are aware of the statement alluded to, and, while they have no reason to doubt that it is substantially accurate, they admit that it might have been more guardedly expressed. As regards the Stockwell Hospital, it appears from the report of the medical superintendent in 1882 that four cases of small-pox had occurred among the staff since 1876, three of which were very mild, and one severe; but in that case the infection was believed to have been contracted before the officer came on duty. At Fulham Hospital we are aware that four nurses had slight attacks, which occurred a few days after they entered the hospital, and in each case the disease ran concurrently with re-vaccination. At the Deptford Hospital there was one case—the disease was incubating at the time of re-vaccination. As regards the Halifax Hospital, the hon. Member was informed by the late President of the Board in May, 1881, that a small-pox patient was sent to the fever hospital,

and that the matron and staff were strongly urged to be vaccinated, but they refused. The matron three weeks afterwards showed symptoms of the disease, and on the day following four of the nurses were vaccinated; but in one case small-pox showed itself in two days, and in another in four days. They were, therefore, under the influence of the disease when the vaccination took place. We have no information at present as to the Sheffield Hospital, but we are making inquiry with regard to it. With respect to the Lewes Hospital, it is to be inferred from the report of the medical officer of health that the re-vaccination was not performed until the nurse had contracted small-pox. We have no information as to Dr. Bakewell, of the Trinidad Hospital. We believe it is not the general custom in the hospitals of the Metropolitan Asylums Board to employ nurses who have had small-pox. From the report of the medical superintendent of the Fulham Hospital in March, 1882, it appeared that at Fulham 42 out of a staff of 295 had had small-pox, at Stockwell 16 out of 340, and at Deptford 20 out of 265. The Board are quite willing to bring under the attention of the National Health Society the particular cases to which attention has been drawn.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND) — MR. HARDMAN, J.P., NEWTOWN-STEWART.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, in a case against Richard Montgomery, gamekeeper to Mr. E. T. Hardman, J.P., lately heard at the Newtownstewart Petty Sessions, a sergeant and a constable swore that while they were engaged in seizing the contents of an illicit still-house, Montgomery presented a loaded double-barrelled gun at the sergeant, who closed with him and succeeded, after a struggle, in disarming and handcuffing him; whether Montgomery's employer, Mr. Hardman, J.P. presided at the hearing of the case, and, from his place on the Bench, gave Montgomery a character for truthfulness, whereupon the Bench dismissed the case; and, whether the Lord Chancellor of Ireland has had his attention drawn to this mode of dealing with such a charge, and to the conduct of Mr. Hardman in presiding at the hearing of a criminal charge against his employé, and offering testimony from the Bench in behalf of the accused?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: This Question assumes a state of facts at variance with that appearing on the Reports furnished to me. It appears Mr. Hardman did give Montgomery a character whilst occupying the chair, and in doing so I think he showed some indiscretion; but as he did not further interfere during the hearing of the case, and took no part in the adjudication upon it, there are not sufficient grounds for referring the matter to the Lord Chancellor.

FISHERIES (IRELAND) — BOARDS OF CONSERVATORS—FREE FISHING LICENCES.

MR. O'BRIEN asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Whether it is legal for a Board of Fishery Conservators to issue rod licences free; and, if so, in virtue of what statute and section?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER): Boards of Conservators are not under the control of the Government. It seems to me questionable whether they are not bound to account in their funds for the duty on all licences issued by them, whether money passed or not. I am not aware how they act under such circumstances, and we have no authority to inquire.

MR. O'BRIEN asked for a distinct statement as to whether the practice was illegal?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER): That seems to depend on a state of facts of which I have no knowledge.

MR. CALLAN: As Chairman of the Committee now inquiring into this matter, is not the hon. and learned Gentleman aware that these licences are not legal unless the Board of Conservators account for the amount of licences with their clerk?

[No reply.]

FISHERY BOARD (IRELAND) — PAYMENT OF COASTGUARDSMEN EMPLOYED ON SPECIAL DUTY.

MR. CALLAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is a fact that the Irish Inspectors of Fisheries employed a number of Coastguards on special duty towards the latter end of last year and the begin-

ning of this year; that the men so employed necessarily had to travel in many cases long distances at their own expense; and that, since they furnished their accounts of expenses in the usual manner and with the usual sanction and approval of their officers, they have not been paid the amounts due to them by the Irish Fishery Department; and, if such is the case, will he give the necessary instructions that the said accounts be paid to these poor men forthwith, and state the reasons, if any, why the payment of these accounts, due long since, have been so withheld?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: My attention was first called to this matter by the Question of the hon. Member. I regret to find that there has been delay in settling these claims; but I understand they are now being paid. I have been unable to obtain a satisfactory explanation of the delay, but I have given orders which I hope will prevent its recurrence.

THE NATIONAL GALLERY CATALOGUE.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, How long it is since the public have been unable to obtain a Catalogue at the National Gallery, and if there is any probability of Sir William Burton finishing the new one in time for the summer visitors?

MR. HIBBERT: The abridged catalogue of the foreign schools has been revised from time to time, and is now on sale, as is also that of the British and modern pictures. The larger catalogue of the foreign schools is now under revision; but as my hon. Friend has not allowed me time to communicate with Sir Frederick Burton, I cannot say when the new edition may be expected to appear.

ENGLAND AND TURKEY—THE ANGLO-TURKISH CONVENTION.

MR. M'COAN asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the Anglo-Turkish Convention is regarded by Her Majesty's Government as being still in force; or whether, like Article 11 of the Treaty of Paris, it was intended to be only provisional and not permanent?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I cannot undertake at a few hours' Notice to go into the matters brought forward by the hon. Member's inquiry, which raise questions which are matters of opinion, and could in any case hardly be answered within the limits usually assigned to a reply in this House.

MR. M'COAN: I must really press my Question on the noble Lord. It is one of fact. Is an existing Treaty, to which Her Majesty's Government were parties some years ago, now in force or not? It is a simple question of fact, and no opinion which the noble Lord can express can affect a question of International Law. I must ask for an answer, "Yes" or "No."

[No reply.]

MR. RAIKES asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any instructions which might have been sent to Her Majesty's Representative at Constantinople with respect to the signature of the Convention by Turkey and any Correspondence or telegrams on the subject would be communicated to the House in the next Papers presented?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I cannot reply to that Question without having previously communicated with the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT — EDUCATION GRANTS.

MR. LODER asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, At what time Education Grants are due, and at what average time after inspection and report the Grants due ought actually to be paid?

MR. MUNDELLA: The grant is conditionally due at the end of the school year. The grant ought to be paid within a month after the inspection of the school, provided that the returns and information furnished by the managers are complete. Any delay generally arises from the fact that the managers have omitted to supply some information which is required to satisfy the conditions of the Code. Special instructions have lately been issued to expedite the payments.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND) BILL.

MR. GIBSON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Judge of the Court of Probate has forwarded any Letter and Memorandum to the Irish Executive,

relative to the parts of the Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Bill affecting the Court over which he presides; and, whether he will lay such Letter and Memorandum upon the Table? In putting the Question the right hon. and learned Gentleman said he hoped the Bill would not be taken on the first day the House re-assembled. He would like an assurance that it would not be taken until, at all events, a week after the House re-assembled.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Yes, Sir; I have received a letter and memorandum from the Judge, and they are at present under consideration. I will see whether they can be laid upon the Table of the House. I cannot say when the Bill will be taken, but there is no intention to take it the first day the House re-assembles.

LAW AND POLICE—BOY ACROBATS.

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been directed to a letter in *The Pall Mall Gazette* of Saturday last, which stated that boys performing in the circus called "Ginnette's" were trained to perform their feats surrounded by men holding whips, who, each time they failed, lashed them severely, till sometimes their backs were one mass of blood; and, whether he would institute an inquiry as to the truth of this statement, and, if possible, have a stop put to such revolting cruelty?

MR. W. H. JAMES asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been directed to a Letter, signed G. Napier Whittingham, in *The Pall Mall Gazette* of 28th March, detailing certain cruelties practised upon children by trainers and managers of a travelling circus known as "Ginnette's Circus;" and, if he will take steps to ascertain whether these statements are correct, with a view of instituting proceedings to prevent their occurrence?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I am afraid there is hardly substance enough in the Questions to warrant an official inquiry. A gentleman writes to the newspapers to say that a friend of his was told by somebody else that something happened, not now, but at some former time. In reality the information comes to me at fourth hand, and I cannot set about an inquiry. If my hon. Friends will vouch for the story themselves, or will give me some foundation for it, I will make an inquiry.

MR. W. H. JAMES: I will repeat my Question when the House re-assembles.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: There is no use in repeating the Question unless the hon. Member gives me some more information on the subject.

ARMY—LONGFORD BARRACKS.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, in reply to a memorial from the Town Commissioners of Longford, asking to have Longford made head-quarters for a Cavalry regiment, he stated that, owing to Departmental arrangements, this could not be done at that time, but that Longford should continue to be the head-quarters of the County Militia, and also a station for a troop of Cavalry and for Infantry; and, whether it is now proposed to take away the Militia from Longford this year during the period for training, thereby leading to the consequence that the wives and families depending on these men, who are, for the most part, drawn from the labouring classes, may be thrown upon the local rates or on public and private charities for support?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I must refer the hon. Member to my reply on the 24th of November last, in which I stated that the General Officer commanding in Ireland had no occasion, under present circumstances, for Cavalry at Longford. The stations of troops must depend upon military necessities. The Militia battalions are trained by turns at the Curragh camp; and this year the turn falls to the Longford Militia battalion, now known as the 6th Battalion Rifle Brigade. Its head-quarters remain at Longford for ordinary purposes.

EGYPT (THE MILITARY EXPEDITION)—THE CAMEL CORPS.

GENERAL OWEN WILLIAMS asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he will state, with regard to the Camel Corps which formed the principal portion of Sir Herbert Stewart's force at Abu Klea, how many are now fit for duty; how many have been killed, wounded, and invalided; and, how many are in hospital; and, whether he can give the number of camels now in possession of this force?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: The latest Return of the strength of the Camel Corps is dated at Gubat on February 1. The numbers at that date, exclusive of men absent from any cause, but including the sick present, were 58 officers and 987 non-commissioned officers and men. The total casualties reported were—killed, died of wounds, and missing:—seven officers and 95 non-commissioned officers and men; wounded:—11 officers and 141 non-commissioned officers and men. The number of sick absent on the 1st of February was 154. The number of camels is not given.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—BAILIEBOROUGH PETTY SESSIONS.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Is he aware that at the Petty Sessions of Bailieborough, on the 17th of March, John Clarke, aged 75 years, was sentenced by the presiding magistrates, on a charge of drunkenness, to imprisonment for one month with hard labour, without the option of a fine; and, whether he is prepared to recommend a mitigation of the punishment?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: John Clarke was sentenced, as stated, to a month's imprisonment. A Memorial was presented to the Lord Lieutenant, and His Excellency ordered his discharge on the payment of a fine of 20*s*.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE TUBBERCURRY PRISONERS.

MR. SEXTON asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Whether, in the cases of the Tubbercurry prisoners, arrested 31st March 1884, and discharged from custody on 11th November 1884, on entry of nolle prosequi by the Crown, the expenses of the accused and witnesses for the defence have not yet been paid; what has been done in the matter since, as announced in the House some months ago, it was taken out of the hands of the Crown Solicitor for Sligo, and referred for attention to the Crown and Treasury Solicitor for Ireland; and, will these costs be now discharged?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER): As this Question only appeared to-day, I have not had time to ascertain whether the costs have been paid or taxed. I shall inquire into the matter when I go to Dublin.

EGYPT—ZEBEHR PASHA.

MR. J. W. LOWTHER asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, By whom the warrant for the arrest of Zebehr Pasha was signed?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Zebehr Pasha was arrested by the British Military Authorities in Egypt with the previous sanction of Her Majesty's Government. I am not aware that any warrant was issued.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—CASE OF SERGEANT DELANEY.

MR. BARRY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he has yet received a report from the Inspector General of Constabulary as to the course taken in the case of Sergeant Delaney, Royal Irish Constabulary of Newtownbarry?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Inspector General has carefully considered this matter. He is of opinion that Sergeant Delaney acted with over zeal and absence of judgment in this case, and that he did not possess the local knowledge he should have had to deal with it properly. He further thinks that this was clearly a case in which the Sergeant was bound to have made inquiry before acting in the summary and precipitate manner he did. However, as no improper motive or intention has been attributed to the Sergeant, who is a man of long service and previous good conduct, the Inspector General thinks that, in addition to his removal from Newtownbarry, which has taken place, it will be sufficient to admonish and caution him as to his future conduct, and to inform him that should he again act so indiscreetly, and with so little tact and judgment, he cannot be considered as fit to retain his rank of Sergeant.

EGYPT—THE CONVENTION.

MR. M'COAN asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If there is any, and what, truth in the reported statement that the Sultan was induced to become a party to the recent Egyptian Convention under threat from Lord Granville that, if he refused, the payment of the Egyptian tribute to the Porte would be stopped?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: As stated a few days ago by the Prime Minister, the signature of the Declara-

tion and Convention relating to Egyptian finance by the Ambassador of the Ottoman Porte was delayed owing to a misunderstanding, but that misunderstanding being now removed, and the signature having taken place, there would be no public advantage in entering into the confidential communications which may have passed between Her Majesty's Government and the Porte.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I wish to ask whether these menaces, which we understand were used to the Porte on this question, were used with the view of obtaining allies for this country in the case of a possible European war?

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: Is it not a fact that Ministers in this House have stated, in regard to the tribute to be paid by Egypt to the Porte, that it was one of the preferential charges upon the Egyptian Revenue? If so, how do they reconcile that statement made here with the menaces made at Constantinople? Or do the Government say one thing in this House and another at Constantinople?

[No reply.]

FRANCE AND CHINA—THE HOSTILITIES—INTERNATIONAL LAW—CONTRABAND OF WAR—RICE.

MR. BOURKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the French Yellow Book, containing the correspondence upon the subject of rice being contraband of war, can be placed in the Library; whether it is a fact that the French Government have claimed the right of treating as contraband the food of a people irrespective of the fact whether or not it is immediately intended for the support of a warlike force; and, when Papers upon this subject will be presented?

MR. MAGNIAC: It will be convenient if I ask now the Question of which I have given my noble Friend private Notice—namely, Whether the French Government have declared war with China, and if they have not, having regard to this announcement by the French of an extensive blockade, and especially to their claims of a right to search British vessels, and to treat ordinary merchandize as contraband of war, whether the Government cannot make some general announcement for the guidance of merchants and shipowners in the anomalous and, it is believed, unprecedented state of affairs in that quarter of the world?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE In reply to the Question of the right hon. Gentleman, as well as to that of which my hon. Friend the Member for Bedford has given me private Notice, I may state that no notification has been received by Her Majesty's Government from the French Government that France has declared war with China. In regard to the latter portion of my hon. Friend's Question, I have to state that I have in substance nothing to add to the explanation given in "another place" by Lord Granville on the 23rd of February, when he stated that the blockade of Formosa could not be recognized as a pacific blockade, but only as a belligerent blockade, and that Her Majesty's Government had also recognized the belligerent right of France to search neutral vessels on the high sea for contraband of war. I stated on March 16, in reply to my hon. Friend the Member for Greenock (Mr. Sutherland), that Her Majesty's Government had protested against rice being treated generally as contraband of war, irrespective of its ultimate destination; but the legality of seizures by belligerents of articles alleged to be contraband of war, is a question to be decided, in the first instance, by the competent Prize Court. A copy of the French Yellow Book will be placed in the Library. The Papers will, I hope, be out on Thursday week.

COLONEL NOLAN asked whether it was not out of Order to answer Questions, as the noble Lord had done, by quotations from speeches made in the House of Lords?

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of Order to be raised. I did not understand the noble Lord to quote from any speech made in the House of Lords, but to refer to a speech in general terms.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: There was a quotation.

MR. MAGNIAC: I do not think the noble Lord has replied to the last part of the Question.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I think the point was answered in the first part of my reply. I said that Her Majesty's Government had stated through the mouth of the Secretary of State, on the 22nd February, that these blockades would be recognized as belligerent blockades, and that all the consequences of a regular blockade would

arise from them. I may point out, with regard to the subject raised by the hon. and gallant Member opposite (Colonel Nolan), that I only referred to the statement made by Lord Granville in "another place," and I communicated to the House—as I have done on previous occasions—the substance of it. I only referred to it to fix the date. I cannot understand that there can be any objection to that.

MR. BOURKE said, he should draw attention to this subject on the Motion for the adjournment of the House.

BARON HENRY DE WORMS: Arising out of this subject, I wish to ask whether the noble Lord is aware that Her Majesty's mails have not been landed at Formosa owing to the French blockade; whether the French ships are allowed to coal at Hong Kong in order to be allowed to chase English vessels and steamers; and, whether Her Majesty's Government will take immediate steps to remedy this gross violation of the rights of neutrals and make suitable representations to the French Government? If the noble Lord cannot answer me now, I will put the Question again on the re-assembling of the House.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I wish to ask a Question with regard to the answer of the noble Lord as to contraband of war. I understand that my noble Friend stated that the doctrine of provisions being contraband of war as being required, not for victualling a fortress or a fleet, but merely for supplying the food of a nation, has been protested against by the Foreign Secretary. I am very glad to hear that announcement, and also to read the protest in the French Yellow Book. I understand my noble Friend also stated that the question whether there was a right to seize vessels containing rice was to be settled at the French Prize Court. I wish to ask if I am right in supposing that the question that would be decided by the French Prize Court is whether rice was really exported for some other purpose than that of food for the nation, and that we have not admitted the principle that the French Prize Court has to decide in the affirmative a new principle of International Law—the consequences of which might be serious—that provisions merely for the supply of the nation should be considered contraband of war?

MR. CHAPLIN: Supplementary to this Question, am I correct in saying that war has not been declared between France and China? And I should like to know whether, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, anything can be legitimately declared contraband of war until war has been declared?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: In reply to the Question put to me by the right hon. Gentlemen the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), I may say that I do not take any exception to his statement of the case; but what I desire to point out to him and to the House is this—that the decision of any particular case that may occur lies in the first instance with the French Prize Courts, and it is impossible for Her Majesty's Government to assume beforehand that the French Courts will give a wrong decision. In regard to the Question of the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin), my answer is certainly in the affirmative.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: What I desire to know is, whether the principle as to provisions supplied, not for a fortress or a fleet, but as food for a nation, being or not being a contraband of war, is to be left to be decided by the French Prize Court?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: No; I did not say that. I said it was impossible for Her Majesty's Government to assume that the French Courts would give a decision contrary to established principles of International Law in relation to this matter. Naturally, if the French Courts gave a decision to to which Her Majesty's Government thought it their duty to object, such a step would be a matter of diplomatic action.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I am sorry to appear so persistent; but I would point out that the French Government put their claim to declare rice a contraband of war on the very principle that provisions, even though intended for a nation's food, are contraband.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: That is a principle against which Her Majesty's Government have already entered their protest, and I must remind the right hon. Gentleman, with regard to the French Prize Courts, that, like all judicial tribunals, they are independent of the Government. They give judicial decisions, and are not bound by the opinions expressed

beforehand by the Executive Governments of the country which they represent.

MR. O'KELLY inquired whether in the great war with France provisions were not treated by this country as contraband of war?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I would prefer not to be drawn into a discussion on minute points of International Law, because I can assure the hon. Member that the branch of International Law bearing on this question of contraband of war is a very large one.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: In considering this question, has the Government found any precedents for articles being found contraband of war before a declaration of war has been made?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I do not think it would be advisable for me to give really what amount to opinions upon points of International Law, even if I considered myself competent to answer the Question. I think in any case the hon. Member will see that it will be a better course for him to put his Question on the Paper.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: I should like to ask the noble Lord a Question arising out of his previous answer. What does he understand by the term "a pacific blockade?"

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I cannot enter into these questions of International Law. I stated that the claim was a claim put forward by the French Government; it was not a claim put forward by the English Government. It was put forward by the French Government, and is not admitted.

MR. CHAPLIN: I wish to give Notice that in consequence of the reply of the noble Lord that in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government articles may be declared as contraband of war without previous declaration of war, and the serious consequences which it seems to me that declaration may give rise to in future, I will put further Questions to him of which due Notice will be given.

ARMY—THE ROYAL IRISH FUSILIERS.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Secretary of State for War, Why Major Kerr has been appointed to assist in training the recruits of the 4th Battalion of the Royal Irish Fusiliers, while there are Subalterns available for the duty; and whether he would appoint a young man, instead of an old Militia Officer with upwards of thirty years' service?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Honorary Major Kerr was called up to drill the recruits on the recommendation of the officer commanding the battalion because there was no subaltern officer available.

THE NEW WAR OFFICE AND ADMIRALTY.

MR. W. H. SMITH asked the Secretary to the Treasury, If he was able to say when the Government proposed to take the Vote for the Admiralty and War Office new buildings?

MR. BROADHURST appealed to the Government to state a definite time at which this Vote would be taken. He understood that the question stood second for the first day after the Recess. If it was taken before Monday week some hon. Members interested in the question would have to travel long distances, and would have to neglect other public duties in order to attend to it. He wished to know, therefore, notwithstanding the obstruction of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster—[*Loud cries of* "Order, order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. Member to withdraw that expression. His supplementary Question is irregular in itself.

MR. BROADHURST: I most heartily withdraw the expression if it is out of Order.

MR. HIBBERT: I certainly have not considered the course taken by the right hon. Member for Westminster as obstructive. I propose to take this Vote on Thursday after the Recess. Ample Notice will be given to hon. Members that the question will be brought forward.

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—OSMAN DIGNA.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL: I wish to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether there is any truth in the statement contained in the newspapers of to-day that Osman Digna has sent in a flag of truce to ask what we want; and, if so, what answer has been given by Her Majesty's Government? I am sorry there has been no opportunity of giving Notice.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: No, Sir; I have not received any con-

firmation of the statement that a flag of truce has been sent in by Osman Digna. Just before I came to the House I received a telegram from General Graham, in which he says that the spies reported that the enemy had completely abandoned Tamai and Hasheen. He is sending out Cavalry and Infantry to ascertain the truth of the report, and an early reconnoissance will be made in the direction of Handoub.

ARMY—THE 82ND REGIMENT—PROMOTION BY PURCHASE.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR asked the Secretary of State for War, If he would explain the circumstances under which the senior Lieutenant of the 82nd Regiment (Lieutenant Maunsell, an officer of long service and specially commended for behaviour in the field) was by purchase promoted in 1866 over on promotion without purchase of Captain Richardson to half-pay, seeing that the senior Captain (Captain Jarvis) was without purchase promoted to the Majority on promotion of Major and Brevet Lieutenant Colonel Thompson, promoted as in the case of Captain Richardson?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: This promotion took place 19 years ago, under the purchase system, which became obsolete 14 years ago. The promotions referred to had reference to certain large reductions which were made in 1866 in the number of captains in regiments at home. To mitigate the hardship of placing so many captains on half-pay a certain number of promotions were granted without purchase to half-pay majorities and lieutenant colonelcies. As the rank reduced was that of captain and these promotions were in aid of the reduction, no subaltern could claim successional promotion without purchase. Some of the half-pay majorities were, however, given to officers serving abroad, as in the 82nd Foot, and in those instances it was necessary to fill up the captain's vacancy. The usual course in such a case would have been to have brought in a supernumerary captain from another regiment; but as this was found to involve much hardship on the officers transferred, the Secretary of State decided that the vacancy should go in the regiment by purchase (as the Royal Warrant fully authorized); the commission being sold for the benefit of the Military Reserve Fund. As that fund was used in buying out half-pay it was virtually in aid of the reduction then taking effect.

INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT—EXTRA PAYMENTS.

MR. ARTHUR C'CONNOR asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is a fact that certain sums of money, varying from £150 to £300, and others pro rata, were paid as gratuities to the permanent officials in the Legacy Duty and Solicitors Department of the Inland Revenue for extra services, for the purpose of gathering into the Exchequer as large a sum as possible by the end of the financial year; whether he is aware that application for similar recognition was made by the writers in the Departments referred to, in accordance with Clause 9 of their Regulations, who rendered valuable clerical service, and whose petition was strongly supported by their official chiefs; whether the Board of Inland Revenue refused to grant the prayer of the petitioners, on the ground that they had "no power" to do so; and, whether, under these circumstances, the Treasury would empower the Inland Revenue Commissioners to do so?

MR. HIBBERT: Certain extra payments have been made to clerks in the Inland Revenue Department for special work. The copyists engaged during extra hours were paid at the proper rate, and the Board of Inland Revenue consider that rate sufficient. In any case there would probably be no power to grant a higher rate, the regulation referred to being apparently not applicable to such a case.

CENTRAL ASIA—THE RUSSO-AFGHAN FRONTIER.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the Russian Forces have seized the Salt Lakes of Er Oilau, upon which the whole surrounding districts, Afghan as well as Persian and Turcoman, are dependent for their salt supply?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The Russian outposts are stationed to the south of the Salt Lakes of Kungreli, in the vicinity of Akrobat.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Do I understand the noble Lord to say they are in possession of those lakes?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I can only give the information which I

possess, which is that the Russian outposts are to the south of these lakes.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Does this occupation constitute a fresh Russian advance? I also wish to ask the Question which stands in my name on the Paper—namely, Whether the Russian Government have consented to withdraw their forces from Zulfagar, Ak-Rabat, and Pul-i-Khisti, which are within Afghan territory; and, if not, what steps Her Majesty's Ministry intend to take to maintain the rights of the Amir of Afghanistan?

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: I wish to ask whether the British Government have consented to the withdrawal of their force from the Pishin Valley; and whether the Russian Government have made any fussy or hysterical representations to Her Majesty's Government in regard to the occupation of Afghan territory?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The Question asked by the hon. Member (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) ought properly to be put to my hon. Friend the Under Secretary for India. In regard to the first Question of the hon. Member for Eye (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett), I did not mean that the position of the Russian outposts, to which I have alluded as being south of these lakes, does constitute an advance. In regard to the Question on the Paper, I am afraid I must decline, as I did yesterday, and on several previous occasions, to enter into a discussion of these topics with the hon. Member. I need hardly say I am very sorry from day to day to give a reply which by repetition may almost seem discourteous; but I am sure the House will feel the difficulty I am placed in by their constant repetition.

MOTIONS.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (POOR LAW) (NO. 4) BILL.

Ordered to be brought in by Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL and Sir CHARLES DILKE.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 116.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT, &c. (NO. 5) BILL.

Ordered to be brought in by Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL and Sir CHARLES DILKE.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 117.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT, &c. (NO. 6) BILL.

Ordered to be brought in by Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL and Sir CHARLES DILKE.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 118.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT, &c. (NO. 7) BILL.

Ordered to be brought in by Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL and Sir CHARLES DILKE.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 119.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (NO. 2) BILL.

Ordered to be brought in by Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL and Sir CHARLES DILKE.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 120.]

EGYPTIAN LOAN BILL.

Report [30th March] read.

Ordered, That leave be given to bring in a Bill pursuant to the said Resolution.

Ordered, That Sir ARTHUR OTWAY, Mr. GLADSTONE, Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, and Mr. HIBBERT do prepare and bring in the same.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 122.]

ADJOURNMENT—EASTER RECESS.

RESOLUTION.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House, at its rising, do adjourn till Thursday the 9th of April."—(*The Marquess of Hartington.*)

CENTRAL ASIA—THE RUSSO-AFGHAN FRONTIER.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Sir, I gave Notice yesterday that upon this Motion being made I would put a Question to the Government, and ask them to state to the House as fully as they feel themselves capable of doing, and without inconvenience to the Public Service, what is the position of negotiations with regard to the Afghan Frontier? I am quite aware that in delicate negotiations such as these, and in the delicate state of circumstances which prevails at this moment, we must be extremely careful not to put Questions or to make observations likely to seriously embarrass the Government; and I am most reluctant to do anything that would have that effect. At the same time, I would point out to the noble Lord that when this House is adjourning for eight or 10 days, and when there will be no regular opportunity of correcting any statement that may get abroad which may be of a mischievous character, and which may be very readily answered and safely disposed of in this House, there are dangers which it is desirable for us to reduce to a minimum by giving such explanations as can be given. Everyone in this House is well aware what the nature of our anxiety is in regard to the position and

advance of Russia upon the Afghan Frontier. We know that for many years the advances of Russia from one point to another in Central Asia have been the subject both of uneasiness in England and still more, I think, of uneasiness in India. Of course such a move as that which has lately taken place in the advance to Merv, and the subsequent advance still nearer to the Afghan Frontier, has been of a character which must necessarily give occasion for anxiety; and when it is stated that that advance has gone actually beyond the Frontier, we say that it gives natural ground for anxiety, for rumours and reports which may lead to the very evils we are anxious to avoid. It is not so much what the feeling may be in this country as the feeling that may circulate among the Natives of India and the Indian population. If there is an idea allowed to get abroad among them that England is not firm in this matter, it may lead to serious consequences. I apprehend, as the Prime Minister stated some time ago, that there is but one real English policy in this matter, that we are all of one opinion—whatever may have been said in the past as to the former movements of Russia—that we must stand by the Ruler of Afghanistan. But I am quite aware with regard to the details of the negotiations that we must be very cautious in the matter, and that we must not endeavour to spread alarm which is the object we have to take away. The noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs told us yesterday that there was every hope of a satisfactory settlement. He mentioned that there was a despatch now on its way from St. Petersburg of which we apparently have imperfect information. I do not know whether he has received any information with regard to that despatch, or what the nature of it is, or the conditions upon which the Russian Government may be willing to carry through the arrangement, which I understand they still adhere to, of laying down a boundary by the action of Boundary Commissioners on the spot. I think it would be satisfactory if we could be told whether such proceedings were in contemplation, whether we are substantially agreed that those inquiries which are to lead to the delimitation of the Frontier are really to take place, and any other information which the Government can give with regard to the attitude of the Powers on this matter, and the state of the negotiations, will, I am sure, be of a very interesting and valuable character.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Sir, I entirely share the feeling expressed by my noble Friend the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, when he said that it was a matter of regret to him and to Her Majesty's Government generally to be obliged constantly to repeat, in answer to inquiries, perhaps not unreasonable in themselves, an answer which, from its constant repetition, might almost be considered to be stereotyed and discourteous. While sharing that feeling, I also may add that it would be far more satisfactory to us, if we thought it was in our power consistently with our duty to the country in regard to those great interests with respect to which the right hon. Gentleman says there is such general agreement in all parts of the House, if we were in a position to make a full statement to the House. We feel very deeply indeed the great responsibility that rests upon us in connection with negotiations of this character of taking measures we think necessary in the circumstances. We feel that responsibility would not certainly be taken away from us, but it would be greatly lightened if we could take the House fully into our confidence, and state the exact position of the negotiations and the exact character of the measures we have under consideration; but I assure the right hon. Gentleman and the House that I am not using any mere conventional phrase, or that I am simply endeavouring to stave off discussion which might be considered inconvenient to the Government, when I do repeat that we must deprecate, and deprecate in the strongest terms, any attempt on the part of hon. Members to induce us to enter into any detailed statement, and a necessarily incomplete statement, as to the progress of these negotiations. The right hon. Gentleman has referred to what he knows from his experience of the inconvenience, under any circumstances, of attempting to enter into details respecting pending negotiations, when a full and complete statement cannot be made. That is an observation which I think is true respecting almost any difficult subject of negotiation; but cer-

tainly, Sir, the character of the negotiations which are at present going on is such as to render that ordinary inconvenience very much greater. At present, as the House is aware, not only matters of fact and of policy are at issue, but there are also at issue questions respecting which there is the very strongest and most sensitive feeling both in this country and in Russia. Public opinion both here and in India—as the right hon. Gentleman has said—is justly sensitive upon anything which may appear to affect the security of our Indian Frontier or the maintenance of the engagements which we have entered into with our Ally, the Ameer of Afghanistan. And, although public opinion in Russia may not have such free means of expression as it has here, the House is perfectly aware that there exists in Russia a very strong military opinion—an opinion which, not unnaturally, is somewhat disposed towards strong and perhaps aggressive measures, and which is perpetually striving to thwart and counteract the diplomatic action which is endeavouring to bring the question at issue to a satisfactory settlement. Well, on the spot, on the scene of these transactions, we know that the Russian troops, the Afghan troops, and our own officers, who are acting as the advisers of the Ameer's Government, and the object of whose mission is to come to an arrangement respecting the disputed question of the Afghan Frontier—we know that they are all at the present moment in very close proximity; we know that they are in positions where an unfortunate accident or misunderstanding might lead to some occurrence, perhaps to some collision, which would greatly decrease the chances of a satisfactory settlement. Further, Sir, we hear in this country of certain movements of Russian troops. We ourselves also have thought it necessary, as has been communicated to the House, to make certain military preparations which we consider that the circumstances of the case demand. These military preparations on our part have not been made with any intention of their being a menace to Russia for the purpose of influencing the friendly negotiations at present in progress. But if we were to attempt to enter into a detailed statement or discussion on these matters, I cannot but feel that it is too probable that some unguarded word—which none of us possibly, and I myself certainly, could not feel perfectly certain to be able to avoid—might convert these military measures which we are taking, and which have in themselves no character of menace, into something that might be supposed to bear that character. But that is not all. It is not merely a question between the Russian Government and ourselves. There is a third party interested—perhaps interested even more than ourselves—and that is our Ally, the Ameer of Afghanistan. As we have repeatedly stated, in reply to Questions, we have entered into certain engagements with the Ameer, but they are engagements which are made on certain conditions. At this very moment the Ameer of Afghanistan is in communication and consultation with the Viceroy of India. And one of the subjects of those communications is a strict definition and a full understanding of those conditions upon which our support depends. Instructions—full instructions—have been given to Lord Dufferin in this matter. We know that those instructions are, in the opinion of Lord Dufferin, instructions which are sufficient for his guidance in the conduct of his interview with the Ameer. But it certainly would, in my opinion, be most inconvenint, most prejudicial to the interests of the Public Service, that anything in the shape of a statement as to the nature of these instructions should be made in this House, and should form the subject of discussion in this House, and should reach the ears or the knowledge of the Ameer, distorted, perhaps, by a colour which might be given to them by such a discussion. Well, under all these circumstances, it appears to me that however great the temptation might be—however anxious we are not to appear discourteous to the House—I should be altogether failing in my duty if I were to attempt to add to, or extend, the declarations which have already been made on this subject. My right hon. Friend the Prime Minister and my noble Friend the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs have already stated that as to the position of affairs on the spot we have received assurances from the Russian Government that their troops will not advance beyond the positions which they at present hold except under certain extraordinary circumstances which they define. They have also

given us assurances that the most stringent orders have been issued to their officers to avoid any collision with the Afghan troops. As has also been stated, instructions have been issued to our officers to give similar advice to the officers of the Ameer of Afghanistan. The House has also been told that we have advised the Ameer not to withdraw his forces from the position which they now occupy. These are measures of a purely temporary character, and which have been adopted by the two Governments with the view, if possible, of preventing any unfortunate occurrence or any collision between the parties. They have nothing to do, as has been stated by the Prime Minister, with the negotiations that are being simultaneously conducted by the two Goverments with regard to what we hope will be the permanent delimitation of the Afghan Frontier. As to that permanent delimitation, the negotiations, as was stated yesterday, are still in progress, and we have sent and we have received several communications as to points upon which, in the opinion of the Russian Government, it is necessary to have a preliminary understanding before the Commission of Delimitation meets and commences its labours. The last of these communications, as was stated yesterday, is on its way. We do not know—the Ambassador has not informed us—what are the exact contents of that communication; but he has said that from the communications which he has had with the Russian Minister he has reason to believe that it is, at all events, of a conciliatory and friendly character, and that it contains an expression of opinion on the part of the Russian Government that the speedy meeting of the Boundary Commission will be of advantage, and will tend to allay the excitement here, in Russia, and Afghanistan. We have not the means, even if it were desirable, of adding anything to the statement on this subject which was made yesterday, and I am sure that the House would not desire that we should attempt to foreshadow the nature or character of a communication which we have not yet ourselves received. I hope that in these circumstances the House will not be disposed to enter into any lengthy or detailed discussion on the subject. I would deprecate, not only such careless or hasty expressions as have been deprecated by the right hon. Gentleman opposite himself, but I would deprecate, if the House would allow me to do so, any discussion on the question at all. It is not merely a careless or a hasty expression that is capable of doing harm. If explanations are asked for on the one side of this question, it is only natural and reasonable that they should be asked for on the other; and if we were to attempt — if we thought we could attempt without injury to the Public Service—to give more definite and detailed answers to Questions, such as have been placed on the Paper by the hon. Member for Eye (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett), we should also be equally bound to give detailed and definite replies to other Questions put by hon. Members who may take a more favourable view of the character of the Russian claims. We cannot possibly give a satisfactory reply to Questions of that sort, unless it were in our power to enter into the whole case. It is not in our power at the present moment to enter fully into the whole case; and under these circumstances I am of opinion, and the Government are of opinion, that no good purpose could be served, but that, on the contrary, there would be very great risk of mischief being unintentionally done if we were to attempt in any degree to extend the declarations which have been made to the House on this subject.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, that he had no desire to run counter to the recommendation given to the House by the noble Lord in regard to the very critical and delicate negotiations to which the noble Lord had adverted, and in the few remarks he was about to make to the House he should avoid in any way trespassing upon delicate ground; but he thought there was one matter of scarcely less importance than the negotiations to which the noble Lord referred which the House would do well to consider for a moment. He wished to refer to the state of our relations with other countries than Russia. As to the state of our relations with Russia he would not then say a word; but during the last few days the House was aware that numerous Questions had been asked and statements had appeared in the ordinary channels of information respecting our relations with the Turkish Empire. A Question had been put to the noble Lord the Under Secretary of

State for Foreign Affairs of a plain and specific nature, which had simply invited an affirmative or negative reply, with respect to a report, certainly of a very extraordinary character, which had been going the rounds of the journals in this country and on the Continent of Europe — namely, a Question asked by the hon. Member for Wicklow (Mr. M'Coan) with reference to menaces alleged to have been addressed by the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to the Representative of the Ottoman Empire in this country. What was the answer of the noble Lord?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The Question was only given Notice of yesterday, and I stated in reply to it that I could not answer at a few hours' Notice.

MR. J. LOWTHER observed that, full Notice having been given of the hon. Member's intention to ask the Question, the noble Lord had the opportunity, of which he doubtless availed himself, or, at all events, should have availed himself, of communicating with the Foreign Secretary. But the noble Lord had come down to the House and in the face of the whole of Europe declined to give the emphatic negative which the country at large expected to be given to this extraordinary report. Every rational person would no doubt put on the answer of the noble Lord the construction that there was a great deal of substantial truth in the suggestions contained in the Question. With regard to a most important point of our relations with the Russian Empire, he thought that this country at large was not disposed to feel any undue alarm at the possibility of having to face serious complications abroad, though, of course, there was a natural desire for the maintenance of peace. But under what circumstances were they now to surrender, on the eve of the adjournment, their opportunities of ascertaining what was passing with regard to our foreign relations during the Easter Recess? What assurances had they that Her Majesty's Government were using their utmost exertions towards establishing and maintaining friendly relations with the other Powers of Europe? Of course, he did not wish to bind the Government to any indiscreet, mischievous, and unstatesmanlike utterances which might have been let drop by any of them under circumstances of greater freedom and less responsibility. Nor did he wish to revive in the public mind memories which they would all gladly obliterate from their recollection. They could not, however, forget that five years ago this country was on terms of complete amity and accord with the Central Powers of Europe, with the Empires of Germany and Austria, as well as Turkey. They could not forget that at that time for partizan purposes grave and serious injury had been inflicted on our national interests, and our relations with those two Empires had become seriously strained instead of being friendly. In the case of one of those Empires an apology—not, perhaps, unduly endowed with dignity—for the moment, at any rate, allayed some of the most pernicious consequences which might have arisen from those very unstatesmanlike utterances. But what had been the case with regard to the Turkish Empire? They had never heard of any apology, abject or otherwise, offered for the expressions freely used with regard to one of the most ancient Allies of Her Majesty's Government. They had never heard withdrawn expressions which could not have failed to cause the most acute dissatisfaction in the ruling circles of the Turkish Empire. If they had felt that even at the present moment, guided by the light of painful experience, Her Majesty's Government had turned over a new leaf, and were prepared to cultivate those old cordial and friendly relations which had for many generations subsisted between the British and the Turkish Governments, he would be the last to raise the question now. But they had it deliberately on record that the Representative of the Foreign Office had declined to give a plain answer to a simple and plain question as to whether the most discourteous, most illegal, and absolutely indefensible menaces had been uttered to the Representative of a friendly Power. They were aware that certain Members, at any rate, in Her Majesty's Councils were of opinion that the Sultan would do well to clear out of some of the most fertile Provinces over which he ruled. It would be well, however, that when Her Majesty's Government were dealing with foreign affairs of the utmost gravity they should make it clear that those utterances of former times, followed as they

had been by most unfriendly and gratuitous acts, would no longer hamper their diplomatic action, or stand in the way of the restoration and maintenance of cordial and friendly relations with the Ottoman Empire. The noble Lord would perhaps say that the Turkish Government had been treated with courtesy throughout these negotiations; but they knew that the lawful Sovereign of Egypt had been treated with scant courtesy in respect to that portion of his Dominions, which constituted an integral portion of the Ottoman Empire, and that the opinions of the Sultan and his Advisers had been treated with uniform contempt throughout the arrangements with regard to Egypt. He would like the Government to assure the House that they would make a serious endeavour to cultivate friendly relations with the Sultan of Turkey, and also with the Rulers of the German and Austrian Empires—that they had, in fact, at last returned to the old national policy of this country, and had abandoned once for all those unstatesmanlike and mischievous lines to which he had referred. At the present time, when the public mind was not unnaturally exercised on the subject of our foreign relations, it would be desirable that some emphatic contradiction should be given to such mischievous reports as those to which their attention had been called, and that the Government should give some assurances as to the line which they would adopt.

MR. ONSLOW remarked that they had been told by the noble Lord the Secretary of State for War that preliminary negotiations were going on with regard to the delimitation of the Afghan Frontier. But they had been told that many months ago; they had been led to believe that before Sir Peter Lumsden had left this country these preliminary negotiations had been ended, and that definite instructions had been given to him and agreed to by the Russian Government. He thought that some indication should now be given as to how it was that there were still preliminary negotiations going on when they had been led to believe that these had been settled last summer. There was every reason for impatience on the subject, because of the delay which had taken place. What the country wished to know was that the Government intended to be firm on this occasion and not give way at all. It was not a question of a compromise of any kind; they knew that much of this territory in which Russia was at the present time had always been recognized by every successive Viceroy of India, by every Ameer of Afghanistan, as well as by Her Majesty's Government, as Afghan territory. Why, then, was there any necessity for any compromise? If the Government were firm, there was much more likely to be peace; if Russia once saw that there was any chance of compromise, or that we were falling back from what we had said in previous negotiations, there was much more likely to be war. They ought also to consider the effect which a policy of retrogression might have in Afghanistan. Everyone on both sides of the House had a firm confidence in the wisdom and tact of Lord Dufferin. He believed that next to Lord Mayo he would prove the best Viceroy India had ever had, and they were quite prepared to leave matters in his hands if Her Majesty's Government were not going to trammel him with telegrams from Downing Street. The noble Lord had said that full instructions had been sent to the Viceroy; but they did not want full instructions sent out to him. The duty of Her Majesty's Government was to impress both on the Viceroy and the Ameer the enormous importance of this question, and their determination at all hazards to keep the Ameer thoroughly on our side. If there was any flinching we would lose the friendship of the Ameer, and they knew very well in whose hands he would speedily be found. It was not a question as to whether Russia should possess herself of a village, or a particular hill, but what the effect of such annexation would be on the Afghans. He, therefore, hoped the Government would maintain a bold, clear, and consistent policy with regard to Russia in Afghanistan.

COLONEL DAWNAY said, that before the House adjourned for the Easter Recess he hoped he might be allowed to say a few words with regard to the troops in the Soudan. It appeared, from what was stated yesterday by the noble Lord the Secretary of State for War, that the Force lately under Lord Wolseley on the Upper Nile, weakened and worn out by privation and hardship, would be forced to wait from now to

September, enduring the scorching heat of the Desert as best it might. Every one knew that enforced idleness in an unhealthy climate, after a very hard campaign, was fatal to British troops; and it would be peculiarly fatal to our troops on the Nile, enfeebled as they were by bad food, bad water, and bad air—without boots, without clothing, and without shelter, and, worse than all, depressed by the failure of all their hopes—a failure for which, not they, but Her Majesty's Government, were solely and directly responsible. According to the Medical Authorities, we must expect 40 per cent of the Force on the Nile to be invalided during the hot season, and the rest would be quite unfit for hard work in the autumn. The other Force at Suakin was for the most part composed of young soldiers, many of whom had never been out of England before. The hard work, made so much harder by the loss of many hundreds of camels, was beginning to tell upon them. A correspondent said, on Saturday last—"The troops are much overworked, and many of them are tired out." Sickness and sunstroke had already made their appearance among them, and this was only the end of March. What would be their condition at the end of May? What they wanted to know, and what they had a right to know before the House adjourned, was this—what was the object of all these sacrifices? What had we gained, and what were we likely to gain, by them? The one main object of the Nile Relief Expedition had passed away for ever. The last hope of the rescue of General Gordon passed away while the Prime Minister was arguing as to whether Gordon was surrounded, or only hemmed in. We had, indeed, gained one thing; we had gained the undying hatred of the Soudanese, whose women and children were fighting against us with the same savage ferocity as the men; but, apart from that, every life and every sixpence had been simply thrown away—thrown away as absolutely as the stores tossed into the Nile at Jubat. And now, in order that the Government might gain a character for consistency, and turn the attention of the country from their failure on the Nile, they had committed us to a war of extermination on the shores of the Red Sea. Thousands of Arabs and hundreds of British lives were to be sacrificed under the pretence of opening up the road to Berber—the very same road that was opened last year by General Graham after two bloody battles, and then deliberately abandoned again by the Government to Osman Digna. Another 10,000 or 12,000 Arabs were now again to be slaughtered on exactly the same pretext. This was a monstrous state of things; and it seemed that the oceans of blood shed by the Prime Minister had made him callous. Hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House, who did not desert Gordon, or betray the Egyptian garrisons, had no quarrel with those poor Arabs who had thrown away their lives with such devoted heroism; and a heavy responsibility rested on them if they sat still and connived at the insane and murderous policy of the Government. Khartoum and the Mahdi were out of the question till next autumn. Whatever the Government might say, they knew perfectly well that a railway to Berber was beyond the range of human possibility within the next two years; and while they were squandering blood and treasure in the Soudan, they were throwing away this country's interests in Egypt in the House of Commons—throwing them away to fatten English Jews and foreign bondholders. While our armies were locked up in the Soudan, decimated by fever, or wasted in fruitless fighting, Russia was advancing. The Prime Minister had all along been playing Russia's game. By sending out the Brigade of Guards to Suakin, the right hon. Gentleman went out of his way to expose the apparent military weakness of England—thank Heaven it was only apparent!—and encourage Russia to take advantage of our supposed unreadiness for war. The life of every British officer and soldier wasted in the African Desert was so much gain to Russia. Our national interests and our honour pointed the same way. The danger to the Empire was not at Khartoum or at Suakin, but on the borders of Afghanistan. We ought to concentrate our resources in the defence of our Indian Empire against Russian aggression, instead of wasting our strength in a war without an object, which was a disgrace to civilization, and unworthy of the English nation.

LAW AND JUSTICE—CONVICTIONS OF INNOCENT MEN — ESTABLISHMENT OF A COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. HOPWOOD said, he rose to call attention to the question of establishing a Court of Criminal Appeal. They had been promised a Bill on the subject, and they had been disappointed, although the House had admitted that such a tribunal was necessary in the interests of justice, and for the redemption from slavery and suffering of a number of persons who, although found guilty, were innocent. As so large a proportion of death sentences were commuted to penal servitude for life, it was fair to infer that there was a doubt in the cases, and yet not sufficient doubt to justify the Secretary of State in setting the prisoners at liberty. If a Court of Appeal existed, some of the prisoners would have the opportunity of proving their innocence if they could. In the cases in which death sentences were commuted to penal servitude for less than life, there must have been even more doubt than in the other cases. In 194 cases of death sentences commuted to penal servitude for life, and 15 cases of commutation for fixed terms, there was the strongest evidence of doubt, calling for further investigation. The fear that if the Court existed there would be an inordinate number of appeals was met by the fact that, out of 572,000 convictions by magistrates in a year, there were only 151 appeals; and as in these cases appeal was now much easier and less costly than it would be in the proposed Court of Appeal, it might be inferred that similarly the sense of guilt in heavier cases would operate to keep down the number of useless appeals. A number of cases had occurred in which men sentenced to penal servitude had afterwards established their innocence. He would mention the case of Galley, of the two farmers, and of a man who was wrongfully convicted twice. Casualties of this kind were more frequent than was supposed. He could give many, with names and result, did time permit. There were two men wrongfully convicted in what was called the Dudd's Hill case, who owed their vindication to the accidental meeting of one of them in prison with a prisoner, who confessed that he and another man committed the crime of which the innocent men had been convicted, yet the evidence seemed so clear at the time that the Judge expressed surprise that they should protest their innocence in the face of it. There was the Durham murder case, in which two men were wrongfully convicted. There was also the Penge murder case, where four persons were sentenced to death; one was pardoned immediately as innocent, and the others suffered imprisonment, and one of them, Patrick Staunton, died in prison of consumption. He maintained that all such cases demonstrated that there were so many cases in which the Home Secretary had interfered that there was every necessity for a Court of Appeal. It was his duty to trouble the Home Office in many cases, for all of which he did not answer; but, without answering for them, he could safely say that many of them did call for inquiry. Without wishing to trespass unduly upon the time of the House, he might say the refusal of the demand for this Court rendered it necessary, in cases like those of Penge and Spennymoor, that the House of Commons should be made more and more a Court of Appeal; and this in itself was one of the strongest reasons why the Government should take the matter up. Either the men were innocent, or there were circumstances of such doubt in the case as to show the necessity for a Court of that kind.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: If my hon. and learned Friend had confined himself to the first quarter of an hour of his speech I should have been able entirely to agree with him. But the last half-hour of his speech, in which he entered into particular cases, was, I think, unfortunate. So far as he thinks that a Court of Criminal Appeal should be created I altogether agree with him. No one could be more happy to be relieved of the responsibility which falls upon a Secretary of State of considering cases which have been decided by a Judge and jury than I should be. No doubt the Court is anxious to be just, and the intention of those who administer the Criminal Law is upright; but, fallible as human judgment is, cases must occur in which there may be a failure of justice, and any means of redressing such possible errors I should be most happy to promote. My hon.

and learned Friend is in this matter really persuading those who are already convinced. But when he goes into an elaborate discussion of particular criminal cases, expresses a decided opinion upon them, and affirms that they bear out his contention, then I must say that I entirely dissent from my hon. and learned Friend. My hon. and learned Friend has a most humane disposition, and I am willing to admit that there are some cases in which there is a miscarriage of justice; but I do not believe that the great majority of criminal convictions are unfounded. Now, what possible good can come from recalling the Staunton case? My hon. and learned Friend has, to my knowledge, put that case most incompletely and inaccurately. It is one which has exercised the minds of judicial men. It has been before successive Secretaries of State, Law Officers, and Lord Chancellors; and my hon. and learned Friend, I venture to say, stands alone in his opinion with regard to it. There is no Court of Criminal Appeal which could come to the conclusion at which my hon. and learned Friend has arrived. And how can an *ex parte* statement like that which my hon. and learned Friend has made be of any service in the vindication of justice? There was no man in the House who had notice of his intention to bring the case forward, so that he might refresh his mind as to the facts. While regretting the course which my hon. and learned Friend has taken with regard to this particular case, I will repeat what I have already said, that on the general question I entirely agree with him. I am happy to think that in this country crime of a serious character is rapidly decreasing. That is one of the most satisfactory features of the time. The sentences of penal servitude are less than one-half what they used to be some 20 or 25 years ago, and this, in itself, is satisfactory. There is, I think, a disposition on the part of those who administer the Criminal Law to mitigate its severity. I believe that the time has arrived when it may be more considerably done—when the sentences may be less severe and less protracted, with equal security to life and property in this country. I have never failed to express that opinion, and upon proper occasions I always like to act upon it. My hon. and learned Friend has referred to many cases in which men were condemned to death and the sentences afterwards commuted, and has rather illogically concluded either that the men deserved to die, or that they ought to be released as innocent. That is not so. A doubt may have arisen; and in no case of doubt will a Secretary of State allow the sentence of death to be executed. That is all I need say on the subject which my hon. and learned Friend brought before the House; but there are one or two questions to which I would refer before sitting down. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Lincolnshire (Mr. J. Lowther) made an attack upon my noble Friend on the subject of Turkey, and demanded whether or not we were eager to cultivate friendly relations with Turkey, and with Austria and Germany. If the right hon. Gentleman will accept my assurance, I can inform him that we are extremely desirous of cultivating friendly relations with Turkey; but I do not think that to rip up what occurred on former occasions would be likely to conduce to that object. Therefore, I must respectfully decline to enter further into those matters. And with regard to Germany and Austria, who can doubt that the Government of England desires to cultivate the most friendly relations with those Powers? Then there was the speech of the hon. and gallant Member for Thirsk (Colonel Dawnay), who uttered a great denunciation of the war proceeding in the Soudan, and spoke of the horrors attending it. I regret the continuance of that war as much as he does; but I do not exactly know the conclusion at which the hon. and gallant Member wished to arrive. Was his speech preliminary to a Motion to withdraw the British Forces from the Soudan? As far as I could understand his speech, it had no other moral, and no other conclusion could be drawn from it, than that we should retire at once from the Soudan. If these are the sentiments of hon. Gentlemen opposite, it is rather singular that they have not been expressed in a more definite form. I should like to have asked the hon. and gallant Member, if he had been present, whether he voted the other night with the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) upon his Amendment on the Vote of Censure, for it was a speech for the Motion of the hon. Member for Newcastle; but if he

recorded his vote against the hon. Member for Newcastle I do not understand his speech. Then the hon. Member for Guildford (Mr. Onslow), in regard to the Afghan difficulty, would reject anything like compromise, for he said that the boundaries of Afghanistan were very well known, and he urged us to stand up for them. But I understand that a Commission has been appointed for the delimitation of the boundaries of Afghanistan; and therefore I do not know that the boundaries are so perfectly well-defined and understood as the hon. Member supposes. If such were the case, for what purpose was it that Envoys were sent from England on the one side, and from Russia on the other, to define the boundaries which, according to the hon. Member, have been already established?

SIR EARDLEY WILMOT observed, that the House and the country were much indebted to the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) for having brought the important question of criminal appeal under their consideration. He (Sir Eardley Wilmot) had long devoted his attention to this subject, and he was greatly disappointed at what had happened in respect of it two years ago. At the beginning of the Session of 1882 a measure for the establishment of a Court of Criminal Appeal was announced in the Speech from the Throne; and the Attorney General introduced a Bill embodying its provisions, which underwent an elaborate discussion extending over three months in Grand Committee. Yet the Bill was allowed to drop, after all the labour and pains devoted to it, and from that time to the present day they had heard nothing more on the subject. It was a monstrous anomaly that in this 19th century the Home Secretary should stand up and say that he was in favour of criminal appeal, and yet not have the courage to utilize the services of the Law Officers to push forward a measure dealing with the subject. What was the use of the right hon. Gentleman holding high Office and having a powerful majority behind him if he was not able to pass a measure to protect innocence, and remedy a grave defect in the Criminal Law? He (Sir Eardley Wilmot) had twice introduced Bills on this subject. In the first he limited the appeal to capital cases and sentences of penal servitude for life, and in the second he limited the appeal to capital cases only. He had been unable to carry either of these Bills, and he had refrained from pressing them more energetically, relying on the promise of the Attorney General in 1882 that Her Majesty's Government fully intended immediate legislation on the subject. He was at a loss to understand the policy of the Government on this question. It could not be said that legislation was not required, for many cases—he might instance those of Perryman and Nicholson among the more recent—had arisen from time to time showing that an appeal would rescue innocent persons from punishment to which they were unjustly condemned. Nobody could defend the absurdity that a man whose innocence was established beyond all doubt should have to go to the Home Secretary and appeal to the Prerogative of mercy for pardon for a crime he had never committed. He considered that it was a disgrace to the Government, with its powerful majority, that it had not long since remedied what was universally admitted to be a most serious defect in the Criminal Law of England.

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—WITHDRAWAL OF THE FORCES.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH: I should like, with the permission of the House, to make one or two remarks with reference to the war in the Soudan, as the subject is one which deeply interests the country. There is a very strong feeling that this miserable and bloody war ought to be put an end to; and, if I am not mistaken, this feeling will, within a very short time, find loud expression throughout the land. Whatever Members of the Government may say on the subject, it must be admitted that the object of the Soudan Expedition has entirely changed. It was originally of a humane character, and secured a considerable amount of support, so long as its purpose was confined to the rescue of that brave man, General Gordon. But it is vain to deny that since the death of Gordon the object of the Expedition has entirely changed. It is now either a war of vengeance, or it is a war of conquest. It is impossible for anyone to conceive what its object can be, unless

we put one or other of those interpretations upon it. I feel most strongly that the action we are taking against the Soudanese is in entire contradiction to all the assurances and pledges that have been given by the Government to this House since the beginning of the Egyptian Campaign. We are all familiar with the declaration that the Soudan was to be left to its own inhabitants, who were a brave people and entitled to be free. Yet this country is now engaged in the odious task of making war against a people who are struggling for their freedom. As this is the only opportunity I have had of raising my voice upon the subject, I feel it my duty to protest against the continuance of this utterly fruitless and barren war. I defy anyone to give a reasonable explanation of the Expedition in which the country is engaged. We can all see with perfect plainness that the attempt to subdue the Arabs can only lead to great loss of life to them and to ourselves; and the time is now fast approaching when, owing to the climate, Englishmen can scarcely live in the Soudan. The Expedition to Suakin stands entirely condemned on every ground; and I do not believe any Member of the Government will now venture to say that he considers it possible to make the railway to Berber, at any rate not without great sacrifices. What I would ask the Government to do on this occasion is to consider whether it is not possible, at a very early date, to withdraw the Suakin Expedition altogether? Soon the climate will oblige you to withdraw; and what is the use of going on fighting battle after battle—shedding blood and making yourselves detested by the people, when the excessive heat will soon compel us to quit the country? It has been said that it is necessary to show our superiority over the Arabs; but we have substantially done that already in the battles that have taken place. According to the news to-day the enemy is not likely to make a stand again, and to go on following them up for the next few months would be a senseless proceeding, and would be attended with heavy losses on our side. I hope the Government will reconsider the whole situation, and will give orders for the withdrawal of the troops at an early date altogether from Suakin; and I would go further, and say that the same reasons which apply to withdrawal from Suakin apply with equal force to the withdrawal of General Wolseley's Army from its present advanced position. We made a mistake in declaring that it was our intention to go to Khartoum; it is still worse persevering in the error. The task is all but impossible, and would involve sacrifices far greater than those which the country has hitherto made. It is better to admit that we have done wrong than to persevere in a mistake; and I would therefore press upon the Government to consider whether it would not now be the wisest course to withdraw the Army of General Wolseley to the proper frontier of Egypt. We may be told that that, under present circumstances, is an impossibility; but I greatly doubt whether it is. We see in the papers to-day that General Wolseley is expected to be at Cairo on the 13th of April, so that he must be able to make the journey in 14 days. If that be so, I do not see how there can be any physical impossibility in withdrawing the Army also; and that would save the shocking loss of life that must take place if an Army remains in those unhealthy regions during the summer. But it is said that it is necessary to smash the Mahdi, because otherwise there will be danger of an attack by his forces upon Egypt Proper. If the Mahdi chooses to come to Egypt we should have the support of the nation in resisting him, because as long as we are in Egypt everyone will admit that it is our duty to defend the country. It is, however, extremely doubtful whether we shall ever see the Mahdi in Egypt at all. Many things may happen that we cannot at present even conjecture before an invasion of Egypt by the Mahdi could take place. Why, then, should we go on with this miserable, wretched war, in order to provide against a contingency which may never arise? We are certainly indulging in accusations against the French on account of their wars of ambition, and everyone condemns the war now being carried on by them in China; but our war in the Soudan is not one degree less defensible. It is a more useless contest than any in which France is engaged in any part of the world. It may be thought by some that the safety of General Wolseley's Army requires the continuance of the operations in the neighbourhood of Suakin,

and for a considerable time many of us were influenced by that belief. But, as far as I am able to judge, I cannot see that there is any practical connection between the two positions, which are divided by a vast expanse of desert 600 miles in extent. I speak with no desire to throw any difficulty in the way of the Government. No one recognizes more than I do the enormous difficulties they have to cope with all over the world; but I am urging that which I believe to be strongly in their own interests and in the interests of the country. They have not yet, perhaps, sufficiently felt the pressure of public opinion out-of-doors upon this question; and I wish on this occasion to give expression to a very widespread feeling, which I am sure will in the course of the summer grow into a most formidable agitation if it is not met by concession on the part of the Government.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—CASE OF MR. JOHN BOYLE O'REILLY.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. SEXTON said, he wished to draw the attention of the Government to certain facts connected with the case of Mr. John Boyle O'Reilly, of Boston, who 19 years ago was convicted of treason in Dublin, and sentenced to penal servitude for 20 years. At that time Mr. O'Reilly had hardly, he might say, reached the years of manhood. The time of Mr. O'Reilly's trial was a time of great suffering and political excitement, and of many political trials in Ireland; and he was one of a large number of Irishmen who were tried upon a similar charge and sentenced to like terms of penal servitude. Those who were sentenced then might be divided into two classes—those who were civilians, and those who were members of the British Army. Not only had every civilian sentenced at that time been released, but also those who, like Mr. Boyle O'Reilly, were members of the British Army had since been set at liberty. In the case of some of the civilians, their release from penal servitude was accompanied by the condition that they should exile themselves from the Queen's Dominions; and he would be curious to hear the Home Secretary say whether the Government now thought the course pursued, in compelling the civilian prisoners whom they released to leave the Queen's Dominions and place themselves in permanent exile, had been a course, which, decided by the result of time, was either a wise or expedient one? It was very curious that the members of the British Army who 20 years ago were tried for treason, convicted, and sentenced, were released many years since without the condition of exile being attached to their release. Some of them returned to their native country. One of them, Sergeant M'Carthy, died there, and one at least he knew was now living in Ireland. Whatever else might be alleged, it could not be said that there was any moral distinction between the case of Mr. Boyle O'Reilly and those members of the British Army tried, convicted, and sentenced to the same time. There was, however, one point of difference. When Mr. Boyle O'Reilly had endured some part of his sentence of penal servitude, he escaped from the penal settlement in Australia. His escape was accomplished under circumstances of daring which attracted very general sympathy. [*Laughter.*] The right hon. Gentleman (Sir William Harcourt) smiled; but he (Mr. Sexton) thought if the right hon. Gentleman was placed in a similar situation he would try to escape himself. Mr. O'Reilly made his way to the Coast of Australia with the help of some devoted friends; he put out to sea in an open boat, floated alone upon the surface of the ocean for three days and three nights, then had the good fortune to be taken on board an American ship, and under the shelter of the American flag he made good his escape to the United States. With regard to the smile of the Home Secretary, he (Mr. Sexton) asked whether it was not a universal principle that a man suffering a sentence of penal servitude would make an effort to escape? If by any conceivable turn of fortune the Home Secretary came to suffer penal servitude himself, would he not make an attempt to escape? He (the Home Secretary) might have shown as much ingenuity as Mr. Boyle O'Reilly; but it was doubtful whether he would have shown as much courage.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I should have been shot by the sentries.

Mr. SEXTON: If Mr. Boyle O'Reilly was shot they would not have been considering his case. The point was that

his guilt was not increased by his effort to escape. Mr. Boyle O'Reilly, whom he had the pleasure to meet lately at Boston, was a gentleman of very high personal qualities, and of the rarest intellectual gifts; and during the years of his residence in America he had made such good use of his powers that he now filled the position of co-proprietor with the Archbishop of Boston and some other prelates of the most important journals in the United States. Mr. O'Reilly was one of the most influential men in the State of Massachusetts and one of the most honoured citizens in the United States, and might long ago have occupied a seat in Congress if he could have spared from his literary labours and the duties of journalism the time to devote himself to public life in that capacity. He (Mr. Sexton) might go so far as to say that one of the English gentlemen who met him lately in Boston, who lately occupied the position of Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of that House (Sir Lyon Playfair), was so impressed with the personal qualities and gifts of Mr. O'Reilly that he was one of the gentlemen who pressed upon the British Government the propriety and the duty of extending to Mr. Boyle O'Reilly the terms freely given to the men convicted under similar conditions. In December last the Irish residents of the City of Ottawa, intending to hold a celebration on St. Patrick's Day, invited Mr. Boyle O'Reilly to join them. The celebration of St. Patrick's Day was held in so much respect that it was the custom for the Parliament of the Dominion to adjourn on St. Patrick's Day, so as to allow the Members of Parliament of Irish birth or sympathy to attend the celebration. Mr. O'Reilly replied to the invitation that did not feel himself at liberty to accept it, in consequence of the uncertainty which he felt of what the action of the British Government might be towards him. He put himself into communication with the American Secretary on the matter; and such was the sense entertained by the American Secretary of the position of Mr. Boyle O'Reilly that he put himself into communication with the American Minister in London, who had an interview with Lord Granville, and, on the part of his Government, put the matter before the Queen's Minister in due form. At this stage the matter dropped for some time, and he (Mr. Sexton) received a letter from Mr. O'Reilly informing him what had been done and asking his advice. He (Mr. Sexton) conceived that the case was one in which the Government would have no hesitation in granting the request. The interest of the Government so clearly lay in wiping out any violent or vindictive memories of the time of Mr. O'Reilly's trial, that he had no doubt that the case was one in which there was no necessity for diplomatic circumlocution; and he advised Mr. O'Reilly to address himself directly to the Home Secretary if the application to the American Minister did not immediately result in a satisfactory decision. The interview of the American Minister with Lord Granville took place on January 9, and on the 29th Lord Granville's decision was communicated to those concerned. Lord Granville wrote —"Your request is one that cannot safely be granted." Mr. O'Reilly was a public politician in America who freely and frankly expressed in the Press and on the platform his opinions on the Irish political question, and on any other question that came within the range of his duty, and his public position alone would surely be a sufficient security for his conduct. The first error the Government committed in the matter was that, through vindictiveness against a man because he happened, nearly 20 years ago, to escape from their custody, they had refused a request made in true diplomatic form by the Minister of a great Government with which they claimed to be on friendly terms. He was bound to describe that as a gross diplomatic error. Mr. Lowell, the American Minister, in his letter to the American Secretary, said—

"The British Government do not feel justified in allowing Mr. O'Reilly to visit British Dominions.

Whereas the Foreign Secretary appeared to believe that the safety of the Realm was concerned with the question of whether Mr. O'Reilly went to Canada, the American Minister appeared to think that Lord Granville thought there was some moral objection. What was the language of the Home Secretary himself? He wrote on the 29th of January to Mr. Boyle O'Reilly's application, saying that he had already re-

ceived a like application from the American Minister, and had replied that, having regard to the circumstances of the case, he could not accede to his request. Here it was not a question of the safety of the Realm or of moral justification, but merely the word of the right hon. Gentleman. Meanwhile, what was happening in America in the interval between Mr. O'Reilly's application and the reply of the right hon. Gentleman? The Irish residents of Montreal gave an invitation to Mr. O'Reilly to visit them, and Mr. O'Reilly replied that he would be unable to go in consequence of the action of the British Government. Thereupon, the Irish residents sent a deputation to the Government of Canada at Ottawa; and upon their return made a public report to Sir Alexander Campbell, the Minister of Justice, and Sir John Macdonald, the Premier, and they saw no reason why Mr. O'Reilly should not visit Canada. Did the right hon. Gentleman know more about Canada than its Premier and its Minister of Justice? One Government decided in one way and the other in a different way. Which decision was right? A Constitutional question of the gravest import was involved. If a Canadian Government allowed a man to visit the Dominion, did the Home Secretary mean to say that the Home Government could interfere? Then, again, the Prerogative of the Crown in England was the Prerogative of mercy The Crown sometimes interfered for the purpose of releasing a man; but it was new to him (Mr. Sexton) that the Crown should interfere to imprison a man whom the right hon. Gentleman and the Government had determined not to molest.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I have never heard anything at all from Canada on the subject.

MR. SEXTON said, that the right hon. Gentleman betrayed an indifferent knowledge of the Correspondence of his own Department. Here was a letter signed "Godfrey Lushington," and dated the 29th January, which said that the Home Secretary had received an application, but could not accede to the request.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I could not give him leave to go to Canada.

MR. SEXTON: But the right hon. Gentleman has assumed to himself the right to refuse leave. His (Mr. Sexton's) object was not to appeal on behalf of Mr. O'Reilly, who would probably never repeat his request—indeed, it was doubtful if he would now accept the permission if it were offered to him. He (Mr. Sexton) wished to protest against the course which the Home Secretary had pursued, and to point out to the Government that they were exposing themselves to ridicule and contempt throughout America. They were worse than the Bourbons, for they learned nothing, forgot nothing, and forgave nothing. He would ask the right hon Gentleman for his decision on the Constitutional question.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, this case was extremely simple. The hon. Member seemed to think that Mr. O'Reilly, of whom he (Sir William Harcourt) had never heard before his case was brought before him, had been dealt with in some exceptional way. This was not so. O'Reilly had come before him as a man who had escaped from prison—who had, in fact, committed the offence known as prison breach. That was a new offence altogether from that for which he was primarily convicted. If a man had been lucky enough to make good his escape from prison in his own country, he surely could not expect to come back again rejoicing. It was not because O'Reilly was an Irishman that he had been thus treated; but the case was judged upon the bare ground of prison discipline, and if an exception were made in the case of this man, and he were dealt with differently, there would be no security for prison discipline. The hon. Member had said he (Sir William Harcourt) had interfered with the Government of Canada. What he had said was that, as far as he was concerned, he could give no leave to this man to go to Canada; and he assured the hon. Member that his decision was based upon no political grounds. The man had been dealt with like an ordinary prisoner who had broken the prison bars, who was a defaulter, and could not be a subject for the mercy of the Crown. In his answer to O'Reilly, he had spoken for himself alone, and had not attempted to interfere with the Government of Canada. O'Reilly might be a very much respected and distinguished person; but that would not prevent him from being dealt with, in

regard to his offence, as any other prisoner.

Mr. SEXTON: Is the discretion of the Canadian Government final as regards Canada?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he supposed the Canadian Government would regard the man as a man under an unremitted sentence; and the question of how they should deal with him was, he imagined, for them to consider.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR, said, that in politics there was nothing so good in the long run as a forgiving temper; but the Home Secretary, after an interval of 20 years since the conviction of Mr. O'Reilly, could only speak of that gentleman's case in so far as it concerned "prison discipline." The hon. and learned Member for Stockport, in bringing forward his plea for the establishment of a Court of Criminal Appeal, had not supported his arguments by reference to any Irish cases, though there were many that would have served his purpose much better than those English ones of which he had availed himself. The hon. and learned Gentleman had gone back to some very ancient cases; but he need not have looked further than a case which was only six or 12 months old—namely, that of Bryan Kilmartin. He might have pointed out as an argument for his Court of Appeal that, though this man was quite innocent of the offence with which he was charged, he was allowed by the Lord Lieutenant to remain under an atrocious and undeserved stigma. It was the treatment of Irish political prisoners which was largely responsible for the maintenance of that temper between the two races, which was such a constant cause of alarm. The Home Secretary had said that he knew nothing of Mr. O'Reilly. Well, the right hon. Gentleman was the only educated man in the House who did not know that gentleman. [*Ministerial laughter.*] He heard derisive cheers; but right hon. Gentlemen opposite should recollect the proviso that he had made. He had said the right hon. Gentleman was the only "educated" man. Mr. O'Reilly was one of the best known, most respected, and eminent citizens of the United States. If anything were needed to prove that statement, it would be found in the fact that he had been offered the post of Laureate. He (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) complained of Mr. O'Reilly being constantly referred to as "O'Reilly." It was the tone of insolence, of arrogance, of mean and snobbish contemptuousness, which in a great measure accounted for the acrimony which unfortunately characterized Irish discussions in that House. The Home Secretary would live in history; but what would be thought of him (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) if he were constantly to describe the right hon. Gentleman as "Harcourt," or as "William Harcourt," or as "the man Historicus?" Then, with reference to the right hon. Gentleman's observations on prison breach, he complained again of that style of speech. Would the Ambassador of the United States interest himself on behalf of a common burglar? This was a diplomatic question in which a great Government addressed another great Government, and the attempt of the right hon. Gentleman to reduce it to the contemptible proportions of a Common Law matter was really not worthy of him. In conclusion, he said it would do no harm to any great Government to show that it could forget and forgive offences. As a Colleague of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian, he (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) would ask the Home Secretary to remember that but for men like John Boyle O'Reilly, Liberal Governments would not have had the glory of passing measures for the benefit of Ireland. If the application should be renewed, he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would have learned to have some regard for the feelings of Irishmen, and some admiration for those who had done and suffered in their country's cause. These sentiments animated all Governments and all peoples, except in the single melancholy instance of the demeanour of England towards Ireland.

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—WITHDRAWAL OF THE FORCES.

OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. W. FOWLER said, he was one of the unfortunate and, he supposed, uneducated people who had not happened to hear of that distinguished man, Mr. O'Reilly. He desired to express his entire approval of the remarks made by the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. S. Smith), and to assure the Government that there was in the country a strong feeling that our position in the

Soudan was a most unfortunate and unjustifiable one. Everyone agreed that it was wrong to kill these poor unfortunate Arabs without some reason. The reports in this morning's papers to the effect that Osman Digna was retreating, and that another Mahdi had arisen, gave him a gleam of hope; and he trusted Her Majesty's Government would have the opportunity of procuring a peaceful settlement without delay. He could not understand the object of the fighting at Suakin, unless it was to prepare the way for the railway; but the railway could not be finished, at any rate, for a year or more, and how that was to enable us to carry on our campaign in the next summer, autumn, and winter he was at a loss to understand; but if we could not make the railway in time, what was the use of making it at all? If we made it we should have to maintain and guard it. We must not go away and leave it to be broken up. But why should we force ourselves on these people? General Gordon could not now be rescued, and the Slave Trade could not be abolished; and what possible object was there to fight for? As for defending Egypt, it could be much better defended on the Egyptian side of the Desert than on the other side where we now were. Another consideration which should be borne in mind was the great waste of power entailed by dividing our Forces, to have one Expedition at Suakin and another on the Nile, while at the same time war was threatening in other districts, without any really adequate object to be gained by such a division. It should also be remembered that the carrying on of a war of this kind encouraged a spirit for war in the country. It was being carried on in defiance of the principles of Christianity which they professed, and they were doing their best to destroy a people with whom they had no quarrel, and who were justified in defending their own country. Notwithstanding this, however, we continued on in this ill-defined course, and in keeping a vast number of our men in a dangerous position and in a miserable climate without, so far as he could make out, any object whatever. They could not go on as they were now doing, and they must give up a position which was inconsistent and not to be justified. This feeling was growing among all classes of Her Majesty's subjects. Even the Opposition, which originally urged the Government to undertake these military operations, were now becoming disgusted. He appealed to the Government not to imagine that this was the idea of a few sentimental people; it was a widespread feeling of a vast number of their supporters throughout the country, and among classes of people whose opinion was well worth attending to. He implored the Government to lose no opportunity of getting themselves out of this situation, for which he admitted they were not wholly responsible. A great part of the difficulties of the Government had been inherited from their Predecessors; but he protested against any further needless slaughter of the people in the Soudan.

Mr. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT protested that it was incorrect to say that the Opposition had urged the Government to this war. They had urged the Government to relieve the garrisons in the Soudan, and that steps should be taken to succour General Gordon at a time when it could have been done with a small effort; they protested against the withdrawal of General Graham's Force when he could have opened the Berber road, and the war, which had since assumed such sanguinary proportions, could have been nipped in the bud. But to say that the Opposition were responsible because the Government, by their delay, vacillation, and cowardice, had given up all their opportunities, and now found themselves confronted by worse difficulties even than war and bloodshed, was most unjust and inconsistent. He had no doubt that the hon. Member (Mr. W. Fowler) had supported the Government on many occasions in each one of their blunders, and now he turned round and threw it in their teeth. There was, however, one phrase in the speech of the hon. Member with which he concurred—the undefined purpose of this slaughter. So far as the slaughter was purposeless and undefined, he joined in the hon. Member's condemnation of it. If General Graham's Expedition were to relieve Kassala and its thousands of people, or to put down the Slave Trade, he would say that it was a worthy object to attain; but the present policy of the Government, as explained to the House, was undefined, and until Parliament was told what the objects of the Government were, hon. Members had a right to

denounce the slaughter now going on in the Soudan as most wanton and indefensible. In regard to the Afghan boundary question, he felt that the appeal of the noble Marquess that there should be no debate on our relations with Russia came with great force from him. He felt that his plea for silence was not a mere pretext, such as the House was accustomed to hear from Ministers, but that there must be some reason for it. The noble Lord, however, contrasted the bearing of the Front Opposition Bench by implication with that of hon. Members on the Opposition side, and had mentioned his name and the character of the Questions he had addressed to the Government. The Question referred to was simply a request for information, as to whether important positions in Afghanistan which had been occupied by the Russian Forces were or were not deemed by the Government to be part of Afghanistan? He had practically asked the same Question throughout. He ventured to say that there was a great misconception on the part of the Government and of hon. Members in the House with regard to the effect produced in Russia by debates in the House. The Government treated Russia as if it was a country like France or the United States, in which every statement made in Parliament was at once reported and excited public feeling. The Government ought to be aware that not an item of news was published in the Russian Press without the direct interference of the Press Censor. If any aggravating or imprudent statement in Parliament was published in Russia it could only be done with the consent of the authorities, and with the object of exciting public feeling; but nothing that could be said in the British Parliament would increase the difficulties of the position. The most certain way, however, of preserving peace was to convince the Government of Russia that all parties in this country were united—[Mr. O'KELLY: No, no!]—he was speaking of Great Britain—in their determination to maintain the integrity of Afghanistan. [Mr. O'KELLY: No, no!]

MR. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. Member to abstain from making these indecorous observations and exclamations.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT, continuing, said, that such union as he had indicated, together with a declaration of our determination to uphold our pledges to the Ameer in face of the Russian aggression, and that no weakness on the part of any British Government would be tolerated by any section of the people, would be the most effective. The debate which made these propositions perfectly clear would be the surest guarantee of peace. Another point to be considered was the effect of withdrawal on the Ameer of Afghanistan. It was of primary importance, in regard to our position as to Afghanistan and to the Ameer, that there should not be the slightest sign of shrinking on the part of Her Majesty's Government. The Ameer was quite capable of judging whether England was in earnest or not; and if he were once convinced that our Government were really firm in their resolve to resist aggression, we might fairly count upon his friendship and support; but if the unfortunate policy of 1873 were pursued in the slightest degree, we should assuredly again drive the Ameer into the arms of Russia; and such *laches* would be most disastrous. In connection with the recent advances of Russia in Central Asia, the abandonment of Candahar by Her Majesty's Government some years ago had had a most disastrous result. He hoped that no hon. Member would be led away on that subject by any mistaken idea as to the amount of benefit to mankind which was said to have been produced by the Russian conquests in Central Asia. We had the safety and the prosperity of the 250,000,000 of people in India to look after. The security of the greatest Possession of the British Crown—a Possession that was more necessary for the trade and wealth of this country than any other Possession of our Empire—was at stake in that matter. He had the greatest distrust of the civilizing mission of Russia in Central Asia; and if he had time for the purpose he could demonstrate that the pleas often advanced on that score were to a large extent unfounded. He regarded it, however, as most unfortunate that the House was now unable to get some more definite statement from the Government. He regretted that the House had failed to obtain more definite information from Her Majesty's Government; but recognizing, as he did, the courtesy of the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War, as contrasted with the behaviour of other Ministers, he refrained from raising the question further on

the present occasion. The position of this country was now very serious. They had evidence that certain demands which Her Majesty's Government had thought fit to make had either been withdrawn or had "lapsed," and that a so-called "agreement" had been made which gave us no practical security, and which left Russia at liberty to revoke the arrangement at any moment when she chose to allege that "extraordinary reasons" had arisen. The construction of the railway from the Caspian was being hurried on, and it might be finished to Sarakhs at any moment. They knew that Russia was increasing her Forces in those regions, while the unfavourable season was coming on for the sending of reinforcements on our side. He, therefore, protested against the delay that had taken place on the part of the Government in regard to accurate information both as to facts and as to policy. He believed that their weakness and procrastination were increasing the dangers of the situation and tending to precipitate war; and if that result should unhappily ensue—although he should deeply regret it—and his appeals and warnings should prove to be correct, he should at least believe that he had discharged his duty—[*Ironical cheers*]—as a humble Member of the House of Commons. Hon. Members who indulged in such cheers would remember that every warning that had been given from that side of the House as to the movements of Russia had come true; and that the action of the Conservative Party was taken in the interest and for the maintenance of our Indian Empire.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, that he could not see the situation in the same light as the hon. Member for Eye (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett). He failed to observe any danger in the advance of Russia, and believed it would be better for both countries and the world at large if the frontiers of England and of Russia in Asia marched together. With reference to the remarks made by the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. S. Smith) and the hon. Member for Cambridge (Mr. W. Fowler), as to the war in the Soudan, he regretted that the action of those hon. Members in that House did not correspond a little more closely with their profession. Why did not those hon. Members and their friends tell the Government that if they did not stop the horrible, cruel, and wanton bloodshed in these petty wars, they would turn them out of Office? He regarded this Government and the Prime Minister as so guilty with respect to the unfortunate Soudanese that if there was a Motion to surrender the Prime Minister to the Soudanese women he would vote for it. Some time ago a few men who, in an out-of-the-way corner in Dublin, attacked Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke, were denounced as murderers and scoundrels, and held up to the execration of mankind. Other men, however, seated in a quiet room in London, armed tens of thousands of their fellow men, and sent them out to the Soudan to put to death men whom they had never seen, and with whom they had no cause of quarrel; and these men were said to be Christian Ministers and vindicators of the resources of civilization. He would ask what, from the calm point of view of morality and justice, was the difference between the conduct of the Prime Minister and that of "Skin the Goat," in Dublin, when assisting in carrying out the murder of Lord Frederick Cavendish? Common sense was shocked and the conscience sickened at the professions of Christianity and civilization made in that House, as contrasted with this revolting conduct, of which it was difficult to speak in Parliamentary language.

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—PROCLAMATIONS—PROHIBITION OF MEETING AT BURROUGHTOWN, CO. WEXFORD.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said, he wished to draw attention to the prohibition by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland of a public meeting which was to have been held on the 18th of February at Burroughtown, in Wexford. The result of that prohibition had been to increase the feeling of hatred towards the Government of the Castle. The county was a remarkably peaceful and Constitutional one, and there had been no crime or outrage of any kind committed in the district. The only reason assigned for suppressing the meeting was that the placard calling it together had been somewhat hotly worded, though, in his opinion, it was not more so than the character of the case had required. The conduct of the Government in thus in-

terfering with the liberty of the people was most infamous. He wished also to complain of the manner in which the Government had treated Mr. John Boyle O'Reilly by refusing him permission to revisit Ireland. Such an act of tyranny would serve to embitter the feeling of the Irish race in America against England.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said, that meetings were prohibited on two grounds—either that the meetings would lead to a breach of the peace, or that they would lead to a fresh outbreak of outrages or intimidation. In this case there had been no apprehension of a breach of the peace; but the meeting was prohibited because it was feared the placard would lead to an outbreak of outrages.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: But we never had any outrages.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The placard convening the meeting was of the most mischievous character. It denounced the payment of rent of any kind under any terms whatever; and, having regard to that fact, there was no course open to the Lord Lieutenant but to proclaim the meeting.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND rose to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman has no right of reply.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Of course, it is very hard to get fair play here.

MR. BARRY said, the Chief Secretary for Ireland had entirely misled the House regarding the character of the placard referred to. There was a single reference in the placard to rent, and that reference did not amount to anything more than the opinion that had been expressed more than once by the President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Chamberlain). It simply referred to rent in very general terms, and did not denounce the payment of rent under any circumstances whatever. The right hon. Gentleman, therefore, he would not say deliberately, but he did undoubtedly misrepresent the character of the placard. If the placard was illegal, surely they had a Crimes Act in Ireland; and why did they not prosecute those who issued it? The placard, on the contrary, was perfectly legal and perfectly justifiable; and if occasion demanded it such placards would be issued again.

SEA COAST FISHERIES (IRELAND)—ENCROACHMENTS OF FRENCH FISHERMEN.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. KENNY said, he desired to call the attention of the House to the constant encroachments of French fishing luggers within the three mile limit on the South and West Coast of Ireland, whereby the interests of the poor Irish fishermen in these parts were seriously interfered with. He had received only that day a communication that a few nights ago these French fishermen landed on the Irish Coast and stole a boat belonging to one of the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries, which was being used by four poor fishermen in the neighbourhood where the Frenchmen landed. He thought it was the duty of the Admiralty, or the Irish Government acting in conjunction with the Admiralty, to see that the coasts were sufficiently guarded by gunboats and cruisers to prevent the encroachments of these foreign fishermen.

It being ten minutes before Seven of the clock the Debate stood adjourned till *this day*, at Nine of the clock.

ADJOURNMENT.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question, "That this House, at its rising, do adjourn till Thursday the 9th of April."—(*The Marquess of Hartington.*)

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

MR. KENNY continued his remarks, and urged that the Admiralty ought to protect the fishermen and fisheries of the Irish Coasts from the depredations of French fishermen by providing gunboats for the purpose. The French boats came close to the shore, drove away the smaller boats of the Irish fishermen, and took the fish that would otherwise be taken by the Irish boats. Turning to another subject, he felt bound to complain that the Notice of Motion for the appointment of the Select Committee on Irish Industries had disappeared from the Notice Paper, and was not on the Paper for the Evening Sitting. The question was one of material consequence, and it was very hard that it should be treated in such a manner by the Government. The Irish Members and the hon. Baronet (Sir Eardley Wilmot), to whom the Irish

people were grateful for moving in the matter, received letters daily from all parts of Ireland on the subject. He also wished to know whether some system could not be adopted under which the cost of the repair of the Irish National schools might not be paid out of the State funds, instead of being cast upon the different localities?

INDUSTRIES (IRELAND)—SELECT COMMITTEE.—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

SIR EARDLEY WILMOT said, he rose to make a personal explanation. He had not put down the names of those to be nominated to serve upon the Committee of Irish Industries for that evening, because he had been led to understand by the noble Lord the Member for Flintshire (Lord Richard Grosvenor) and the Clerk at the Table that there was no chance of the House meeting that evening at 9 o'clock. The hon. Baronet was proceeding to give in greater detail his reasons for not putting down the matter upon the Paper that evening, when——

MR. SPEAKER said: I must call the hon. Baronet to Order, on the ground that he is exceeding the bounds of a personal explanation.

SIR EARDLEY WILMOT said, he begged to apologize; but he could not see that he was transgressing the Rules of the House in the statement he was making. ["Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER said, he should expect that the hon. Baronet would respectfully bow to the decision of the Chair.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE CRAUGHWELL MURDER CASE—COMPENSATION.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

MR. O'BRIEN said, before the Motion for Adjournment was put he would like to ask the Solicitor General for Ireland whether there was to be any compensation given to the five men in the Craughwell murder case, who were discharged within the last few weeks after being kept in prison for two years and a half without trial? He would like also to ask the hon. and learned Gentleman whether he would be able to give any undertaking that this system of long imprisonment without trial in Ireland would not be persisted in? If these cases were the cases of five respectable Englishmen, who were kept in gaol for two years and a half without trial on a fearful charge, and then dismissed without a shilling of compensation, and without the slightest apology, and with only a third-class ticket to their native towns, he would like to see the English Minister who would stand up in that House and defend it. This grievance had occurred not merely in the Craughwell cases, but had happened in the Ballyforan case and the cases of the Tubbercurry prisoners, and was constantly occurring. Only last week Baron Dowse felt obliged to refer to the subject of prolonged imprisonment without trial in far stronger terms than he (Mr. O'Brien) had at his command. In these cases the men were torn away from their homes, shut up in solitary cells, and subjected to all sorts of subterranean intimidation. Of course, it was impressed upon them that with a Green Street jury, whether they were innocent or guilty, the inevitable result would be that they would be sent to the gallows or penal servitude. If they were broken down by this system, a trial took place and a conviction was had, and it was another feather in the cap of Earl Spencer. If, however, the men could not be bribed or intimidated they remained in prison in solitary confinement from Assizes to Assizes, and in a large number of cases from year to year. In the Ballyforan case one man named Kennedy hung himself in his cell after an interview with Mr. George Bolton, and a man named Nolan became insane. In the Craughwell murder case five men were kept for two years and a half without trial, subject to this fearful system of torture; and then they were dismissed under the cowardly system of *nolle prosequi*, their health ruined, their business destroyed, and even their reputations under as dark a cloud, because the Crown, after all this punishment, would not admit their innocence, but sent them away branded with the imputation that they had simply escaped because the Government had not been able to lay their hands upon sufficient evidence to clinch the case against them. They were not even afforded an opportunity of establishing their innocence by being permitted to take their trial before a jury. Their acquittal would in that case have been rather an awkward testimony against the *régime* of Earl Spencer, and the blood and iron policy which he

upheld. He believed that the Irish Members had a right to demand that there should be some understanding from the Government that this system should come to an end. These men, in addition to being dragged from their homes and subjected to a regular system of torture, were afterwards compelled to undergo a second system of police persecution. Mr. Fitzgerald, of Cork, after having been cruelly wronged, was, after a trial, triumphantly acquitted even by a Green Street jury, but was never since able to stir out without being dogged by detectives. Indeed, so far had this gone that when he called upon the representative of *The Freeman's Journal* in London to complain of the way he was followed, the detective who was watching him actually knocked at the door, forced his way upstairs, and asked Mr. Fitzgerald to come away, as he would die of cold outside. This might excite smiles from the hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench; but he assured them that it was a serious matter for those whose business and reputation were at stake to be followed about the world by a pair of policemen. He called upon the Solicitor General to give an undertaking that the efforts to ruin men by such a system of espionage would not be continued.

LORD RICHARD GROSVENOR said, he wished to explain that he had nothing to do with the withdrawal of the Notice of Motion given by the hon. Member for South Warwickshire (Sir Eardley Wilmot). If the hon. Member had been under the impression that there would not be a Sitting that was not his (Lord Richard Grosvenor's) fault.

MR. HARRINGTON expressed his surprise that no apology had been made on the part of the Government for the acts to which his hon. Friend had drawn attention. They had heard a good deal about the endeavours of the Government to establish a just and stable Government in Egypt. No Government that had existed in Egypt had been half so unjust or tyrannical as that which now existed in Ireland. If the Government was not prepared to give these men compensation, at least they ought to have the decency to put them upon their trial in order to establish their innocence, and to show their fellow-countrymen that the charge on which they had been imprisoned was without foundation. He complained strongly of the treatment to which untried prisoners were subjected, and announced his intention of again calling attention to the case of Myles Joyce.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER) said, that in the Craughwell murder case five men were arraigned at the Assizes; but on the first occasion their trial was postponed for the production of a witness who was supposed to be in America. On the next occasion one man was convicted and sentenced to death, and at another trial at the next Assizes another man was found guilty and also sentenced to death. The Crown then, with what he considered an exercise of clemency, entered a *nolle prosequi* in the other cases, and it was to these men that it was suggested that there should be compensation given. In the Ballyforan murder case, which had also been referred to, after some delay there was a conviction upon the capital charge in one of the cases, and in the second case the jury disagreed, and the accused were allowed out upon their own recognizances to come up for trial when called upon. He thought he should not be asked to give any opinion about what occurred at the door of *The Freeman's Journal* office, as he knew nothing about it.

MR. HARRINGTON asked, whether one of the prisoners in the case to which the hon. and learned Gentleman had referred was not a policeman residing out of the district altogether?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER) admitted that there had been a policeman concerned in the case.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

House adjourned at Ten o'clock till Thursday 9th April.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 9th April, 1885.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE — Industries (Ireland), Motion for Nomination [House counted out].

SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS; Votes 5 to 11, 13 to 19. *Resolutions* [March 30] *reported.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered*—East India (Unclaimed Stocks).*

Ordered — First Reading—Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders * [123]; Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Provisional Order * [124].
Second Reading—Egyptian Loan [122].

QUESTIONS.

—o—

SAVINGS BANKS ACT—BELFAST (KING STREET) SAVINGS BANK.

MR. GRAY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether Savings Banks may prepare two forms of accounts, one for the satisfaction of the Commissioners of National Debt and the other for exhibition to depositors; and, whether he is aware that the Belfast (King Street) Savings Bank has been doing so for some time past?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): Since the hon. Gentleman put his Question on the Paper, I have been in communication with the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, who have made inquiries of the Trustees of the Belfast (King Street) Savings Bank. The reply of the latter is, that they have

"Complied with the 59th section of the Act of 1863, and have publicly affixed and exhibited in a conspicuous part of the office where deposits are usually received a duplicate copy of the annual statement rendered to the Commissioners for the year ended the 20th of November, 1884, and dated the 7th of January, 1885, and which will remain so affixed and exhibited until the issue of the next annual statement. No supplementary or explanatory account or item whatever, not included in the Return made to the Commissioners, has been added to the duplicate."

The accounts being annual do not show any variation that may take place during the year, and no other than the authorized account can be exhibited.

MR. GRAY: I am extremely obliged to the right hon. Gentleman; but there is one part of the Question which I do not think he answered. The point on which I desired information was, whether it was in compliance with the regulations to have two forms of account, one being the public annual account, and the other being the account exhibited in accordance with the Act of Parliament?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): I thought I had answered the Question very distinctly. There is only one form of account, and it cannot be altered during the year.

IRELAND — SLIGO HARBOUR BOARD— REPAYMENT OF LOAN.

MR. SEXTON asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the Lords of the Treasury have considered a Memorial addressed to them, on the 14th of January last, by the Sligo Harbour Board, praying that the period fixed for commencing the repayment of the principal of the Treasury loan of £20,000 to them may be deferred; that the term of years in which repayment is to be made may be extended; and that the rate of interest charged may be reduced to the lowest practicable terms, in accordance with the recommendation made in the Report of the Select Committee on Harbour Accommodation; whether it appears from the Memorial, and from other information in the possession of the Treasury, that the Board have expended the full amount of the loan in deepening the channel, dredging for deep-water berths, improving the berthage at present quays, and other works of urgent necessity; that very considerable progress has been made with these works; that, owing to the failure of the contractors to execute their contract, the Harbour Board have been obliged to undertake the completion of the works with their own staff and plant; and that, as no improvement in revenue can result from the works until they are completed, and as the existing terms of the loan would necessitate the payment of £1,700 a-year, out of a revenue of only about £6,000, which barely allows the requisite margin for prosecuting the works, the Board will be constrained to abandon the effort to complete the works in which they are now engaged, and to give up the hope of improving the portal revenue, unless the Treasury terms are relaxed; and, whether the Treasury will grant the terms prayed for in the Memorial of the Board?

MR. HIBBERT: The Memorial has been received, and the subject is under inquiry in Ireland. An engineer will visit the place at next spring tides; and, on receipt of his Report, we shall be in a position to decide upon the course to be pursued. At present, I can only add that the rate of interest on the existing loan is fixed at the lowest rate allowed by the Act under which the advance was made.

MR. SEXTON said, he would put a further Question on the subject.

POST OFFICE—MR. A. TURNER, POSTMASTER AT OAKHAM.

MR. E. STANHOPE asked the Postmaster General, If he is aware that Mr. Alfred Turner, the Postmaster at Oakham, has recently addressed a political letter to *The Grantham Journal;* that Mr. Turner is constantly taking part in politics, attending political meetings, and occupying the chair at them, and is actually the President and Treasurer of the Liberal Executive Committee; and, whether, in the circumstances, he will direct Mr. Turner to abstain, directly and indirectly, from taking any further part in politics?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: In reply to the hon. Member, I have to say that the facts stated in the Question are substantially correct. In consequence, however, of the answer which I gave on the 26th ultimo, to the Question put to me by the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Whitley), the Postmaster of Oakham at once resigned his post of treasurer of the Executive Committee of the Rutland Liberal Association, and expressed his regret that he should have transgressed the bounds of propriety inseparable from his official position. He further stated that in future he should not take any public action in political matters. I have accepted this assurance, and have no doubt that it will be faithfully observed.

FRANCE AND CHINA—THE HOSTILITIES (INTERNATIONAL LAW)—CONTRABAND OF WAR—RICE.

MR. W. H. SMITH asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If the French Government have withdrawn their declaration indicating rice as contraband of war?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: No, Sir; the French have not given notice of the withdrawal of the declaration.

FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—CHECKPOINT PIER, CO. WATERFORD.

MR. HEALY asked the Secretary to the Treasury, If he could state what was the amount of the engineer's estimate for the Checkpoint Pier, county Waterford; how was the money provided; what is the amount of the contract for the work, and when is the contractor bound to complete the works; and, is it a fact that the plan of these works designed by the engineer of the Board of Works is so faulty that a boat slip has not been provided for boats bringing fish there at low water, and that at such times the pier will be nearly useless?

MR. HIBBERT: The engineer's estimate for this work was £3,000, towards which £2,250 was provided by grant from the Sea Fisheries Fund, and £750 has been contributed locally. The amount of the contract is £2,649, and the contractor is bound to complete the works on the 1st of October next. No boat slip was recommended by the Fishery Commissioners, neither did there appear to be any local desire for one; but the Waterford Steamship Company having asked that there should be one, the Board of Works are in communication with them on the subject.

FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—CLEGGAN PIER, CO. GALWAY.

MR. KENNY asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, If it is a fact that the Grand Jury of the county of Galway presented a sum of £2,000, as far back as the Spring Assizes of 1884, towards a grant out of the Sea Fisheries Fund for the erection of a pier and formation of a harbour at Cleggan, in the county Galway, according to plans prepared by the Board of Works, and that the Piers and Harbours Commissioners, and the Treasury thereupon sanctioned a free grant of £6,000, to complete said works; and if, notwithstanding the length of time that has since elapsed, the works have not yet been commenced; if the works have been let to a contractor; and, if so, what is the amount of the contract, and when is he bound to have them completed; and, if a copy of the detailed plans and specifications will be furnished to the county surveyor, who will be obliged to maintain the works hereafter?

MR. HIBBERT: At the end of last June, the Government heard that the Grand Jury had made a presentment for £2,000 on account of this work, and a grant of £6,000 from the Sea Fisheries

Fund was sanctioned in the middle of July. The tenders received after the necessary interval were not satisfactory, and fresh ones had to be called for. The contract was executed on the 18th of December last, its amount being £7,468, and the contractor is bound to complete the works by the 1st of October, 1886. Detailed plans and specifications will be furnished to the county surveyor if the Grand Jury desire it.

CIVIL SERVICE — PARLIAMENTARY CANDIDATURE—SIR WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether Sir W. B. Gurdon, being a Parliamentary candidate, has retired from his appointment in the Treasury?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): No, Sir; Sir William Gurdon is not a Parliamentary candidate. But whenever, if ever, he should become one, he will give up his appointment in the Treasury.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked whether the right hon. Gentleman had seen an announcement in *The Lynn Advertiser* to the effect that Sir William Gurdon had written a letter, which was read at a meeting of the Liberal Association, consenting to his name being mentioned as a candidate for the constituency? At the same meeting a letter was read from Mr. Lestrange withdrawing his name as a candidate.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): Will the hon. Member give me the date of that extract?

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: The 28th of March, 1885.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): If the hon. Member will let me have the extract, I will look into the matter.

THE DECLARATION OF PARIS, 1856.

MR. M'COAN asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the instructions and powers of the British Plenipotentiaries to the Congress of Paris, who signed the Treaty of March 20, 1856, included authority to sign the Declaration of April 16, 1856, and if he will lay a Copy of them upon the Table of the House; whether the Declaration of Paris has ever been ratified by the Crown or approved by Parliament; and, whether there is anything in either the Treaty of Paris, its Protocols, or the Declaration to show that Article 11 of the Treaty, which neutralized the Black Sea, "was not expected to be a permanent provision," while "the Declaration was intended to embody a permanent principle?"

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The British Plenipotentiaries at the Congress of 1856 had no instructions with reference to the Declaration, the signature of which was not contemplated when the Congress was summoned. The concurrence of Her Majesty's Government in the principles of the Declaration was communicated to Lord Clarendon in a despatch of the 13th of April, 1856, and after its signature the course taken by Lord Clarendon was entirely approved by Her Majesty's Government in a despatch of the 18th of April. Lord Palmerston declined to lay the instructions, and so did Mr. Bourke (see debates of April 13 and July 2, 1875). The Declaration was laid before Parliament, but did not require ratification. The phraseology quoted by the hon. Member does not appear in the Treaty, its Protocols, or in the Declaration. The 11th Article of the Treaty states that the Black Sea is formally and in perpetuity interdicted to the flag of war. The wording of the Declaration shows that it was intended to embody a permanent principle in so far as the Powers who adhered to it were concerned.

FRANCE AND CHINA — THE HOSTILITIES—THE ENGLISH MAILS.

BARON HENRY DE WORMS asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is a fact that Her Majesty's mails are not landed at Formosa owing to the French blockade; that the steamer with the mails arrived, but the captain refused to land the mails without the prior consent of the French authorities; that, as no French man of war was in sight, H.M.S. *Champion* went 150 miles to receive the answer that the mails were contraband of war; whether the English postmaster at Hong Kong announces that the mails for the French Fleet will be delivered regularly; whether French ships are allowed to coal and refit at Hong Kong in order to be able to chase English vessels and

steamers; and, whether Her Majesty's Government will take immediate steps to remedy this violation of the rights of neutrals, and make representations to the French Government on the subject?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: It appears that, on two occasions recently, the mails were not allowed by the French to be landed at Taiwan Foo, on the ground that information might be conveyed to the enemy by that means from the mainland. Letters for the Consuls were, however, allowed to be landed. I am not aware that the English Postmaster at Hong Kong has made the announcement referred to. French ships are allowed to coal and refit at Hong Kong so far as the terms of the Foreign Enlistment Act permits, as the Papers which will be in the hands of hon. Members to-morrow show. I may point out that Questions relating to Hong Kong should be asked of the Colonial Office.

EGYPT (FINANCE, &c.)—THE PORTE—THE CONVENTION OF LONDON, MARCH 18, 1885.

MR. RAIKES asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, When, and in what form, the communications between Her Majesty's Government and the Porte, relating to the signature of the recent Convention concerning Egyptian finance, will be communicated to Parliament?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: As I have already stated, it is not intended to lay the Papers on the Table relating to the confidential communications which passed between Her Majesty's Government and the Porte prior to the signature of the Convention. But the Declaration of the 17th and the Convention of the 18th will be laid on the Table with the signature of the Turkish Ambassador attached, as soon as the ratifications have been exchanged, and two separate declarations made by the Ambassador on signature will be laid on the Table at once.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE EGYPTIAN LOAN BILL.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, What are the intentions of the Government with regard to the second reading of the Egyptian Loan Bill, which is the Second Order of the Day; is it intended to proceed with it this night; and, if so, at what hour?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (MR. CHILDERS): The Government propose to take the second reading of the Bill to-night. As there will probably be a debate of some importance on going into Committee, I have considered with my Colleagues on what day it would be well to take that stage, and we propose to take it on Thursday, the 16th instant, naming Thursday, the 23rd instant, for the Budget, instead of the 16th. The second reading of the Bill will be taken at any time to-night.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: If the second reading is taken to-night, it must not be understood as committing the House to the principle of the Bill, the debate on which must be made on the Motion that the Speaker leave the Chair.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am quite willing that the second reading shall not be understood as adding to the force of the previous division on this subject.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I should like to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he has any further Papers to lay on the Table with regard to the correspondence subsequent to that now before the House respecting this loan?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (MR. CHILDERS): No, Sir; all the subsequent correspondence was confidential, and cannot be laid before Parliament.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: What will the Business be on Monday?

MR. GLADSTONE: The Queen's Message will be taken first, and the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill next.

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIAN ATTACK ON THE AFGHANS AT PENJDEH—STATEMENT OF H.M. MINISTERS.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Seeing the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister is now in his place, I desire to ask him, Whether he is in a position to give the House any information with regard to the position of the question relating to the Russian negotiations respecting the Afghan frontier; and, also

with regard to the reports published in the newspapers to-day as to a collision having taken place on that frontier?

MR. GLADSTONE: I shall do my best to answer the Question of the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Stafford Northcote), which he has put in such a considerate manner; and I likewise thank the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. Stanhope) for having evinced the same disposition in regard to the Question he had proposed to put. I had prepared myself to answer the Question as put; and what I should have said to him (Mr. Stanhope) I shall state in answer to the first part of the Question of the right hon. Baronet. The House will recollect that a good deal of notice was taken in the newspapers, in the course of last week, of an answer which it was stated had been despatched by the Russian Government to the British Government on the subject of the frontier negotiations. Constructions were put upon that answer which, no doubt, had a certain effect on the public mind. That answer reached Her Majesty's Government on Thursday, the 2nd instant, and a Cabinet Council was summoned, and met on Saturday. The answer, which we then examined and considered, did not appear to us to advance the questions that were under consideration between us towards a conclusion. But a subsequent communication has been received from Russia within the last 24 hours, and that communication did appear to place the matter in a more hopeful position. However, Sir, the House will not be surprised when I say that it is impossible for me to make any further statement upon the subject of the "frontier negotiations" strictly so called. It is impossible for me to make any further statement as to the progress of these negotiations in the present very rudimentary and incomplete state of the communications between the two Governments as to the very grave occurrence that has just been reported to us, and in respect to which occurrence we shall carefully bear in mind both what is due to our engagements to the Ameer of Afghanistan and what is due to ourselves as representing the British Crown. I pass, therefore, from that occurrence, and proceed to give as good an account as I can to the right hon. Baronet and the House of the intelligence which is in our possession. I will mention, in the first place, the allegations that are made by the Russian Government; and, perhaps, I ought to state, in justice to the Russian Government, that it has been made known to us that their information is incomplete, and that a telegram which they knew had been despatched to them had not reached them when some later communications reached them, on the strength of which I now recite the principal propositions which they contain. In the first place, there are two things admitted—namely, that an attack was made on the Afghans by the Russians, and that the Afghans were defeated. On those two points there is no doubt—defeated, as we are informed, after a gallant fight. The Russian allegations are mainly these—I will not attempt to give them in strict form, but the House may depend upon the substance of my recital. The Russians attacked the Afghans, as they state, after being provoked by acts of hostility so termed—the nature of which we are not distinctly informed of—on the part of the Afghans. When the fighting was over the Russians retired. They retired, according to a phrase used in one document, "to their previous positions." The phrase used in the other document is that they retired "to the left bank of the Kushk." These two phrases may be exactly equivalent. I am not prepared to say they are not; but I mention them both because they are used in the two accounts which have reached us. It is next alleged that English officers directed the Afghans, without taking part in the actual engagement; and, finally, it is stated that the Russian Commander sent an escort to protect the English officers after the Afghans were defeated, but that the English officers had themselves left the ground when the escort arrived, so that there was no occasion for it to act. Now, Sir, these are the principal allegations that have reached us as the allegations of the Russian Government.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: What is the date?

MR. GLADSTONE: Of this statement?

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: No, of the engagement?

MR. GLADSTONE: The date of the engagement is the 30th of March; and, perhaps, I may say that the earliest intelligence of the most material of the

facts I am about to recite only reached Lord Granville and myself this morning. Well, now, Sir, I come to the allegations made by Sir Peter Lumsden and our own officers—allegations to which I need scarcely say that, as a matter of course, we give credit, and which, undoubtedly, call for very grave attention. In the first place, it is stated that no forward movement of any kind was made by the Afghans before or since the 17th of March—the 17th of March being the date of the telegram I shall now recite. On the 29th of March we were informed—and when I say "we" I speak of Sir Peter Lumsden's telegram sent to us—we were informed that, notwithstanding the Russian assurances of the 17th of March—this is the substance of the telegram which the House will no doubt recognize, because it was the substance of the statement made by me in this House and sent to St. Petersburg and recognized there, and returned thence with a certain addition stated in this House at the time—on the 29th of March we were informed by Sir Peter Lumsden that—

"Notwithstanding the Russian assurances of the 17th of March that the Russian forces would not advance from the position they then occupied, provided the Afghans should not advance nor attack them, or unless some extraordinary circumstance should happen, such as a disturbance in Penjdeh"—

then the recital says—

"the Russians were drawn up in force almost within range of the Afghan position, though the Afghans had neither attacked nor advanced, and Penjdeh was perfectly quiet."

Next, that every endeavour was being made by the Russians—this is in the nature of a general statement—to induce the Afghans to begin the fight; and that the Russian forces had twice attempted to forcibly pass through the Afghan pickets. The next point is, that on the failure of those attempts, Captain Yate met the Chief of the Russian Staff by appointment, and was informed that no such arrangement as that referred to in our telegram of the 17th of March, as to the non-advance of the Russians, had been received. ["Oh, oh!"] These are very grave statements, and have been made the subject of proper communication. Next, that the Chief of the Staff—the name of the Russian General I do not recollect—would not give an assurance to Captain Yate that the Afghans would not be attacked without previous notice, and he claimed the right to turn out the Afghan posts, whenever they might inconvenience the Russians, without reference to any third party. That, of course, must be taken in connection with the statement immediately preceding it—that he had not received from St. Petersburg instructions corresponding with the telegram of the 17th of March. Next, we learn that, on the 29th of March, Sir Peter Lumsden desired Captain Yate again to see the Russian Commander and effect an amicable arrangement if possible. We learnt, again, on the 7th of April, that down to the 30th of March, the Afghans had made no forward movement before or since that telegram of the 17th of March. I must make this recital, because it brings down to a somewhat later date the statement with which I have commenced. On the 7th of April we also learnt that Captain Yate had, on the 1st of April, sent a note from a point which he had reached with all the British officers and escort safely on the previous day, at 8 P.M., on the way to Gulran. It stated that the Russians had attacked and defeated the Afghans, and had occupied Penjdeh on the 30th. The Afghans were said to have fought gallantly, and to have lost heavily, two companies being killed to a man in their entrenchments. The survivors retreated along the Murachak road. The British officers were neutral in the engagement. The House will not be surprised when I say, speaking with measured words, and in circumstances of great gravity, that to us, upon the statements I have recited, this attack bears the appearance of an unprovoked aggression. We have asked for explanations from the Russian Government; but there has not yet been time to receive such explanations. We shall endeavour to arrive at a just conclusion on the facts. But before receiving our communications yesterday, and when we had not the important communications of this morning, but something preliminary in the same direction, the British Ambassador at St. Petersburg reported to us last night (at 40 minutes past 5) in these words—

"The Minister for Foreign Affairs expresses his earnest hope and that of the Emperor, that this unhappy incident may not prevent the continuance of the negotiations;"

and he also reported a statement in the

words of M. de Giers, that the Russians retired to their previous positions, and did not occupy Penjdeh. I may say that I have laid these statements before the House as being the incomplete and partial statements which the very short time that has elapsed since the receipt of the news alone enables me to offer; but such as they are, they are as much as our public duty will permit us to make; and I think I may say that they comprise the whole of the material statements of fact which have reached us upon this important and, for the moment, I may say very painful matter.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: After the very grave statement the right hon. Gentleman has made, of course I do not wish to put questions that would be embarrassing to the Government; but I do not quite understsnd whether the Government believe that Penjdeh is now occupied by the Russians or not. The reports seem to be conflicting.

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, Sir, there is much that is conflicting in the statements. I may also say that this particular point, I think, is not yet quite elucidated, because the statement that the Russians occupied Penjdeh comes to us from a British officer who had left the spot. Under these circumstances, it is not for me to say what has taken place; but it is evidently possible that when they defeated the Afghans in the intrenchments at Penjdeh, and entered those intrenchments, the natural inference would be that they may have occupied Penjdeh; but I do not presume to give an opinion, or any explanation on the point. I merely suggest it as a mode in which, possibly, the conflicting statements may be reconciled.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say that representations have been made to the Russian Government, but that Her Majesty's Government have not yet received an answer. I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he can tell us when he expects to receive an answer?

MR. GLADSTONE: That, Sir, is a question I am not able to answer; but I cannot doubt, from the grave nature of the case, from the nature of the representations made, and, I am bound to say, from the spontaneous communications from the Russian Government on the subject, I expect that it will arrive with full expedition; but I cannot presume to point out the exact time when it may be expected. But the Government will take care that every communication which can properly be made to the House is made without delay.

MR. O'KELLY: I wish to ask whether the right hon. Gentleman can say that the statement that no advance took place on the part of the Afghans is confined to the locality of Penjdeh; or, whether any advance, or any other act of aggression on the part of the Afghans, took place in any other portion of the territory?

MR. GLADSTONE: No, Sir; the statement is given to us in general terms, and so I have quoted it. But we have no reason to believe in any forward movement, or in any aggressive act on the part of the Afghans.

MR. NORWOOD: I beg to give Notice that, to-morrow, I will ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, whether any provision has been made for the protection of British commerce in the Baltic and Black Seas?

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL: I wish to ask the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, how many days it takes Sir Peter Lumsden to communicate with this country; and, also, whether the Russian communications take a longer time?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The wire on a part of the route—namely, that *vid* Meshed—has quite recently, I am sorry to say, been broken—I believe, by a snowstorm—and, therefore, communications are taking longer than they did a short time ago. The communications between Sir Peter Lumsden and London before the wire was broken took three or four days. Now, the communications referred to by the Prime Minister take six days—that is, in consequence of the wire having been broken.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL: Will the noble Lord tell us what time is occupied by the Russian communications?

MR. GLADSTONE: Eight days.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL: By what route could the Russian communications take place?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I cannot give accurate information on that point now; but I will make inquiry.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Has this communication come through the Viceroy; or, are the Government

aware whether the Viceroy has been made acquainted with what has occurred?

MR. GLADSTONE: These communications have come to us direct from Sir Peter Lumsden, and not through the Viceroy; but it is the invariable practice of Sir Peter Lumsden, on every subject of importance, to telegraph to the Viceroy; and his telegrams invariably end with the words "Sent Viceroy."

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Have the Government had any communications from the Viceroy since?

MR. GLADSTONE: There has not been time.

MR. MACFARLANE: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman, whether, when the Russian Government made statements to our Ambassador in St. Petersburg, with reference to this regretable incident, they, at the same time, offered any explanation why the arrangement between the Russian Government and Her Majesty's Government, communicated to this House on 17th March, had not reached the Russian Commander on the 30th?

MR. GLADSTONE: I cannot undertake to make any additions to the statement I have made before the House; but I will point out to the hon. Gentleman that we have no knowledge entitling us to say that the Russian Government, when M. de Giers saw the British Ambassador last night, was aware of what had been said by the Russian Chief of the Staff. That statement of the Russian Chief of the Staff would only reach the Russian Government through us, and it had not reached them at the time when the explanation of M. de Giers was made.

MR. ONSLOW: Is it the fact that Sir Peter Lumsden is in telegraphic communication with the Viceroy? My impression is, that the telegrams come to this country, and then are sent on to the Viceroy.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have explained that all this intelligence is regularly communicated by Sir Peter Lumsden to the Viceroy.

MR. ONSLOW: How; not by telegram?

MR. GLADSTONE: By the best means of communication at his command; and we have a communication from the Viceroy which shows that Sir Peter Lumsden had communicated with him, so far as the time permitted, on this very matter.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL: I suppose we may assume that the information that was in possession of the British officers as to the agreement of the 17th March was formally communicated to the Russian Commanders on the spot by the British Commissioner?

[No reply.]

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: Is it within the knowledge of the Government that the Afghans have been fortifying Penjdeh?

[No reply.]

EGYPT—SEIZURE OF THE "BOSPHORE EGYPTIEN."

MR. O'DONNELL asked the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is true that *The Bosphore Egyptien* newspaper was seized at Cairo by the orders of Her Majesty's Government, in spite of the protests of the French Consul?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The hon. Member had better put his Question on the Paper.

MR. O'DONNELL said, he would give Notice of a Question on the subject.

MR. O'KELLY asked whether this paper was not suppressed by the authorities at Cairo in an arbitrary manner, and without consultation with the French authorities?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Perhaps the hon. Member would also put his Question on the Paper.

MR. O'KELLY: Does the noble Lord mean to say he is not in possession of any information on the subject?

ORDER OF THE DAY.

—o—

SUPPLY.—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

(1.) £129,088, to complete the sum for Public Buildings, Great Britain.

MR. HEALY asked if this were Vote 5 in the Estimates?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. HEALY said, the Vote contained an item in connection with the Bridge over the Menai Straits in Holyhead. As the Irish Members were constant travellers across this Bridge, he would like to have some explanation of the item?

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE remarked, that the Bridge referred to was not the Tubular Bridge, but the Chain Bridge, which had no connection with the railway service.

Vote *agreed to.*

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £7,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for preliminary expenses in connection with the erection of the New Admiralty and War Office, under the provisions of 'The Public Offices Site Act, 1882.'"

MR. BERESFORD HOPE said, he should be sorry if this Vote were allowed to pass *sub silentio.* He could quite understand that at the present moment the House had very grave matters pressing on its mind, and that therefore there might be a disposition to get rid of minor questions, such as he admitted this to be. But although far beneath the important questions now arising in connection with European and Asiatic politics, this was not altogether a minor matter to many persons living in the Metropolis who had any regard for Art or taste for architecture, and who were not prepared to sit down quietly with a tacit admission of Napoleon's definition that they were "a nation of shopkeepers." He did not contest the necessity for the erection of the projected new Offices for the Admiralty and War Department. On the contrary, he was quite prepared to say that it was a shame and a disgrace that the matter had not been undertaken a long time ago; and he thanked his right hon. Friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) for having undertaken it with his usual energy when First Commissioner of Works. As they all knew, this building was the result of a general competition which took place last year; and they also knew that, to everybody's surprise, the prize at that competition was carried off by two gentlemen, no doubt very meritorious persons, but who up to this time had been absolutely and totally unknown. He did not complain of that. He remembered the lines of the poet—

"Full many a gem of purest ray serene
The dark unfathomed caves of ocean bear;"

but, at the same time, he thought the circumstances of the case were such as to render it necessary that something should be known of the architects who had been selected. Those who had arranged the competition would no doubt be prepared to maintain that the necessity of having buildings for the purposes for which they were intended was the chief consideration. He presumed that everybody would admit that to be the first object; but it was also desirable that, in securing that object, regard should be had to the adequate and satisfactory architectural details of the new Public Offices. In this case, it appeared that the competition had been managed upon a much more complicated system than other competitions for the erection of public buildings in former times. In the first instance, there was a preliminary competition, and out of that preliminary competition nine designs were selected. With regard to those nine designs there was a second competition, and he complained that the public had not been consulted and taken into full and complete partnership with the Office of Works in regard to the competition and the final selection. The first competition—the general competition, out of which the nine designs were selected—was a complete secret confined to the judges, from all participation in which the public had been excluded. They only knew that nine designs were selected, and that out of those nine designs the one which was presumably the best had been taken. He was unable to say whether it was the best from an artistic point of view, but he presumed that it was the one which best complied with the narrow and restricted limits laid down by the Office of Works. The public, however, had no means of knowing whether the preliminary competition was as sufficient and satisfactory as it should have been, and the competitors themselves had a right to the utmost assurance as to the manner in which the eliminating process by which the designs sent in had been reduced to nine had been reached. The designs had not been exhibited, as had been the case in all previous competitions. In the

famous competition in connection with the erection of Public Offices, 30 years ago, there was a full exhibition of the designs in Westminster Hall. It might be said that an exhibition of the designs in this case would have been so cumbrous that it had been of necessity excluded; but he denied that that was a sufficient reason for excluding it. They ought to have been prepared, when they engaged in the competition, to accept it with all its difficulties and its liabilities, no less than its advantages and its conveniences. He contended that by inviting the architects of this country to enter into a public competition, and then, by hiding away all the unsuccessful designs without allowing a judicial, critical, and enlightened public to come in and judge for themselves as to how far the appointed judges had or had not discharged their duty, and how far they had or had not come to an enlightened decision, the Government had conducted the competition in a most unsatisfactory manner. Of course, the fact that the successful competitors were men who were totally and absolutely unknown intensified the dissatisfaction; and in the absence of information as to the principles by which the judges had been guided in making their selection, of all knowledge as to the comparative merits of the different designs sent in, and of the grounds upon which the prize had been finally and substantially won, he thought the Committee ought to pause and look twice before it accepted the award. For these reasons he called upon the Committee to consider well what it was doing before it passed the present Vote. The facts which had attended the competition throughout—the unexpected choice of unknown men, the doubt whether the successful competitors, who, of course, had won their position in a creditable manner, had, nevertheless, won it from the superior artistic merits of their designs—a doubt rendered still more forcible by the fact that the designs sent in at the original competition had been carefully suppressed, was a ground which ought to induce the Committee to pause before it irrevocably accepted the award. He came next to discuss the merits of the designs of Messrs. Leeming, the successful competitors. In doing so, he was honestly and fairly bound to confess that, viewing the matter from an artistic point of view, he was not at all satisfied with the result. He would not pretend to attempt to enter into the question of Office accommodation. That was a matter on which, after all, it was far more fitting for clerks and Under Secretaries to say something than architects or men of taste; but he must say that, looking at this building as a production of National Art, it was wofully disappointing. It was vulgar, commonplace, overloaded with ornament, and absolutely fantastic in such originality as it possessed, for that certainly appeared in a form which no one else would have conceived—that of elongated four-sided cupolas, standing in a row upon the top line of the structure. The design might be seen upstairs in one of the Committee Rooms, so that any hon. Member, by a personal inspection, could see the manner in which the building was to be overloaded with columns, and what it was the nation was called upon to buy. He would not speculate upon the effect which a study of the designs was likely to produce upon the artistic mind of Europe, and that of the general public in this country. No doubt it would be said that the architects had won the prize after an open competition, and it might be asked what, under the circumstances, Parliament ought to do. He ventured to say that was not the best thing; but after matters had gone so far, the only way of partially repairing the damage done was what, although it might probably affect the *amour propre* of Messrs. Leeming, was well worth doing for the sake of the national credit in regard to Art—namely, to accept, if they so pleased, the carcass of the building and the distribution of the rooms, and then to clothe that carcass with artistic features of a different character from the present proposals. It was not a question of style, Gothic or Italian, but peculiarly and emphatically one of taste, and the design ought to be as simple as possible. If it were decided to erect these buildings in the Italian or Classical style, let it be so; but let the work be carried out in the best taste, and not in so inferior a manner as to be unworthy of a great nation. Messrs. Leeming were young architects, unknown in their Profession, and probably they would be able to produce something better in time; but it would have been more satisfactory in this instance if so important a work could have been placed

in the hands of more experienced men. There was one thing he could answer for, and he trusted the Committee would estimate it at its proper value, that any other design would be cheaper, as the faults of the design under consideration were not those of its plainness and simplicity, but, on the contrary, were found in the way in which it was overloaded with ornaments. He sincerely hoped that the Government would not hurriedly proceed with the execution of the work upon the present designs, and any additional expense which the delay would involve would be amply saved by sparing the country from the national disgrace of erecting an inferior building upon so conspicuous a site. In order to take the sense of the Committee, he begged to move the reduction of the Vote by the sum of £1,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £6,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for preliminary expenses in connection with the erection of the New Admiralty and War Office, under the provisions of 'The Public Offices Site Act, 1882.'" —(*Mr. Beresford Hope.*)

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that as he had been mainly responsible for the progress of the arrangements in connection with these buildings, he thought the Committee would expect him to say a few words on the subject. He quite agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that this matter was of so much importance that it should not be allowed to pass without discussion. Reference had been made to the competition, and it had been stated by his right hon. Friend that there had been a double competition—that was to say, in a first competition all the world had been invited to send in designs for this important building, and, having eliminated a certain number and selecting a limited number, the competitors were invited to enter into a further competition. The first competition resulted in 148 architects sending in designs. The judges consisted of five persons—the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith), himself (Mr. Shaw Lefevre), as the First Commissioner of Works, and two very eminent architects, one of whom was the President of the Institute of Architects. He believed that this was the first time two architects had been invited to be judges on equal terms with the official judges in a competition of this kind. He had said that 148 designs were sent in. Among the 148 architects who sent in designs in the first competition, there were many of the most eminent architects of the day. He was not able to mention their names, because the first competition was necessarily a secret one; but some of those gentlemen had since published their designs, although they were not among those that were selected, and no doubt many hon. Members had seen them in *The Builder*. The judges were unanimous in their selection of the first nine designs. In the first instance, 10 prizes of £500 each had been offered; but the judges were unable to select 10 of equal merit, and being only able to select nine, those nine were invited to enter into a second competition. The judges eventually selected three out of this number as being of more conspicuous merit than the rest and above all the others; and, after again very carefully considering the matter, they at last decided that the Messrs. Leeming's plan was the best, both in respect of internal arrangements, elevation, and appearance. In every way Messrs. Leeming's designs were distinctly and decidedly the best. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had complained that the public had not been invited to inspect the designs of the first competition. That exclusion, however, was a necessary incident in this form of double competition, and it was a plan which had not been adopted for the first time in the general trade, although it was adopted for the first time by the Government. Hon. Members would see that it was impossible to allow the public generally to see all the designs of the first competition, since hints might have been taken from other designs and made use of in the second competition. The public, however, had been invited to inspect the nine designs chosen, and they had agreed with the choice made by the judges. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had spoken in somewhat harsh terms of Messrs. Leeming's plan. For his own part, he (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) felt great hesitation in expressing any strong opinion on artistic matters; but if there was one point on which he could himself speak with great

confidence, it was that of the internal arrangements and ground plan of the designs selected. That was a matter to which he had given great attention, with a view specially to this competition and in laying down the conditions of the competition, and with the experience which he had had personally of many Public Offices he had no hesitation in saying that Messrs. Leeming's design, both in regard to the ground plan and the internal arrangements were incomparably and infinitely superior to those of any existing public building in London, and very far superior also to those of any of the other designs which had been selected from the first competition. When he came to the question of the elevation, in the presence of the right hon. Gentleman, who was an authority on such matters, he felt some hesitation in expressing an opinion; but he would say this much—the two eminent architects who were among the judges and had inspected the plans—not only the 143 originally sent in, but the nine finally selected—were of opinion that this design was one of great merit, would do great credit to the country, and would compare favourably with the building of Sir Gilbert Scott on the other side of the Horse Guards Parade. He believed that his right hon. Friend opposite was more of an authority upon Gothic than Classic architecture, and, when speaking of the details, the right hon. Gentleman seemed to treat the projected building rather as one which was intended to be erected in the Gothic than in the Classic style.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE: No; my right hon. Friend is quite mistaken.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that comparing it with many Gothic buildings, especially the one in which they were sitting, or the new Law Courts, he should say that the design of Messrs. Leeming was very conspicuous for its simplicity of treatment and for the absence of those fantastic details which the right hon. Gentleman condemned. It was quite true that Messrs. Leeming were young and unknown men, and had hitherto won no high prize in their Profession; but that was not the first time that an open competition had brought forward conspicuous merit. He need hardly point out to the Committee that admittedly the most beautiful classical building of modern times in this country, and perhaps the most beautiful in Europe—namely, St. George's Hall at Liverpool——

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK: No.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: Did the right hon. Gentleman deny that?

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK: Yes.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he must say that the right hon. Gentleman almost stood alone in that opinion. Mr. Ferguson and the highest architectural authorities had expressed the strongest opinion as to the artistic merits of St. George's Hall, and spoke of it as the best building of modern times, in this country at any rate. And the design for St. George's Hall was the result of an open competition, which had been won by a young architect who had only just reached the age of 21, and who had never previously performed any public work. Owing to his death before the completion of that work, St. George's Hall had been his single work. He only mentioned the fact to show that open competition had before produced a great work; and he believed that the work of Messrs. Leeming would be equally a credit to the country, and not unworthy of our reputation for artistic taste. Probably the Committee would expect him to say a few words on the finance of the matter. The site had already been made the subject of an Act of Parliament in 1882, after a long and careful investigation by a Select Committee of the House. The site had been bought at a cost of £550,000. Of this sum it had been agreed to pay £400,000 to the Woods and Forests Department as representing the Crown, or he should rather say that it was the sum agreed to be paid by the Crown, by an annuity spread over a term of years. The remaining £140,000 or £150,000 had been paid to individual owners of land or leases on the ground, so that altogether the sum of £550,000 represented the cost of the land. Comparing this price of £550,000 with the price of the only other alternative site suggested — namely, that of Great George Street and Parliament Street, there would be a great saving of money of not less than £1,000,000. It must also be remembered that £400,000 of the price agreed to be given was merely a book transfer from one Department to another, and that

the money paid out of pocket would not be more than £150,000. With regard to the estimated cost of the building, that was between £600,000 and £700,000; but, large as the sum was, it would not be a serious burden upon the State, inasmuch as the payment would be spread over a considerable term of years. It would be necessary to erect the building in two blocks, the first occupying the position of Spring Gardens Terrace. When that block was completed, the clerks of the Admiralty would be placed in the new block, and then it would be possible to pull down the existing Admiralty buildings and erect the second block. It was estimated that the first block would take four or five years in building, and after the removal of the Admiralty Office, another period of four or five years would be occupied in the erection of the second block. Altogether, the erection of the entire building would take about 10 or 11 years. In the current year there would only be an expenditure necessary of £10,000, and there was a possibility that even the whole of that sum would not be required. It would be necessary to enter into a contract for the building, and for that purpose working drawings would have to be made. It would, therefore, hardly be possible for the builders to begin work during the current year, and even next year no very large sum would be required to be paid over to the builders. After that the annual payments would be considerably larger; but, as they were spread over a space of 10 or 11 years, the charge in any year would not be very considerable. When the building was completed, it would be possible for the War Office to remove from its present quarters in Pall Mall. The buildings now occupied by that Department would consequently become vacant, and it was estimated that they were worth from £350,000 to £400,000. At present they were rented from the Woods and Forests Department at a not very high rent in proportion to the value of the property; but when the War Office was removed into the new building, property valued at from £350,000 to £400,000 would be set free. He thought he had now fully explained the financial part of the matter, and the only question now remaining was whether the Committee would sanction the plans which had been prepared. As he had already said, those plans had been the subject of very careful consideration, and had been very much improved since the time of the final competition. In the first place, Messrs. Leeming, acting upon a suggestion he had made to them, had amended their designs and thrown back the front of the building from Whitehall for a distance of 35 feet, which would very much improve the appearance of the building as seen from Whitehall. In the second place, they had enlarged the great Court of the building from a width of 80 feet to 95 feet, which would very much improve the building in respect of light and ventilation; thirdly, they had completely modified the Whitehall front; and, fourthly, they had altered the position of the campanile, which had been formerly placed at the end of the building next to the Horse Guards, but was now placed at the angle of the two fronts to the Horse Guards Parade. Anyone who would look at the designs would see that those alterations were of great importance. The building had been simplified in appearance, the columns to which his right hon. Friend had alluded, and which certainly stood out, having been thrown back more than the building itself. In that respect also a very important improvement had been effected. The main question, however, after all, for the Committee to consider was whether this building would really be a suitable building for the Admiralty and War Office. He thought they would be of opinion that the interior of great Public Offices ought not to be sacrificed to exterior. Every possible attention had been paid to the interior arrangements, and he must repeat that in their interior arrangements these plans could not possibly be improved upon; the building would house the two great Departments, and leave a considerable number of spare rooms over. There was only one other point to which it was necessary to allude—namely, that no provision was now made under the roof of the Admiralty for official residences for the First Lord of the Admiralty and the First Naval Lord; but on the ground plan they would see that there was a plot of land reserved on the north front of Spring Gardens, separated by the road only, upon which it would be possible, if in the future it should be

desirable to do so, to erect residences for those two Officers. For his own part, he was inclined to think that it was desirable those Officers, although not necessarily under the roof of the new building, should have residences provided in close proximity to it. That would be quite consistent with the other arrangements of the building, according to the plan adopted. He would conclude by saying that his belief was that Messrs. Leeming had honourably won this very great prize, and that the building erected upon their design, although it might not satisfy the artistic requirements of his right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Beresford Hope), would, nevertheless, be a great ornament to the Metropolis, and satisfy all the requirements of the War Office and Admiralty.

MR. GREGORY said, the sum the Committee were asked to vote at the present moment was, of course, a comparatively small one, but it would involve a very large expenditure of money hereafter. It was satisfactory to know that the interior arrangements of the new building had received so much attention at the hands of the right hon. Gentleman. He spoke feelingly upon the subject, because he happened to be a constant frequenter of a building where the arrangements were far from complete or satisfactory—he referred to the new Courts of Justice, which, both in regard to light, ventilation, and many other requirements, were most defective. He trusted that no inconveniences of a similar kind would be experienced in the proposed building, and certainly the right hon. Gentleman and the Government had ample warning before them in the arrangements to which he referred. He hoped that warning would not be without its due effect upon the consideration of the details of the arrangements connected with the new Public Offices. With regard to the elevation of the building, he could not, of course, speak with any authority upon the matter; but he confessed that when he saw the designs, it did appear to him that they were somewhat overloaded with ornament. There seemed to be a rather large number of columns designed for the purpose of ornament which could very well be dispensed with without spoiling the architecture of the building. He would, therefore, suggest that some reduction should be made in the external ornamentation. He gathered from the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General that that was to be the case, and he sincerely hoped that the building as erected would not be nearly so redundant in the way of architectural ornament as the designs seemed to imply. The total sum put down as the cost of the building was £700,000. He did not know—but here again he spoke in ignorance—whether that sum was to be considered excessive; £700,000 was the Estimate for the Courts of Justice, and he took it that the new Public Offices would be of something like the same dimensions. In the case of the Law Courts, however, there had been constantly increasing Estimates. As the Government were now about to enter upon a very serious expenditure, he hoped that great care would be exercised, and that before they entered into this large expenditure, they would see that everything was strictly regulated by contract. It would be necessary, in the first instance, to provide that contracts should be duly entered into, signed and sealed; and that every step of the work hereafter should be regulated by such contracts. They should also have a contractor upon whom they could rely, not only for the performance of the work, but for seeing that the Estimates were not materially exceeded. It was a matter of great importance, he thought, that before voting a large sum of money, Parliament should have some assurance that contracts would be entered into and laid upon the Table. He also trusted that the contracts, when entered into, would be substantially adhered to, and that the work would be proceeded with as rapidly as possible. The building operations should not be allowed to be suspended, either by want of means, or by strikes; but it should be rapidly and substantially carried on. Upon those conditions, so far as he was personally concerned, he was prepared to assent to the Vote.

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, he must invite the Committee to consider well the remarks which had been made by the Postmaster General in bringing this Vote under their notice. It was not a question as to the qualifications of Messrs. Leeming, or the artistic character of their designs. Everybody must admit that the plan for these new

buildings was a very beautiful one; but the question which the Committee had to consider was not whether the plan was a beautiful one or not, but whether it was really necessary or desirable that at the present moment they should spend a sum of certainly not less than £1,500,000 in the construction of the buildings, in the present state of the financial arrangements of the country? There was one matter which it was important the Committee should consider. At the close of last Session the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General, who was then Chief Commissioner of Works, wished the House to make some arrangement respecting the outside of Westminster Hall. An hon. Member sitting on those Benches discussed the subject, and the House of Commons decided that the proposal of the First Commissioner should not be entertained then, but should be postponed. The Committee would recollect that at the close of last Session it was determined that the arrangements proposed to be entered into by the First Commissioner of Works should stand over as a matter for further consideration; and he certainly thought the country must rejoice at the decision then come to by the House of Commons. The question now raised by the Postmaster General was one of very great importance. The Committee were asked at the present moment of financial crisis not to vote £6,000 this year, or £10,000 next, but to commit themselves by the Vote proposed to be taken to an expenditure of at least £1,500,000. [Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE: £700,000.] They knew from what his hon. Friend the Member for East Sussex (Mr. Gregory) had just said that they could not always depend upon the Estimates submitted to the House. They were always largely exceeded; and when the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General said that £700,000 was the full sum that would be required, the right hon. Gentleman knew as well as he (Sir Robert Peel) did, and as well as the Committee did, that the Estimate would not cover one-half of the expenditure that would be ultimately incurred. The right hon. Gentleman told the Committee a short time ago, that private residences for the First Lord of the Admiralty and some other Officers was not included in the Estimate, and that item alone would probably cost at least £100,000 more. At all events, he maintained that this was not the moment for the country, in the present state of their political affairs, to pledge itself to expend an amount of money which would probably in the end exceed £1,500,000, nor was it necessary. Was not the accommodation at the present moment adequate for the purposes for which it was required? The Postmaster General admitted just now that he was unable to express any opinion upon matters of Art; but he said that, under the plan of Messrs. Leeming, the internal arrangements in connection with the new Offices would be perfect. Well, let that be so; but was that a moment for spending something like £1,500,000 for the purpose of securing more perfect internal arrangements, when the internal arrangements of the existing Admiralty and War Office were, he presumed, fully adequate for every purpose required? No doubt Messrs. Leeming had very creditably gained the competition; but nine gentlemen were selected, as they now learned from the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General, out of 148 gentlemen who took part in the first competition. Each of those nine gentlemen received £500 for his designs, and he presumed that that sum of £500 a-piece was included in the sum of £7,000 the Committee were now asked to vote?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that was not so.

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, he should like, then, to ask where that sum of £4,500 was to come from?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE remarked, that it was voted last year.

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, he would be glad, under those circumstances, to learn from the right hon. Gentleman what it was the sum of £7,000 represented? It appeared in the Votes as the estimated expenditure which was to come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1886, in conection with the erection of the new Admiralty and War Office.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the Committee would, perhaps, allow him to explain that this sum was put down in the Estimates in order that the opinion of the Committee might be taken upon the plans of Messrs. Leeming. It had been thought desirable that a small Vote should be submitted to the Com-

mittee, in order that the Committee might have an opportunity of expressing its opinion. A portion of the money would be expended in pulling down some old buildings which it was necessary to pull down before the new scheme could be proceeded with.

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, it was quite clear that this sum of £7,000, which appeared in the Vote as the sum necessary to complete the sum that would come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st March, 1886, was intended to deceive the House of Commons, and to obtain a pledge that would bind the Committee to the expenditure of the whole of this money upon the proposed new buildings. He certainly did not think the statement of the right hon. Gentleman was at all a creditable one for a Member of the Government to make; and he could only hope that the right hon. Gentleman conducted the Department over which he now presided with a greater amount of accuracy, because to tell the Committee that this was the estimated expenditure up to the 31st of March, 1886, but that not 1*d.* of the sum was to be expended when voted, except in pulling down a few old houses, was certainly not dealing with the House of Commons in a straightforward way. The right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General had found fault with the criticisms of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Beresford Hope). No doubt, his right hon. Friend had been somewhat severe upon the accepted designs; but his right hon. Friend was a high authority upon questions of Art, and was fully entitled to express his opinion, however harshly it might bear upon a *protége* of the Government. The right hon. Gentleman had described the design as wofully disappointing, and as original only in the depravity of its taste. No stronger condemnation could have been passed by any authority upon artistic questions; but his right hon. Friend went on to say—"Let the building stand; but let us have the carcass only, and surround that carcass with artistic features entirely at variance with the present proposal." He (Sir Robert Peel) sincerely trusted that the Committee would not hastily pledge themselves to the demand now made upon them by the Government. He was convinced, in his own mind, that it was not necessary to expend this money. He was also sure that the explanation of the Postmaster General had not been thoroughly satisfactory; and bearing in mind the vast sum of money the adoption of the present Vote would hereafter involve, in connection with the new Admiralty and War Office, it would be well if a little more time were given for the consideration of the plan. He cordially endorsed what had been said by his hon. Friend behind him (Mr. Gregory), that really the financial question was one which ought to engage the attention of the Committee, and that this was certainly not the moment for the House of Commons to embark blindly into a scheme of this nature—a scheme, too, which they learned from the right hon. Gentleman himself was ill-digested, and anything but complete.

MR. BROADHURST trusted that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Beresford Hope) would not press his Motion to a division. They could not expect that the designs for a classical building would altogether meet the approval of a Gentleman who was understood to admire little other architecture than Gothic; and the right hon. Gentleman would himself admit that a Gothic building for the purposes of official labour was altogether an impossibility. [MR. BERESFORD HOPE: No.] Probably the right hon. Gentleman had had some experience in the course of his life of the difficulty of satisfying himself with any building plans that were submitted to him. Any hon. Gentleman who undertook to erect some large building for himself must be aware of the enormous difficulties which attended the settlement of the plans. There were many consultations and numerous alterations of the plans, and every kind of detail had to be examined and gone through before the individual who entered upon a building speculation was able to please himself with a plan that was intended to be carried out under his own direction. If, then, they were to wait until they had a plan which met with the universal approval of the House of Commons, they might have to wait for a very long time indeed, to say nothing of the difficulties which would have to be contended with in the criticisms which would be passed upon the

scheme from time to time in the House itself. The right hon. Baronet the Member for Huntingdon (Sir Robert Peel) appealed to the Committee not to pass this Vote at a critical time like the present, because of the enormous outlay to which it would commit Parliament. But he did not understand the right hon. Baronet to tell the Committee what the crisis was to which he referred. He presumed, therefore, that he made a merely general allusion.

SIR ROBERT PEEL: I, of course, referred, though in more general terms, to the programme of the Liberal Party, "Peace, Retrenchment, and Reform!"

MR. BROADHURST said, he thought that was hardly a satisfactory explanation of the general term crisis. What was in his mind, and no doubt it was in the minds of other hon. Members, was that the right hon. Baronet meant that the Government, or rather the country, was now engaged in difficulties in Egypt and the Soudan, with, unhappily, prospective difficulties in another part of the world. But surely the right hon. Baronet would be the last man in the House to tell the country that they must not undertake the erection of some Offices on account of the possibility of an engagement in warlike operations with a great European Power. Surely the right hon. Baronet would not present the financial position of this country in that light before Europe and the whole world. There was, surely, no reason to suppose that he would so humiliate the nation before the financial authorities of the world. If these Offices were necessary, the sooner they were erected the better for the business of the country. If they were not necessary, why was the proposal ever entered into? He understood that this was not the proposal of one side of the House only; but that right hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, who had had considerable experience of the inconveniences of carrying on Departmental work owing to the contracted state of the present Government Offices, in the War Office, and especially in the Admiralty Office, had approved it. If that was so, the first necessity, nay, the first duty of the country, was to provide Offices in which the work could be done conveniently and expeditiously, and they ought to lose no time in preparing the Offices for the transaction of their important work. He had taken some little interest in this matter from another point of view. He had been in communication with the Government for some months past, urging on them, if these Offices were to be erected, the desirability of commencing the work as soon as convenient. It was well known that they had a great mass of unemployed labour, chiefly unskilled labour, especially in London. Although the Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) stated that building operations would probably not commence this year, even if the Vote was passed that night, still there would, he apprehended, at an early day be a considerable demand for labour in pulling down the present buildings, erecting hoardings, preparing the foundations, and effecting a general clearance of the site to be occupied. That would give employment to a large number of the unskilled labourers of London. In saying that, he was not speaking for his special class, the mechanics, because there would be no employment for them for a considerable time under any circumstances; but there would be instant employment for a large number of unskilled labourers, who were the most pressed of any class of the community in times of depression and want of employment. He wished it to be clearly understood by the Committee that he was not advocating in the slightest degree that the Government should provide employment for those out of employment. He had never proposed and never advocated such a thing, and, so far as he knew, there was no possibility of his doing so. But if the work was necessary, if they had made up their minds that the work was to be done, then, he said, commence it at this time, rather than at any other time. Therefore, he hoped the Committee would not entertain the objection made to the proposal by the right hon. Baronet the Member for Huntingdon; indeed, he did not suppose the right hon. Baronet would himself press the objection. The hon. Member for East Sussex (Mr. Gregory) had appealed to the Postmaster General to take care that the inconveniences under which the Legal Profession laboured at the new Law Courts should not occur again in the Government Offices now under discussion. He did not possess an intimate acquaintance with the construction of

the new Law Courts; but he questioned whether, if the present contract was let under the circumstances under which that contract was let, they would be satisfied either with the building or with the contract. No matter how clever, accomplished, and far-sighted the architect might be, he always received at the hands of a capable and careful builder a vast number of practical suggestions as they progressed with the work. The contract for the Law Courts was let under circumstances which made it most unlikely that any such suggestions should be made. It was let at a ruinous price. Everyone who was engaged in the building trade knew perfectly well at the time the contract was accepted that nothing but disaster, failure, incompleteness, and dissatisfaction could result from the acceptance of that estimate. He was now speaking entirely from memory, and as the incident occurred 10 or 12 years ago the Committee would excuse him if he was wrong in his figures; but what he was about to state was something near the mark. The estimate of capable and well-known substantial building firms was something like £1,000,000; and the estimate which was accepted from an entirely unknown Provincial firm, of no experience, and of very little position, was, he believed, about £250,000 less. How was it possible for anyone to suppose that half-a-dozen of the great London building firms, some of the best firms in the world, the most experienced, the most honest, the most capable, could make a mistake of £250,000 in a contract of £1,000,000? The thing was absurd and impossible. He should not have referred to this, as he doubted whether it was quite the occasion to do so; but as the hon. Member for East Sussex (Mr. Gregory) had referred to it without correction he had ventured to mention it. He further wished to say that when they got to that stage of the proceedings of accepting contracts, he hoped the Government would take the greatest possible care that the inconceivable blunders committed in the case of letting the contract for the Law Courts were not repeated in the contract for the new Government Offices, and thus avoid bringing disgrace on the country, having incomplete buildings, and involving a far greater loss to the taxpayers of the country than if the contract was let at a fair price to a competent firm.

MR. GORST said, he thought the Government had got the support of the hon. Member for Stoke (Mr. Broadhurst) on false pretences. He understood the hon. Member to suppose that out of this sum of £10,000 a considerable proportion would go to the payment of unskilled labour. He should like to know how much? Up to this point they had spent £6,000 on architect's commissions and salaries of foremen of works without touching a brick; and how much of the £10,000 that was going to be spent this year was likely to be spent in giving wages to labourers, especially to unskilled labourers? He should also like to know whether the hon. Member reckoned the workmen who pulled down buildings as unskilled? He did not profess to have the same knowledge on these matters as the hon. Member; but he had always understood that a "housebreaker," as he was called—that was, one who pulled down houses—was one of the most highly-skilled in the trade. But he rose for the purpose of supporting the views placed before the Committee by his right hon. Friend the Member for Huntingdon (Sir Robert Peel)—views which had been misunderstood and misrepresented by the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Broadhurst). He did not suppose anyone in that House thought that whatever crisis they might find themselves in, they could not look forward to spending £10,000, or £100,000, or £1,000,000 upon any absurdity which the nation liked to throw its money away upon. They had quite sufficient money and financial credit to throw money away when they liked. But the question was whether, when their Navy was notoriously inefficient, and when the Admiralty themselves had come to the House and told them that large sums were necessary to make the Navy efficient, this was a time to spend £1,500,000 on Admiralty Offices. He should say—better keep the Admiralty Offices a few years longer in their present barely efficient state, and bring up the Navy to a more efficient position. It was not a question whether they could afford to spend £1,500,000 or not, but whether, having £1,500,000 to spend, they had better spend it on buildings in Spring Gardens or on torpedo-boats and iron-clads, which would add to the effi-

ciency of the Navy. He knew that the erection of the new War and Admiralty Offices was planned by the late Government; but it did not follow that the late Government would have spent the money at the present moment. He did not oppose the erection of those Offices at some time or other, and he did not feel competent to enter into the architectural question, or say whether the plans now proposed were good or not. What he was anxious to say was that the present was not a moment when they should begin an expenditure of this kind, but that it would be better to devote any money they had to spare on the Army and Navy, neither of which were in an efficient condition, as was confessed by the Government themselves. He understood his right hon. Friend (Sir Robert Peel) to urge the Committee to postpone this unnecessary and, comparatively speaking, useless expenditure, in order to spend the money on something more essential to their present position.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD observed, that the hon. Member for Stoke (Mr. Broadhurst) had spoken as if this expenditure were necessary for the removal of the building. As he had had the pleasure of sitting for some days on the Select Committee appointed to consider the matter, he should like to trouble the Committee with a few words. The House had already voted a very large sum of money for the acquisition of the site; and therefore the question of the progress of the work was in a different position from what the hon. Member (Mr. Broadhurst) had stated. He was prepared to bow with great deference to the right hon. Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Beresford Hope) on matters of taste; but he understood the right hon. Gentleman, after condemning the design before the Committee, to suggest that the carcase should be preserved. But he understood the carcase of a building to mean the external walls; and if they were to do that they would be accepting the architect's design. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Beresford Hope) proceeded to advise the Committee to study the designs upstairs; but he saw little use in doing so if they accepted the Vote now before the Committee. Those designs were considered by a Select Committee, of which one distinguished Member, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith), was present that night, but had not yet favoured them with his views. The Chairman was the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Childers); but that right hon. Gentleman had been so busy during the last few months that he supposed he had not been able to give much attention to the matter. The Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) spoke of the building as a great practical work, and compared it with one of the most successful works of Sir Gilbert Scott in another part of London. He spoke of the internal arrangements as being perfect. There were rooms in the Home Office which were higher than they were long. That was a great fault. Some of those rooms had a space of from 6 to 8 feet above the tops of the windows, entirely unventilated, and they were asked to vote a sum of £30,000 to complete the sanitary arrangements of the Government Offices. That was a point which the Postmaster General did not touch upon. He spoke only of the ground plan, which had nothing to do with the height of the rooms, and did not necessarily show the sanitary arrangements. He should like to know what the right hon. Gentleman had to say on that matter. Then the right hon. Gentleman had informed the Committee, for the first time, that there had been a considerable modification in the plan proposed by Messrs. Leeming and Leeming; and the right hon. Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Beresford Hope) proposed to reduce the Vote by £1,000. Now, his right hon. Friend (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had pointed out that they were not in a great hurry for this money; and he was not quite sure if the money were voted this year that it would be spent next year. Therefore, he took it that his right hon. Friend would be just as well pleased to get £9,000 as £10,000, because the conclusion of the arrangement with the architect would be one and the same thing. It was obvious from the remarks of the Postmaster General that this was not a matter of very pressing urgency. He (Mr. Arnold) was not disposed to any dealing with this Vote which would refer the matter to another competition. Whether there were faults in the competition he was not an authority to decide; but he was not disposed to do anything to re-open that competi-

tion. But he thought the Committee had some reason to complain that there was nothing in the shape of a Report on the proposed buildings. They were asked to commit themselves somewhat blindly to a Vote of £700,000 upon the word of one whom he was always disposed to respect, the Postmaster General; but he had drawn the attention of the Committee to some points to which that right hon. Gentleman had not alluded. There must be many other points of great and vital interest; and he should be glad if the Postmaster General, or some other Member of the Government, were disposed to postpone the consideration of the Vote for a little while, until they were in a position to receive a full and accurate Report upon the building, embracing not only the modifications which his right hon. Friend (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had suggested, but showing the House that all the internal and sanitary arrangements had been considered. He could not support the Motion for the reduction of the Vote; but he should be glad if the Vote itself were postponed, so that the Committee might have more full and decided information before it.

Mr. W. H. SMITH wished, as special reference had been made to him as a Member of the Committee, to say a few words. In the first place, as the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had stated, competitions were invited; and the Committee, which was appointed under conditions of strictly "limited liability," had specific instructions to report as to the best 10 plans out of the 148 submitted to them. There was no difficulty in arriving at the conclusion that nine were worthy of consideration, and that no more than nine were. When those nine came to be still further examined, and after a considerable period had elapsed, during which the architects had opportunities of improving their plans, there was no difficulty in arriving at the conclusion that there was one plan which was the best. The Select Committee were not responsible for procuring the best plans which could be procured, but only for deciding which were the best plans out of the 148 submitted to them; and then, by a subsequent arrangement, they expressed the conclusion that this one plan was the best. He had no doubt whatever that they arrived at a completely satisfactory conclusion upon the conditions under which they acted. They were unanimous. They were assisted by competent special advice in the persons of Mr. P. Hardwick and Mr. Christian, than whom no one could have given information more interesting to the Committee and more important to the country. As he had said, there was no reservation in the conclusion at which the Select Committee had arrived; but there were considerations which the House would bear in mind before deciding so large a matter. It was the largest Government Office since the erection of the block which comprised the Foreign Office, the Home Office, the Local Government Board Office, and the India Office. The points to which the Select Committee particularly directed their attention were the Office arrangements and the convenience of the Offices; and they satisfied themselves that many of the evils which undoubtedly existed in the Government Public Offices had been obviated in the plans of the Messrs. Leeming. Those plans showed great skill and ability in dealing with the points of light and air which were not provided for satisfactorily in other Government buildings: but there were details in which he should wish to see a decided improvement. The Select Committee were not responsible for the existing revised plans, which they had not seen until they saw them upstairs in the Committee Room. They were responsible for the selection of the original, not for the revised plans, though the revised plans, no doubt, in many respects, showed improvements. If he were responsible, he should wish to see still further improvements in many respects—such as provision for larger rooms in several of the Offices, where clerks would work together more efficiently than if they were separated and in smaller rooms. He would prefer to see the Accountant's Department, or any other Department involving the employment of many clerks under the charge of a senior officer, much larger, rather than having them dispersed over many smaller rooms, without the supervision which the senior officer was capable of giving. He was aware that in the Departments themselves there was a good deal of objection to that arrangement; but experience was against the Departments, and in favour of the views he advocated. He had no doubt

that if, by the Vote that night, it were placed in the power of the Office of Works to see that modifications of that kind were carried out, it would be a great advantage; and he should be disposed not to assent to the Vote unless some assurance were given even now that such modifications would be effected. Hon. Members had been invited to examine the plans upstairs; but he would point out that a cursory examination by hon. Members, with the slight knowledge that many of them possessed with regard to the details of large architectural works, was not sufficient to enable them to arrive at a correct conclusion, and to make up their minds to a plan to which the Committee could commit themselves. If, therefore, the Vote was taken that night, he thought there ought to be an opportunity for further consideration with regard to the details, which were of such very great importance to the proper discharge of the duties of those establishments. The hon. Member for Stoke-upon-Trent (Mr. Broadhurst) had urged upon the Committee the difficulties in the way of the conduct of Public Business; but it should be borne in mind that those difficulties might, perhaps, rather tend to increase than be removed by the too hasty adoption of plans that might not be the best that could be desired. He wished to bear his testimony to the fact that the general plan of the building was probably as good as it could be; that the rooms were well-proportioned and well-ventilated, and that they were not open to many objections which had been urged on hygienic grounds in other cases; but he did not think that they were altogether suited to the work to be performed in the building. Nor did he think that the most economical system had been arrived at with regard to a point on which he desired to lay particular stress—namely, the distribution of the work itself within the building. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to the question of the erection of official residences at the Admiralty. He could only speak from his own experience, and say that, in his opinion, such official residences were a matter of absolute necessity. In times of difficulty and emergency, the First Lord and others were expected to be on duty day and night, and it was no uncommon thing for messages to be brought to the First Lord at any time after 11 o'clock at night and before 11 o'clock next morning by clerks who were on duty for the purpose during that time; and it was often desirable, in consequence, that the First Lord should have the opportunity of communicating with the First Sea Lord. Therefore, he repeated that, in his judgment, official residences in close contiguity with the Admiralty, both for the First Lord and for the First Sea Lord, were absolutely necessary. He hoped that the suggestion made by the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold) would be well considered by the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. RYLANDS said, he did not intend to follow the right hon. Gentleman into the question from an architectural point of view as to whether the plans were the best or not for the purpose in view. It seemed to him that there were two or three preliminary questions which should be considered with reference to this Vote. In the first place, he thought that the Committee ought to be definitely assured by those in authority that it was absolutely necessary that those buildings should be at once proceeded with, and that grave public inconvenience arose from the fact that the buildings were not erected. He had had the honour of being a Member of the Select Committee which met specially to consider the site of the proposed building, and he believed that the site recommended by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Shaw Lefevre), the Chief Commissioner at that time, had, on the whole, the most advantages; therefore, whatever money had been spent in securing the site with the view of carrying out the recommendation of that Committee had not been lost; because he believed they were all unanimous in the opinion that, sooner or later, it would be necessary to erect new Admiralty buildings. But the question remained as to whether the urgency of the case was so great as would justify the Committee at the present moment in undertaking this very large expenditure. The £700,000 which had been put down must be regarded as a round sum. They knew well that when an enormous building of this kind had to be erected the ultimate charge was always in excess of the figures put forward by the Government for the encouragement of the Com-

mittee in making the first Vote. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith) said it was a matter of the greatest importance that the residence of the First Lord should be within the Admiralty building. He recollected that, when he was on the Committee which considered this question, evidence was laid before them that this was absolutely necessary; and, as a matter of fact that was admitted. He had himself put a Question on the subject in the House, and the necessity of the official residence being so placed was acknowledged; but immediately afterwards came the plan of the Chief Commissioner, with the house of the First Lord left out.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the original plan showed the residences, except in cases in which it had been suggested that they should be left out.

Mr. RYLANDS said, that appeared to him to be an entire change of front on the part of the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman said he agreed as to the importance of those residences, and he would probably remember that he (Mr. Rylands) had on a former occasion stated that if the official residences of the First Lord and the First Sea Lord were not made part of the first plan the right hon. Gentleman would involve himself in an enormous additional expenditure. There could be no question that, as part of this great plan, the First Lord's residence could be dovetailed in a way which would not, to a very large extent, increase the cost of the building; but if it came forward by way of addition it would lead to a very largely increased expenditure. He thought they were justified in asking whether this Vote meant that Parliament, within the next few years, would have to provide for this special object a very large sum of money? He understood the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Robert Peel) to say that, notwithstanding all the professions of the Government with regard to Peace, Retrenchment, and Reform, they had gone on increasing the Expenditure of the country in a formidable and appalling manner. He did not know how they would satisfy the country when they came to justify this expenditure. The promise had been given a year or two ago that there should be something definite done to curtail the Expenditure of the country, and to cut down the various items which were in the nature of excrescences; but nothing had been done, and he pointed out that with regard to the various Departments the increase was really going on to a greater extent than appeared upon the face of the Estimates; because in making the calculation they must add to the present Estimates the Supplementary Estimates that would be brought forward. When he found that in all branches of the Civil Service and in the Army and Navy Departments there was an enormous expenditure, and when hon. Gentlemen opposite told them that, notwithstanding all the great expenditure upon the Army and Navy, they ought to spend some millions more to put the country into a proper state of defence, he knew that this meant sooner or later an increased burden on the public. They could not tell, until the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer made his Budget Statement, how that burden would be applied to the shoulders of the people; but it would come, and the present was already a time when the people of the country and the capital employed in industrial operations were suffering to a very large extent. He thought the Government ought to pause before they committed themselves to the expenditure of so large an amount, unless it was absolutely necessary, and they were compelled to take the step, in which case the burden would have to be borne. But if the case was one in which the Committee could exercise an option, he was of opinion that the Vote should be postponed to a more convenient season. He should vote for the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Beresford Hope), not as an expression of any opinion in favour of his views, but simply because he felt that in the present state of the country the Vote should be postponed, which postponement might possibly lead the Government to the conclusion that this was a time when the proposal ought not to be pressed.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, he wished to endorse what had fallen from the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) as to the inopportuneness of incurring this large expenditure at the present moment. The amount proposed for the year was not, perhaps, very large; but it was, as

the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General had expressed it, for the purpose of pledging the House of Commons to the expenditure of the whole sum. Now, the whole sum asked for was a very large one, and half of it, it appeared, was to be spent in five years; because, although they did not know which block of buildings was to be completed first, whether the Admiralty or the War Office, they were informed that the proposal was to erect the buildings in two blocks, one of which was to be completed in five years. His right hon. Friend had observed that this was merely a bare estimate of the expenditure, and hon. Members knew very well that the actual estimates for architectural works invariably exceeded the original estimate. He believed that the cost of the Houses of Parliament was three or four times as much as the sum originally estimated. Now, the danger of embarking on this at the present moment was that they would have to expend, perhaps, £200,000 annually for the next five years, during which, from what he had heard that night, the country might be engaged in a desperate and expensive struggle. They were going to spend £1,600,000 on the Admiralty Offices. Why not, he asked, spend £1,600,000 on restoring the Navy, instead of making the Offices more comfortable for those who administered it? This money would provide the cost of an iron-clad; the Government might build torpedo-boats with it, or they might give the troops cartridges which would not jam. He said that, with the enormous expenditure going on in the Soudan, and with the probability of a war with Russia, this was a most profligate proceeding on the part of the Government. He observed that the occupants of the Treasury Bench, finding themselves hard pressed on this subject, and knowing what was the feeling of the Committee, had sent for a strong reinforcement in the person of the Prime Minister? He had no doubt that that right hon. Gentleman would find out that this was not the time for going into this large expenditure, especially in view of his policy of Peace, Retrenchment, and Reform, to which the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) had alluded, and upon which the right hon. Gentleman, on acceding to Office, laid so much stress. But he wished to say one word with regard to the manner in which these Estimates were brought forward; and, without wishing to depreciate the hon. Gentleman the Member for Leeds (Mr. Herbert Gladstone), he was bound to protest against the act of the Government in placing the head of another spending Department in the other House of Parliament. He had more than once expressed his regret that the Admiralty was not represented in the House of Commons, and now the Government were again placing the head of a spending Department in the other House. That, to his mind, was a great and dangerous innovation. He thought that all expenditure ought to be watched over in the House of Commons; and he trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would give the Committee some assurance that if they remained in Office, which was very likely, seeing that they were going to plunge the country into a great war, all the spending Departments should be represented in that House.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the question of erecting this building had been for years before the House of Commons; and it had been advocated from the point of view of economy as a most desirable thing that a building should be erected for the two Departments of the Admiralty and the War Office. In 1877 a Committee which sat to consider this question came unanimously to that conclusion. They said that they could not too strongly point out the necessity and the expediency of the Government proposing some plan to remedy the evils then complained of; that it would avoid great expense in the future; and that it was essential that the officials should be concentrated under one head. Sir Robert Hamilton, one of the most able officers of the Department, and now connected with the Irish Government, gave it as his opinion that the Admiralty staff should be housed under one roof, instead of being dispersed through 28 small houses; and that, Sir Robert Hamilton believed, would lead to the saving of many thousands a-year by the diminished charge due to the concentration of the staff. He (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) could bear out that view certainly from his own experience at the Admiralty; and he did not think it too much to say that the system under which all the Admiralty officials were

spread about in so many places was the most uneconomical one which could be devised, and that by bringing them under one roof a great economy would be effected. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had stated that the cost of the building would be £1,500,000; but he ventured to say that such would not be the case, and he would point out that the other Estimates for great buildings which had been erected by the Government of late years had, as a rule, not been exceeded. It was so with regard to the new Law Courts, which were built within the Estimates, and also with the new Home Office and the new Colonial Office. All those had come within the original Estimates, and he undertook to say that these new buildings for the Admiralty and the War Offices would be erected for the sum of £700,000. But the Committee must recollect that when he last spoke upon this matter, he had pointed out that there would be a very considerable sum derived from the setting free of the site now occupied by the War Office in Pall Mall, which was worth from between £350,000 to £400,000. That being so, it would be seen that the Government were not calling really for £700,000 for this purpose, but for something like one-half of that amount. He also pointed out that the houses in Spring Gardens, which had been bought for a considerable sum, were now empty, and must remain so until some plan had been carried into effect. Therefore, he said that it would be very bad economy, having gone so far, suddenly to stop and relegate this affair to the future. He had dealt with this question from the beginning from the point of view of economy, and his opinion was that the alternative plan would have cost the country much more money; indeed, he ventured to take some credit to himself for a scheme which would undoubtedly have an economical result. It was his confident belief that when the Admiralty and War Office Departments were brought under one roof, not only would the Public Business be facilitated, but a great economy would be effected in the Departmental charges. That led him to the subject of the concentration of the clerks, to which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith) had alluded—a point which he, equally with the right hon. Gentleman, held to be of the greatest importance; and he had already done his best to persuade the War Office and Admiralty officials to adopt this course as far as possible. He believed that an arrangement of the kind indicated would not be inconsistent with the plan as it existed—that was to say, that it would be very easy, by removing the partitions between some of the rooms as now laid out, to modify the plan in such a way as to make provision for a greater number of clerks in the same room. He could only say on that point that the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster, supported, as he understood it to be, by the general opinion of the House, would be of great value to the Department. Although he was no longer connected with it, he hoped that his noble Friend (Lord Rosebery) would bring further pressure to bear on the Authorities at the War Office, and Admiralty to adopt this plan, which he believed would be conducive to the better supervision of the clerks and to greater economy. His hon. Friend the Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold) had asked him whether the faults which now existed in the Colonial Office and the Home Office would again make their appearance in this building. He would only say that he had in view the very faults to which his hon. Friend had alluded, and that, so far as he was responsible, they should not be repeated. The rooms were to be of a moderate height, not excessively lofty, as in the case of the Home Office, the rooms of which building he considered to be discreditable to the architects engaged upon them. With regard to the internal arrangements, he would repeat his belief that the new building would be extremely satisfactory, and most suitable to the Public Service. While expressing with some confidence his own opinion with regard to the architectural details of the building, it must not be supposed that he was in that respect dissatisfied with it—on the contrary, from all he could learn from those competent to form a judgment on the matter, he believed it would be an ornament to London, and that it would compare most favourably with any of the existing public buildings.

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, that when complaints were made of defects in the new Public Offices it was only fair to

the late Sir Gilbert Scott to remember the immense influence brought to bear upon him by the then Prime Minister, Lord Palmerston, to compel him to erect a mass of buildings in a style it was notorious he greatly disliked. He (Lord John Manners) was glad to hear there was no intention of compelling this unknown architect, Mr. Leeming, to construct the proposed new building in a style he was not familiar with, and was not partial to. So far the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General was satisfactory. Having had some considerable experience in the Office the right hon. Gentleman recently filled —the Office of Works—he (Lord John Manners) was aware that nothing led to expense so much as unnecessary delay in the commencement and completion of large Government buildings. The Postmaster General had told them that he favoured this particular site over that of Great George Street, because he believed the cost would be something like £1,000,000 less. On that subject the Committee should be informed—if they did not know it already—that when the Great George Street site was first suggested, the recommendation came from a most important Committee, appointed during the Earl of Derby's third Administration, to consider the question of the site for the necessary new public buildings. That Committee went into the question of cost in great detail, and, recommending the Great George Street site, put down a given sum of money as the necessary expenditure. Parliament was informed of all that had taken place before the Committee; and, in an informal manner, it expressed its approval of the plan for the whole of the Public Offices being built on that one site. In consequence of Parliament having taken that course, notice was served upon the owners of all the houses on the site, and considerable expense was incurred in consequence. Proper notices were given in the month of November. Well, a change of Government ensued—a Liberal Government came in, and repudiated altogether the scheme of their Predecessors; and the result was that nothing was done for many years in the matter of the concentration of the Public Offices. Later on—in 1874—when Mr. Disraeli's Government resumed the consideration of this question, it was found that, in the interval, the estimated cost of acquiring the Great George Street site had risen by some £500,000. That was one of the results of delaying immediate action in these great enterprizes. From an economical point of view, therefore, he was not personally in favour of delay. When he was told that the ground had been already purchased at considerable expense, and was lying more or less useless, and must continue so until the buildings which it was intended to put on it some day or other were erected, he confessed that, from the point of view of economy, the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) would not gain much by delay. With regard to what had fallen from the hon. Member for Burnley, he (Lord John Manners) had been very much struck by the great difference which existed between the view of the hon. Member and that previously expressed by an hon. Gentleman sitting immediately behind him—namely, the hon. Member for Stoke-upon-Trent (Mr. Broadhurst). The latter hon. Member had stated that there was great distress in all the building and other trades which employed unskilled labour, and had recommended the commencement of the work of pulling down the houses which now occupied the site, for the sake of giving employment to those who were in need of it. The hon. Member suggested that the work of pulling down might be proceeded with, even if the work of erecting the new buildings was not to be undertaken just yet. The hon. Member for Burnley, on the other hand, had argued that because there was great distress in the building and other trades it would be well to suspend operations on this particular class of building. He would leave it to those two hon. Gentlemen to reconcile their views. Having said that, he was bound to state that he thought the debate which had been originated had shown that, in one or two important respects, the Government themselves were not quite clear as to what ought to be done with respect to these great buildings. He had been much struck by the important omission from Messrs. Leeming's plan of the official residences of the First Lord and the First Naval Lord of the Admiralty. It was said that there was a piece of land on which these residences could hereafter be built; but he confessed, from what the

right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General had himself told them of his knowledge of the Admiralty, and also knowing how strongly the same view was entertained by those who had had Admiralty experience, he was surprised at the absence of all reference to those buildings. They were, on great and universal authority, proclaimed to be absolutely necessary. It would, therefore, he thought, be better for the plans to be taken back, and for the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General, or whoever was responsible for the plans in the future, to have prepared one complete design showing how the residences for the First Lord and First Naval Lord were to be interpolated into, and brought into immediate connection with, the other Admiralty Offices. That was an important point, and he should be sorry to see the Committee give a Vote for these public buildings, and some years hence be called on again to vote an additional sum for the official residences. He should be sorry if unnecessary delay occurred in the prosecution of the work; but he really thought that, under the circumstances he had mentioned, something like a postponement should take place.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) appeared to think that the Committee was of opinion that the official residences should be under the same roof as the Offices. [Mr. RYLANDS: No, no!] At any rate, the original scheme had not provided that the official residences should be under the same roof. The scheme two years ago provided that the official residences should be on a plot of land in Spring Gardens, at the north of the main block of buildings. That plot was still reserved for the purpose, and it would still be possible to erect the official residences on it. It would not be possible to put those residences under the same roof as the Admiralty and War Offices. There was not room enough for them, and it would not be possible to squeeze them in. The Government, however, would reconsider the subject; and he trusted that in the meantime the Committee would be content to leave the matter where it was.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR said, he rose to express the opinion that, from the acquaintance he had had with the War Office, he believed it desirable that those residences should be under the same roof as the new Government Offices. He was also of opinion that the buildings for the two great Departments should be pushed forward with the utmost rapidity, and that the War Office should be first erected. The rooms in the War Office were small in number, uncomfortable and unhealthy, and difficult of access; and he would, therefore, strongly support the recommendation of the noble Lord (Lord John Manners) in regard to the speedy erection of the proposed new buildings. He was of opinion, moreover, that all the expense of providing the official residences, as well as the other new Government Offices, should be paid for by means of Annuities, and thus save the necessity of applying to Parliament for annual Votes for the purpose of defraying the cost of their construction. An Annuity of £12,000 for 35 years at 3 per cent would cover the sum needed. The right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General had told them that the Estimates were not often exceeded in these matters, and that it was not frequently found necessary to apply to Parliament for grants for extra work after the original plan had been either wholly or in part carried out. But the statement appeared to him to be not well founded. At all events, allowance should be made for such probable calls. He objected to the way in which the expenses were minimized in the Estimates. The Auditor General, in his first year's audit, had estimated that the cost of the land would be £238,000; but it was now stated that it would be over £500,000, and that sum, to his mind, ought to be paid in the form of Annuities, so as to enable the accounts to be kept in a proper manner. The Estimate for all the works, put in a lump sum now, was £1,270,000; but he thought the right hon. Baronet the Member for Huntingdon (Sir Robert Peel) put the probable cost at a very low figure when he put it at £1,500,000, and that his estimate would certainly be exceeded; and he was strengthened in that view when he heard that alterations had already taken place in the plans, and that other improvements were to be made in them. The Committee, he thought, were entitled to have all the items put before them. The hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold) was of opinion that a detailed Report should be sub-

mitted to the House showing all the items and arrangements; and he (Sir George Balfour) agreed with the hon. Member in that, believing it to be desirable that they should see what went on from time to time, and in what respect the increase was taking place, and that a revised annual Report should be presented to the House on the progress or on the changes in plans. As matters were now arranged, the House of Commons had no control over those items in detail, the control of large items of money being ineffective without detail. He would recommend the Junior Lords of the Treasury to consider the subject, and to see that these and kindred remarks were made known in the proper quarter.

SIR HENRY HOLLAND said, that, up to a certain point in this debate, he had intended to support the passing of this Vote. In several of the reasons adduced in support of it he entirely agreed. He believed it would be economical to begin the work as soon as possible, now that the site had been fixed upon and purchased, and also from the saving that would be effected by getting rid of the different houses in which, to the great inconvenience of the Service, the work of these Departments was now carried on. He was satisfied also that the want of accommodation, and the consequent want of arrangement in the present Offices, called for as speedy a remedy as possible. No one who had occasion to visit either of those Departments could doubt that. At the Admiralty one was buffeted about from one house to another in New Street and Spring Gardens; while in the War Office the passages and rooms were all on different levels owing to the Department extending over adjoining houses; the rooms themselves were small, inconvenient, ill-ventilated, and not at all fitted for the work to be done in them. He would go further, and say that the proposed plans seemed to him to be exceedingly well adapted for Offices. He did not now refer to the architecture of the buildings; upon that he offered no opinion; but he had paid special attention to the arrangement of the rooms, the shape of the rooms, the lighting of the passages, and so forth. Nothing was more deplorable than the want of attention paid to those important points in the great block of public buildings containing the Foreign Office, Home Office, and Colonial Office. The rooms were ill-proportioned; the passages had to be lighted by gas; and the ventilation was most imperfect. It had been said by the late First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) that the Estimates in respect of those Offices had not been exceeded; but he (Sir Henry Holland) would like to know what sum had been spent since their completion in improving them and in securing proper drainage? The drainage was so defective that the cellars were filled with water at one time, and the expenses incurred since the buildings had been opened must have been very great. For all those reasons he would have supported the Vote, had it not been for the point raised by the right hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith) as to the necessity of having residences for the First Lord and the Naval Lord within, or closely contiguous to, the Admiralty building. Now, his right hon. Friend the late First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) said there was a site upon which such residences could be built; but the Committee had no plans of these residences, nor had any Estimate of their cost been presented. The necessity, or, at all events, desirability, of having those residences had been upheld by several persons of authority, and, as the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer knew, by Sir Alexander Milne, who probably had done as much and as good work at the Admiralty as any living person. That being the case, he thought the Vote should be postponed—only for a short time, as he hoped it would be passed this year—to allow the First Commissioner of Works to have plans and Estimates prepared and presented to the Committee of houses for the First Lord and Naval Lord.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): It has been my fortune to be both at the Admiralty and War Office, and I was also a Member of the Committee upon which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith) sat last year. Perhaps, therefore, I may be allowed to say a few words with regard to the desirability of proceeding with these buildings with as much speed as possible, and also as to the addition of these residences. I have heard it said that everyone who has been at the Ad-

miralty is of opinion that the First Lord should have a residence there. I am bound to say that I know two persons, at least, who have been First Lords of the Admiralty who are not of that opinion. This has been a vexed question for some time, whether the Heads of the Admiralty and War Office should reside continually on the scene of their work. Speaking from my own experience, I do not think it wise that either the Secretary of State for War or the First Lord of the Admiralty should reside in the building in which his work is carried on. There are many reasons why, in this proposed new building, such arrangements would not be convenient to the Admiralty. I do not know whether the Committee is acquainted with the history of the Admiralty; but formerly it consisted, in the main, of the houses of the different Lords. There were five Lords who had houses under one roof, there being one large Board Room for them to meet in and transact business, and three or four other rooms for clerks. The occupation of these houses was from time to time discontinued. One Secretary only, besides the First Lord, was retained on the spot, and since then even he has left. I am of opinion that as the old plan has come to an end it would not be wise to revive it, and to build these houses for administrative officers, with one exception. It is, no doubt, of importance that there should be someone of position on the spot in connection with the Navy, someone who would be ready at all times to receive telegrams with power to telegraph replies in matters not necessarily requiring the approval of the First Lord. But my impression is that it would be better for this official, who should be, I think, the First Sea Lord, to live in the special building contiguous to the Admiralty than that he should reside actually inside the Admiralty building. I speak with great submission to the Committee; but from my experience of the nature of the work to be done in the Admiralty that is my deliberate opinion. It would not be desirable even for the First Lord or the Secretary of State for War to have houses in the new Offices; but, as I have said, it would be well to have either the First Sea Lord or the First Secretary to the Admiralty in a contiguous building near enough at night to give orders at once. I agree with the hon. Member for Midhurst (Sir Henry Holland) that there should be as little delay as possible in proceeding with the building of these Government Offices. If we put off the Vote another year I fear great mischief will be done. The proper thing, I think, is to pass this Vote, and to have a distinct proposal made with reference to the building of the residence I have referred to. My right hon. Friend will be prepared to bring up such a proposal; and the Committee, when it is put before them, will be in a position to pronounce an opinion upon it. After the great care which has been taken over the preparation and adoption of these plans I should strongly deprecate any further delay in commencing the work.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said, that in order to simplify the discussion he might observe that when he moved the reduction of the Vote it was simply in order to bring the matter before the Committee, and to avoid a premature decision being arrived at. Since then an alternative course to that of the Government had been proposed—namely, to postpone the Vote, not for an indefinite time, but so as to enable a fuller House, and one with a mind more matured on the subject, to discuss it. If a proposal to postpone it was made he would not stand in the way, because he would have gained his object in having prevented a premature decision being arrived at.

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, it was clear the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer could not have been in his place when the Postmaster General made his speech, for the latter had told them over and over again that there was no accommodation for the Minister for War or the First Lord of the Admiralty in the proposed new building, but that he would bring up a plan for the construction of residences for one or two of the superior officials ruling over these Departments.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE: I never said anything of the kind.

Sir ROBERT PEEL said, the right hon. Gentleman had distinctly stated this—that he would consider an Estimate for the erection of these residences on a plot of ground contiguous to the proposed new Public Offices. What he (Sir Robert Peel) wished to point out was, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had either not heard, or had not paid much attention to, the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster

General. Before they came to a decision on the Vote he wished to impress upon the Committee—if the Government were not prepared to postpone the matter—the importance of the statement they had heard from the Postmaster General in his second or third speech, he did not know which. The right hon. Gentleman, in reply to the statement that the new building would cost £1,500,000, had said that, in his opinion, it would not cost more than half as much as the estimated £700,000.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that in that statement he, of course, took into view the amount which would be received on account of the site in Pall Mall.

Sir ROBERT PEEL: Yes; the right hon. Gentleman did not believe that more than half the £700,000 would have to be expended. Was that at all likely to be the case, judging from what they knew of public buildings in this country? Were the Government prepared to accept the suggestion of the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold) and postpone the Vote? The Prime Minister was in his place, and he, if he pleased, could bring about such postponement. The right hon. Gentleman smiled at the suggestion; but if he had been present during the whole of the debate he would know that the Committee had not the proper plans before it, and that the expenditure which the erection of these new Offices would entail would be enormous. The right hon. Gentleman must know that the circumstances of the country at this moment were not such as to warrant a large expenditure on public buildings, and probably he would agree that it would be desirable to have the Vote postponed to a more fitting occasion.

Mr. BROADHURST wished to say to the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands), and those who were inclined to vote with him on the ground of economy, that they were very poor economists indeed to have advocated any such proceeding as that they had enunciated. The noble Lord the Member for North Leicestershire (Lord John Manners) had stated to the Committee that he had discovered that delay in these matters was costly. In this particular case nothing was more certain than that delay would be costly. He would ask the Committee to remember that iron was enormously cheaper than it had been for many years past, and iron was no inconsiderable item in the estimate for a building of this kind. All building materials, from the concrete upon which was put the brick foundation to the slates and chimney-pots put on the roof, were, at that moment, at a price hon. Members could never expect to see them at again, and which few would care to see them at again, because they were too cheap for reasonable trade profits. He hoped the Committee would consider this circumstance in coming to a decision. With regard to what had fallen from the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) and the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff), no one would find fault with their counter suggestion. Those hon. Gentlemen did not advocate economy; they did not condemn the spending of public money in the sense that the hon. Member for Burnley condemned it. What they said was that if there was £1,500,000 to spend, spend it by all means, but not on these public buildings—spend it at Portsmouth and Chatham. He (Mr. Broadhurst) certainly thought that as an argument against delay, from an economical point of view, the low price of every class of material was an element in the consideration of the subject not unworthy of the attention of the Committee.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, it struck him that this discussion was too late; that the hon. Gentleman the Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) would have shown a practical interest in the question of public economy if he had made this stand a little earlier. If when the Bill which sanctioned the transfer of the land from the Crown to the Board of Works was before the House the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Rylands) had made his protest instead of now, when it was an empty parade, he might possibly have effected some economy of the public money. But on this occasion, as he had done on many others, the hon. Member for Burnley had indulged in a great show of anxiety to curtail the public Expenditure; but he (Mr. A. O'Connor) had never yet seen the hon. Gentleman give a vote in the House which was at all likely to be effective for the purpose he was supposed to have in view. Now, the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General

(Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had told them that the two blocks to be erected were to be allotted, one to the War Office, and the other to the Admiralty, and that whatever might be their exterior merits from an architectural point of view the interior arrangements were perfect. Now, the staffs of those two Departments were not of the same size, and the work carried on in the one did not admit of the same classification as the work carried on in the other; and, therefore, he (Mr. A. O'Connor) assumed that the arrangements which were to be so perfect in the first block intended to be allotted to the Admiralty were made with a view to the Admiralty work, and that the block could not be very well assigned to War Office work. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) told them that the first block would furnish ample accommodation for all the Admiralty work, and leave room to spare. Well, the right hon. Gentleman went on to tell them that when the Admiralty Authorities transferred their staffs to the new buildings they would be able, by classifying the men employed in a better way than now, by getting rid of multiplied sub-divisions, and by having very large rooms, to effect a considerable reduction of the staff. That he (Mr. A. O'Connor) thought was very likely, and he thought it was also good policy; but when the right hon. Gentleman had effected that reduction he would have a still greater amount of spare space; and, under those circumstances, he (Mr. A. O'Connor) failed to see that the internal arrangements could be regarded as so very perfect. What he wanted to suggest to the Government was that it would be better not to give the first block to the Admiralty, but to give it to the War Office, and he made this suggestion for two reasons. The distribution in the War Office was admittedly defective and inconvenient. The structural difficulties impeded the work, and the sanitary condition of the Office was exceedingly bad —indeed, some of the rooms actually stood over old cesspools, which were only cleared out after some of the staff had died. Besides this, there was, on page 21 of the present Estimates, a long list of the houses in Pall Mall for which the Treasury were paying rent for War Office accommodation. The sooner those buildings were surrendered, the sooner the War Office staff got into the new premises in Whitehall, the sooner the expenses of the buildings in Pall Mall would be got rid of, and there would be this further advantage—that £350,000 worth of property would be liberated; and if when that sum came in hand the Government, instead of coming down to the House to ask for a further Vote on Account, were to ask leave to appropriate the money, they would thereby effect a large economy. That, he thought, was a practicable suggestion which the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hibbert) would do well to consider. The money would be taken into the Exchequer, and be spent on anything which might happen to attract attention, or require expenditure on the part of the Government. By housing the War Office first they would save an immediate outlay for rent, and they would also get in hand £350,000, which would enable them to disburse that sum in the shape of Votes in the House for the prosecution of the Admiralty buildings. With regard to the unused space in the Admiralty buildings, he (Mr. A. O'Connor) presumed, after the expression of opinion they had heard from more than one Member entitled to speak with authority, it would be useless to propose that such officials of the Admiralty who were to be housed should be under the same roof; but whether the First Lord, or the Naval Lord, or any other official was to be in residence, it was plain a further Estimate on account of the Admiralty buildings would be brought forward. If this was not so, why not give the first building to the War Office, and let the question of the housing of Admiralty officials stand over? The hon. Member for Stoke (Mr. Broadhurst) wanted to know why this was a time when the House should hesitate to vote large sums of money, or to commit itself to large expenditure; and he seemed to think that the possibility of a war in Asia, in addition to the war in Africa, was not to interfere with the erection of buildings which might be necessary. But, apart from all prospective war expenditure, he (Mr. A. O'Connor) thought the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Childers) was in a position to tell the hon. Gentleman the Member for Stoke that this was scarcely a time to increase the charge on the public purse. He (Mr. A. O'Connor) did not know whether they were to

be told in a few days about a deficit; but he thought that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer could make both ends meet, without some extraordinary expedient, many people in the country would be very considerably surprised. That alone seemed a satisfactory reason why the Committee should be chary of voting large sums of money for work of this kind. The hon. Member for Stoke had given very bad grounds for expenditure of this kind, for practically he had asked the Government of this country to adopt the Napoleonic plan, or, in other words, to Hausmannize London.

MR. BROADHURST said, he distinctly stated at the commencement of his remarks that he did not ask the Government to find employment because people were out of work.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he should be very sorry to impute to the hon. Member anything he did not say, and he willingly withdrew any words which put an unfair interpretation upon what the hon. Gentleman stated. But it seemed to him (Mr. A. O'Connor) that there was great danger in advocating the expenditure of large sums of money because there were a great many people out of work. To have an energetic foreign policy, and to erect large buildings in the Metropolis in order to give employment to people, was just that kind of policy which did so much to overthrow the Administration of the Emperor Napoleon III. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff), and the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst), had been twitted by the hon. Member for Stoke (Mr. Broadhurst) because they wished to have all the money of the country spent in the Dockyards at Chatham and Portsmouth. Now, there was another part of the United Kingdom besides Portsmouth and Chatham, which might also claim some recognition at the hands of the Government when they were proceeding to distribute public money, and that was the part of the United Kingdom called Ireland. There were Offices in Dublin with regard to which the strongest possible representations had been made year after year. Even so far back as the year 1877, it was pointed out that there were Offices in Dublin in quite as an unhealthy condition as the War Office or the Admiralty; but it was impossible to get anything from the Government for the improvement of those Offices. The Government were willing to come to the House, and get money by £500,000 or £1,000,000, and sometimes by tens of millions, for Public Offices in this country, or for the erection of barracks or fortifications, or for expenditure on the Navy which was to be made in this country; but in Ireland, neither for Military purposes nor for Civil Service purposes, could money be got in the same way. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Beresford Hope) meant to proceed with his Motion for a reduction of the Vote; but if he did he (Mr. A. O'Connor) should support him, not because he at all appreciated the point of view from which the right hon. Gentleman approached the subject—indeed, he could not see how the right hon. Gentleman's arguments bore on the subject—but upon a totally different ground—namely, as a protest against the system of spending lavishly large sums of money in this country, and utterly neglecting Ireland.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, he had suggested that the Vote should be postponed, in order that the Committee might obtain some further information upon the sanitary and other arrangements of the present buildings. As the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) did not seem disposed to accept that suggestion, he (Mr. Arnold) was not disposed to vote against him if he pressed the Vote. If the right hon. Gentleman was determined to press the Vote, he (Mr. Arnold) hoped he would afterwards be prepared either to re-assemble the Committee, in order that there might be some reconsideration of the details, or to appoint a Departmental Committee, who would give some Report upon the internal arrangements of these very important buildings.

MR. HIBBERT said, he thought his right hon. Friend (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) would be quite willing to consent to the appointment of a Departmental Committee to consider the suggestions made. It must, however, be remembered that what the Government were now proposing was merely a preliminary Vote. Of course, it would be quite possible to give more information to the Committee upon various items of details when the contract had been advertised and accepted. With respect to the suggestion

of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst), that they should postpone, or, rather, not proceed with the Vote that night, he (Mr. Hibbert) was bound to say that if the Vote were now withdrawn the Navy would not get anything in consequence of the withdrawal of the Vote. He did not, however, wish to press that matter very strongly; what he wanted to draw the attention of the Committee to was, that when the Committee had passed this Vote—as he hoped they would—proceedings could be taken towards the pulling down of the houses upon the site in Spring Gardens and the immediate neighbourhood, so that a real preparation could be made for the commencement of the work. The £10,000 asked for that night would be used partly for the purpose of pulling down the old houses and preparing the foundations for the new buildings. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Queen's County (Mr. A. O'Connor) had suggested that the War Office, rather than the Admiralty, should be transferred to the first block of buildings; but he (Mr. Hibbert) thought the hon. Gentleman would be led to see that that was quite impossible. There would be great advantage in removing the War Office first, if it could be done; but it would be seen that if they filled the first block with the War Office there would be nowhere to place the Admiralty; in fact, it was quite necessary that the Admiralty should be moved, in order that the land upon which it now stood could be obtained for the erection of new buildings. That seemed to him (Mr. Hibbert) to be a real answer to the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. A. O'Connor). His hon. and gallant Friend (Sir George Balfour) had suggested that the money should be paid by Annuity. He (Mr. Hibbert) did not think they had quite come to the position of undertaking the erection of their public buildings by means of Annuity; indeed, he thought it was better to postpone their erection than to adopt such a principle.

MR. W. H. SMITH understood that, in his absence from the Committee for a few minutes, the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) undertook that the question of the larger rooms for the work of the important Office of the Accountant General should be fully considered. As to the question whether there should be one or two official residences, he (Mr. W. H. Smith) was of opinion there should be two. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer seemed to think there should be one. He (Mr. W. H. Smith) hoped that some assurance would be given that there would be a further opportunity afforded of discussing the matters raised by this Vote before the end of the Session; because, in his opinion, the question of residences was one of the very greatest importance.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR desired to explain that he suggested that these proposed buildings should be erected by means of Annuities, because it was well that they should be completed with all possible speed. If they could not be completed under 10 years —the time stated by the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre)—because they could not get the money more rapidly voted by Parliament, he (Sir George Balfour) thought it would be well to raise the money by Annuity, as in the case of the fortifications, and then the work could be finished within three or four years.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 26; Noes 45: Majority 19.—(Div. List, No. 89.)

Original Question again proposed.

MR. WARTON desired to ask one question of the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre); and that was, if he correctly understood that the right hon. Gentleman had already made some alterations in the plans? That day the right hon. Gentleman had expressed an inclination to make other alterations to meet the necessities of the official accommodation required. Might he (Mr. Warton) ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he had any intention of letting the House know, at any time, the extent of the alterations; and whether he would settle, in his own mind, how far the alterations would extend before he invited tenders?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the hon. and learned Gentleman could see himself what alterations had already been made by comparing the plans now lying in the Committee Room with the plans

exhibited a few years ago. The alterations were made by the architects at his (Mr. Shaw Lefevre's) suggestion, which was a very different matter to the alterations being made upon his own authority. Whether further alterations would be made would be, of course, a matter for consideration. He had no doubt an opportunity would be given the House later on of knowing what, if any, alterations were contemplated.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE suggested that it would be well if the original plans were exhibited along with the new ones.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that he would see that that was done.

MR. BIGGAR said, he did not think the Government had made out any case why the Vote should be passed that night. The Committee were asked to vote a sum of £10,000 in order to pull down some old buildings; but it was not intended to commence the new buildings for some considerable time. He did not altogether disapprove of giving employment to the unemployed labourers of London; but it really seemed to him that the expenditure of £10,000 would have no practical effect upon a population of 4,000,000. The right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had told them that he did not understand anything about architecture, but that he had made several suggestions to the architects which were of great importance. It struck him (Mr. Biggar) that the right hon. Gentleman had better not meddle with the architects, but let the architects themselves be responsible for the structure. The right hon. Gentleman also told them that the internal arrangements would be perfect; but he agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith) in the opinion that it was very desirable that the internal arrangements should be materially altered by making rooms of a larger size than was at present contemplated. In point of fact, it appeared that the Government themselves had not made up their minds at all upon the subject. With regard to the question of the official residences the Postmaster General and the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Childers) took issue, and expressed perfectly different opinions. When it came to the final test, he (Mr. Biggar) supposed the Cabinet would confirm the decision of some official of the Board of Works, so that it was utterly impossible for any Member of the Committee to guess correctly what kind of arrangements would ultimately be made. The right hon. Gentleman would acknowledge the fact that if this Vote, small as it was, were carried, the country would be committed to the large outlay of something like £1,200,000, which he understood to be the estimated expense of the new buildings for the Admiralty and War Office. Against that might be placed the annual rent now paid for the War Office; but he understood that nothing was taken for the value of the land. He gathered that there would be an expenditure of £1,200,000, independent of the necessary outlay hereafter upon the official residences. In regard to the official residences it did not appear that the Government had, as yet, made up their minds as to what they intended to do. He thought that before they asked the House of Commons to commit itself to an outlay of so very large an amount they should themselves make up their minds as to what their future plans were to be. At present they were asking for this large expenditure for a plan in regard to which they had not themselves formed any fixed opinion. Under the circumstances, he would suggest to the Government that they should withdraw the present Vote, and submit full plans hereafter when they had entirely made up their minds. Not having made up their own minds, how could they expect the House of Commons to make up theirs? The position of the Government in the matter was altogether untenable.

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(3.) £15,120, to complete the sum for the Furniture of Public Offices, Great Britain.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR remarked, that this was not a very large Vote, but it by no means exhausted the money appropriated for this purpose. If hon. Members would turn over to the next page of the Estimates—page 29—they would see, under the head of Customs and Inland Revenue, Post Office and Post Office Telegraph Buildings, a further sum of something less than £10,000 for furniture for Public Offices. In previous years he had drawn attention to this Vote, and had pointed out what

he considered to be the gravest shortcomings in the administration of this part of the Public Service, and to a certain extent his criticisms had been admitted by previous Secretaries to the Treasury to be well-founded. The Committee of Accounts had examined certain officials in regard to this matter, and had obtained from them very material admissions as to the state of things which existed. The consequence was, that owing to the observations contained in the Report of the Public Accounts Committee, the Exchequer and Audit Department had communicated with the Office of Works, which was in charge of the Vote, and had made some inquiries in regard to the proceeds of the sale of old stores and furniture. Inquiries had also been made as to whether the Office of Works was responsible for the furniture in use in the various Public Offices, and if it had in its possession an inventory of such furniture. The Office of Works wrote back a letter, which was printed on page 23 of the Appropriation Account of last year, from which it appeared that in the opinion of the Office of Works it would not be found practicable to lay down any hard-and-fast rule for the disposal of old stores and furniture. The practice had hitherto been to dispose of worn-out stores and furniture by auction as they accumulated from time to time, in the case of a large quantity, or by private competition where the stock was small. What he had said before, and what he would now repeat, was that there was a considerable waste of public property in connection with old furniture, and the Treasury and the Office of Works ought to exercise a much closer scrutiny over those who had the management and the handling of this furniture than was the case at present. The Office of Works went on to say that the furniture in the various Public Offices, after it was deposited by the Department, was placed in the custody of the Office-keepers, who were primarily responsible for any loss. No inventories of such furniture were in existence, except in the case of certain official and other residences, in regard to which there were special arrangements, and to make and keep up a system of inventories would involve heavy labour which ought not to fall upon the Office. That was the observation of the Office of Works; but it seemed to him that if the preparation and keeping up of these inventories would entail heavy work upon the Office, that fact alone showed how important it was that the work should be done. There was an immense quantity of furniture in the Public Offices which was liable to be shifted about from room to room, and it was easily lost sight of after it had been once moved. It was, therefore, of great consequence, in the interests of the public, that something like a systematic check should be kept over all the public furniture, both old and new, at head-quarters. In every workhouse, under the existing Poor Law system, an inventory of the furniture in every room was taken, and the furniture itself was carefully watched in order to guard against local peculation. Had the Office of Works any guarantee that improper transactions in regard to the furniture might not be going on in many of the Departments of the Public Service? He had not the least doubt that a considerable amount of personal profit was made here and there throughout the Service by reason of the utter absence of check upon the disposal of old furniture. Old tables and chairs, and all sorts of things, were furnished to the different Departments and charged for as new. An oak table ought to last for 50 years if properly handled; but it would be found that in the case of the Public Offices furniture of that description was provided new and replaced in the course of a few years, costing the country a considerable sum of money. What became of the old furniture he was unable to say. No doubt, each item was very small in itself; but when it was necessary to supply hundreds and thousands of these articles, the cost amounted to a considerable sum, and the admissions contained in the letter published in the last Appropriation Account ought to be quite sufficient to direct the attention of the Committee to the matter. Seeing that there was a Comptroller and Auditor General specially appointed to watch over the administration of the public money, it was only right that the Committee at least should draw his attention to this matter. The attention of the House had at last been drawn to the question by the reference made to it in the Report of the Public Accounts Committee, and he should be glad to learn

that the Government were prepared to take effective steps to prevent the disposal of Office fixtures in the manner he had indicated.

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, the hon. Member for Queen's County (Mr. A. O'Connor) had pointed out that the present Vote did not exhaust the whole of the present charge for furniture. That was quite true; but he (Mr. H. Gladstone) might point out that it was found more convenient to place the items for furniture in the respective Votes for the different Departments in order to allow hon. Members to judge of the proportionate cost of the furniture according to the character of the Public Office or Building provided with it. That was the defence of the present practice. In regard to what the hon. Member had said of the lack of inventories, no doubt it was true that the Office of Works was not supplied with lists of furniture at the present time, and he could not help feeling the force of the remarks which had been made by the hon. Member. It appeared to him that it might be possible for the staff of each Department or Office to keep an inventory of the furniture of such Department, which might be submitted when required to the First Commissioner of Works. He would bring that suggestion under the notice of the First Commissioner, who might be able to make some arrangement which would meet the views of the hon. Member.

MR. RYLANDS said, the Junior Lord of the Treasury had not alluded to one part of the objection to the present system—namely, that which had reference to the course taken by the authorities in deciding upon condemning furniture as being so far worn out as to require replacing. He quite agreed with the remarks of the hon. Member opposite. It was very desirable that Parliament should have, under the heads of the different Votes, a statement of the amount of money expended upon furniture in the respective Departments. That would be a much more convenient course than the one now adopted. In the Vote now under discussion there was a note at the foot which directed the attention of hon. Members to the fact that there were various Departments under which expenditure for furniture was incurred, which expenditure was not included in the present Estimate. He presumed that about £20,000 was voted for furniture in separate Votes, in addition to the sum of £17,120 they were now asked to vote for the supply and repair of furniture for the Public Offices.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, the amount was more than that.

MR. RYLANDS said, the hon. Member for Queen's County (Mr. A. O'Condor) said that the amount was more than £20,000, but he was probably including the Vote for Consular Buildings. Independently of that Vote, there was a sum of about £20,000 distributed in the general Votes, and not included in the Vote now before the Committee. The points which he understood to be pressed upon the Office of Works were, first of all, that there should be some system under which the Office should know exactly what articles of furniture they had for disposal, so that if an application were made to them from any Department, the Office of Works would know at once whether such articles of furniture could be supplied. The other point was this—that there should be some careful means taken to secure that no furniture should be condemned without proper authority being given. He must say that on looking at these Votes it always struck him as somewhat extraordinary the short life which appeared to belong to Government furniture. Every year they passed Votes of considerable sums for various Departments, and he thought the Votes they passed were very much in excess of the amount which ought to be reasonably expended. The third point, and a not unimportant one, was—what became of the old furniture? What was the system under which the old furniture was disposed of? He understood that there was some statement of the amount received for the disposal of old furniture somewhere. The system, however, was a very uncertain one, and he did not know where to find any record of the extra receipts which came from the sale of furniture, unless it was contained in the Vote they were discussing at the present moment. He certainly saw one item of £50 for estimated extra receipts; but he hardly thought that that item could be supposed to represent the entire amount received from the sale of old furniture. These were the three points he would impress upon the Government as matters in

which economy might be effected by the Department.

MR. WARTON wished to ask the hon. Gentleman the Junior Lord of the Treasury, who was in charge of this Vote, a question or two. He did not quite understand what was the meaning, on page 28, of giving an account of the expenditure incurred for the year 1883-4, because they had in the Vote now before them an Estimate not only for the coming year, but for the past year also. Why, therefore, should they go into the expenditure incurred two years ago? He certainly failed to see what advantage they would derive from doing so. There was, however, one matter with regard to which he would like to have some explanation. He referred to the item of £14,030, which would be found in the middle of page 27, for the supply of furniture to the various Public Offices and the Courts of Law in England and Wales, inclusive of fixtures and fittings. He did not quite see what was the object of those figures, which included a considerable number of items—even one as small as £1 15*s.* 6*d.* But no amount of consideration devoted to these items would reduce the expenditure of last year—1884-5—or affect the estimated expenditure for the coming year. So much, by way of general observation, upon the whole Estimate. But there was another question he wished to ask with a distinct object object—namely, whether this item of £14,030 had reference to the furniture for the Royal Courts of Justice? If not, he did not know where they were to look for the expenditure upon the furniture supplied to the Royal Courts of Justice. If hon. Members would look at the bottom of the page they would not be able to find any distinct statement in connection with the Royal Courts of Justice; and the reason he felt tempted to call attention to the matter was the loud complaints that were made of the disgraceful character of the furniture, desks, and fittings of the Royal Courts of Justice provided for the use of barristers. He had mentioned the matter last year; but he knew it was folly to expect to make any impression upon the Government under five or six years of persistent complaint. He had certainly called attention to matters five years ago which were only now receiving attention. He would ask hon. Members who were not acquainted with the Royal Courts of Justice to be kind enough to go there and inspect the seats provided for the junior Bar. It was hopeless to attempt to write at them; and, as a matter of fact, the desks and seats were more fit for a workhouse than for a Court of Justice. They were altogether degrading to the dignity of the Bar, and he hoped to see some attempt made to render them more decent. At any rate, their defects might be concealed by a coating of paint, or by staining them, or in some way or other. If the hon. Gentleman the Junior Lord of the Treasury would give him some assurance upon that point he should feel much obliged.

MR. HIBBERT said, the first question asked by his hon. and learned Friend was—why the expenditure in connection with the various Public Departments was given for the year 1883-4, and not for any later date? He believed that the list was given very much in compliance with a request made by hon. Members in investigating the accounts of previous years. It was quite impossible, however, to give a list for the year 1884-5, seeing that the expenditure was not yet completed, and the financial year itself was not concluded. The list given contained the expenditure for the last complete year, and that was the only year to answer any beneficial purpose that could be given so as to be of assistance to hon. Members in enabling them to see the extent to which furniture was provided for the different Public Departments in any one year.

MR. TOMLINSON said, the explanation which had just been given was hardly a satisfactory one. He should have thought that these items might very properly have appeared in the Appropriation Account; but he did not see why, to explain this particular Vote, they should have a set of figures, which amounted to something like £42,900, but had no connection whatever with the expenditure for the present year. He failed to understand how an expenditure of £42,900 two years ago could form any guide to the Committee in regard to items which were estimated this year to come to £17,120. Of course, there might be exceptional expenditure in a particular year in connection with any particular Department. To give an instance of what he meant

he would take the item of the Tower of London. The furniture for the Tower of London in 1883-4 was put down at £27 4*s.* 5*d.*; but this year, in consequence of recent occurrences, it was only reasonable to suppose that a large sum of money would be necessary to replace the furniture and fittings destroyed in the explosion. He, therefore, failed to see how an expenditure of £27 4*s.* 5*d.* in the year 1883-4 could be any guide in regard to what was likely to be expended this year upon furniture for the Tower of London. He knew that the Junior Lord of the Treasury would tell him that the Return was given in answer to a request made by hon. Members on former occasions. Still, it did appear to him to be very remarkable that such a statement should be given in the Estimates by way of explaining this Vote, which could only be described as a page from the Appropriation Account.

MR. HIBBERT said, that he was equally surprised with the hon. Member when he first saw this Return in the Votes, and on making inquiry the reason given to him was the one he had stated—namely, that the Return was inserted in compliance with a request made by several Members when this Vote had been under discussion in previous years. That reason must, of course, be taken for just what it was worth.

MR. WARTON said, that he had received no answer to the complaint he had made in reference to the Royal Courts of Justice.

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, he would make inquiry into the complaint of the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton). As to the furniture generally, no doubt the Office of Works was responsible for the disposition of the old furniture; but he believed that the old furniture parted with was very small in extent. Nevertheless, as the whole of the furniture of the Public Offices came under the special control of the Department of the Office of Works, and that Department was solely responsible for it—either for supplying new furniture or for condemning it when old or worn-out—he would make inquiries in order to see what force there was in the complaints of the hon. Member for Queen's County (Mr. Arthur O'Connor).

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked whether, if the official in charge of the furniture of a large Public Department were to cart it away, and put the price of it into his pocket, there was any authority which could check such a proceeding, or, indeed, know anything about it?

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, he thought it would be impossible for any public officer to do that. He did not know that there was any special machinery to prevent it; but, practically, such conduct was impossible.

MR. BIGGAR asked for information in regard to the item of £64 9*s.* 4*d.* for the General Assembly Hall in Scotland. It was an item which appeared as the sixth from the bottom of page 68. He wished to know if the Junior Lord of the Treasury could give any information to the Committee on that item, and could explain upon what grounds the General Assembly of Scotland was entitled to furniture for their Hall? He understood that the General Assembly of Scotland obtained their funds by levying tithes, and that they had no claim upon Parliament for anything in the shape of a subsidy.

MR. HIBBERT, in reply, stated that the General Assembly Hall was kept up at the expense of the State. The tithes levied by the General Assembly of Scotland were handed over to the Imperial Exchequer and paid into the Public Accounts every year. Consequently, the expense of keeping up the General Assembly Hall was provided for in the same way as other public buildings in Scotland. The system might be a very wrong one, but it was a system which had been in operation for a considerable time.

MR. WARTON said, he had already called the attention of the Committee to the curious result of the plan adopted by the Government in giving a Return of the expenditure upon furniture for the Public Offices. The Return now given on page 28 had no reference whatever to the Estimates the Committee were called upon to vote, and formed no guide to the expenditure of the coming year. The Secretary to the Treasury told them that the Return was inserted at the request of certain Members who had complained in previous years of a want of information. He should like to know who those Members were who

desired to have the Return printed? He was afraid that it was just the sort of thing the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) would suggest, and then take no notice of it afterwards.

MR. RYLANDS said, that his impression of the matter was that the First Commissioner of Works had been asked to give the Return in order that it might be looked upon as the basis upon which the Estimates for succeeding years were framed. They had now an Estimate of £14,035 for the supply of furniture for various Public Offices, and the question they wanted to know was which Offices were to receive that furniture? He thought there was considerable advantage in having before them an account of the way in which the money had been expended in a previous year, in order that the Committee might form an opinion as to the requirements of the same Offices for the present year. Of course, that was all the advantage that could be obtained. They had before them a Vote of £14,000, and they were asked to show how that £14,000 was expended. Of course, it was not to be supposed that this year the same charges would appear against the different Offices. Some would be much lower, and some much higher; but the Committee would have an opportunity, and, he thought, with advantage, of seeing from time to time what the expenditure under each head was in the different Offices. No doubt, a complete Return would appear in the Appropriation Account; but he thought it would also be convenient for the House to have it before them when they were discussing the Estimates.

Vote *agreed to.*

(4.) £227,373, to complete the sum for the Revenue Department Buildings, Great Britain.

Mr. TOMLINSON wished to call attention to the way in which an item of £14,800 was inserted in the Vote for rents, insurance, and tithe-rent charges, on account of Customs buildings. From the item, which would be found on the first page of the Vote, it would appear that the rents were mixed up in a most extraordinary manner with other things. He could not help thinking that it was very desirable, in framing the Estimates, that they should be so prepared and submitted that hon. Members would be able to know exactly what was paid for rent, and what were the liabilities incurred for insurance, tithe-rent charges, and other items of expenditure. Very considerable sums were now paid in the shape of rent for buildings in which the public business was transacted, and the amount so paid had always been one of the stock arguments in favour of the erection of new buildings for the Admiralty and War Office. The contention was that considerable economy would be produced by having a permanent building belonging to the State, instead of leasing premises. But unless Parliament had the means of knowing what was expended in rent, it would be impossible to judge what saving would be effected by substituting new buildings, erected at the expense of the State, for the premises now held under leases. From the present Vote, it was impossible to ascertain what sum was paid in the shape of rents of various kinds; and he wished to know whether the hon. Gentleman the Junior Lord of the Treasury was able to give any explanation to the Committee of how much was expended in rents, and how much went in insurance and tithe-rent charges on account of Customs buildings? One reason which induced him to put this question to the hon. Member was that upon the next Vote, which related to County Court buildings, he intended to say something in reference to an item of £13,000, which appeared there for rent, insurance, &c.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the Committee would, perhaps, allow him to reply to the hon. Member, seeing that he had had experience in the matter when occupying the position of First Commissioner of Works. He might say that a comparatively small part of the item was for tithe-rent charge, the great bulk of it being for rent in the true sense of the term, and it applied to a large number of buildings that were used for Public Offices.

MR. TOMLINSON said, the reply of the right hon. Gentleman was not precisely directed to the point he had raised. He thought that the charge for rent ought to be altogether separated from the charge for insurance and any other charge. The Committee ought to know what was the aggregate amount paid for rent, in order that it might be possible to compare the system of hiring

buildings with that of erecting them specially. The Vote ought to be sufficiently plain to enable hon. Members to see at a glance what was charged for rent, and any charges for insurance and other matters should appear in separate items.

MR. WARTON said, he thought that, generally speaking, it would be as well to have all the items connected with Customs buildings, Inland Revenue buildings, Post Office buildings, and Post Office Telegraph buildings placed under their proper heading in the different Departments to which the Offices belonged, instead of being included in this Vote. Why should not the expenditure in connection with each Department be taken by itself; and why should not the Customs buildings appear under the Customs Vote, the Inland Revenue buildings under the Inland Revenue Vote, the Post Office buildings under the Post Office Vote, and the Post Office Telegraph buildings under the Telegraph Vote? Speaking under correction, he felt bound to say that the Estimate laid before the Committee in regard to the Post Office expenditure did not afford a full opportunity for comparing the revenue with the income. They were asked to make up their minds whether they could afford to establish a system of 6*d.* telegrams instead of the present 1*s.* rate, and they would probably be asked very shortly whether the Revenue would sustain material injury by taking off a trifle of the charge it was at present proposed to impose for the address. How could they tell what the profit or loss was upon the Post Office or the Telegraph Department unless they knew what the buildings connected with each cost? He thought it would be a much more business-like mode of proceeding to include, both in the Post Office and the Telegraph Vote, every item of expenditure which related to those Departments. In his opinion, it was altogether absurd to have separate Votes, and he should be glad if the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General would inform the Committee why the present system was persisted in? He certainly thought that it would not only save trouble, but that it would enable the House of Commons to understand in a better manner what they were called upon to do. So much with regard to the general question. There was, however, one special matter upon which he desired to ask for information. He saw, under the head of Customs buildings, an item of £138 for the protection of the London Custom House from fire in 1884-5. He wished to know why that item did not appear again for the present year? Had any other arrangement been made for the protection of the Custom House from fire, or for what reason was that item excluded from the present Vote? Certainly, in these days, when so many attempts had been made to destroy public buildings, it was a most important thing that every step should be taken to protect the public property from every sort of danger. He could not, therefore, understand why this item had been cut off.

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE remarked that the suggestion of the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton), that all buildings should be brought under the separate heads to which they related, would be a retrograde step, and a return to the old system which had already been condemned. It had been thought desirable to concentrate the items for the maintenance of the several public buildings in one Office, and include them in one Vote, so that everything might be looked at and attended to upon a large scale whenever an expenditure was found to be necessary. Of course, that idea must be taken for what it was worth; but it was certainly considered to be more economical to deal with all these buildings in the same Vote. He did not think it would be of any public advantage to adopt the suggestion of the hon. and learned Member.

MR. HIBBERT said, the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) had referred to an item for the protection of the Custom House in London from fire. That item had been discontinued owing to the adoption of a new system, by which the building was regularly watched, and hydrants employed, with a constant supply of water.

MR. TOMLINSON said, there was an item in the Vote of £3,350 for fuel, light, and things of that kind. He wished to know under what Office that charge came, because it would appear to apply to a variety of Departments—the Customs, Inland Revenue, Post Office, and Telegraph Departments—each of which required fuel, light, and things

of that nature? He should have thought it would have been a more economical plan for fuel and light to be provided for each Department by the Department itself. The item was a very large one, and he was certainly of opinion that the Department itself would be in a better position to exercise a complete control over the expenditure than if it were placed in the hands of some general Department, which he presumed, in this case, was the Office of Works. He should be glad to learn what the arrangement was, and how it happened that these items were not provided for under the head of each Department?

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, the Department which dealt with the question of supplying fuel and light was the Office of Works. There were officials specially responsible for this branch of work. It was found more economical for one Department to attend to all the arrangements, and to see that they were conducted upon the same system. Although the work was upon a large scale, there were great advantages in the plan which was now adopted.

Vote *agreed to.*

(5.) £26,210, to complete the sum for County Court Buildings.

MR. TOMLINSON wished to make an observation in reference to the items under Sub-head C. He found that in reference to several similar items in other Votes the full details were given—as, for instance, in the case of the Metropolitan Police Courts under Sub-head B. At the bottom of that Vote there was a statement of the rates of insurance and rents paid in connection with the Police Courts. But on referring to the present Vote he found that all the rents and insurance were lumped together, and a lump sum of £13,000 charged for them. He found also that there was a reduction upon the item this year as compared with that which was contained in the same Vote last year. He wished to know how that reduction was effected, because there had been a sort of floating rumour that in the town with which he was connected (Preston) there was going to be an attempt to effect a reduction in the charge for the County Court Offices by the removal of the offices from one part of the town to another? He thought a plan of that kind ought not to be attempted without careful consideration. It was quite possible that in many instances offices could be provided at a reduced rental; but such a change ought not to be made without fully considering the convenience of those who had to practice in the Courts and had charge of the business conducted in them. In matters of this kind, in connection with the County Courts, economy of rent was not the only question which ought to be considered, because it must be remembered that the County Courts, in populous towns, were almost wholly maintained by the fees received from the suitors, and anything which tended to render the transaction of business in the County Court Offices less convenient to the Legal Profession, and to the public generally, would have a tendency to reduce the fees. What, therefore, he wished to urge was that if any saving was sought to be effected in a Vote of this kind by reducing the amount of rent now paid for the offices, the greatest care should be exercised in order to see that professional gentlemen were not in any way prejudiced by the change. He hoped the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Vote would be able to give some explanation in reference to the reduction, and that he would further explain how much was charged for rent, how much for insurance, and so on, and if any steps had been taken to supply permanent buildings instead of renting them, and whether any economy had been effected by such charges?

MR. WARTON said, he thought there was a great deal of force in the remarks of his hon. Friend the Member for Preston (Mr. Tomlinson) in reference to the loose manner in which the Estimates had been prepared. For instance, on page 28, no detailed information in reference to the particular items was given, whereas in the next Vote full information was supplied in connection with similar items. He should be glad to learn why the same plan had not been followed in both cases? There appeared to have been a reduction of £500, and the Committee ought to have some account of it, because he did not suppose that there had been any diminution in the number of County Courts. If the Committee could not have full particulars, he would submit, with great respect, that it ought, at any rate, to be explained why the reduction had been

effected. For instance, a short foot-note stating where the reduction had taken place—whether in Bridport, or Preston, or wherever the case might be—would be of advantage. He complained of the entire want of uniformity in the system pursued, and he hoped the Government would explain why the item for rents, insurance, &c., was only £13,000 this year, when it was £13,500 last. This was a very important matter, because he was sorry to say that for some time past he had noticed that when the Supplementary Estimates were brought forward there seemed to be something like a systematic suppression of a good deal of the information which ought to be laid before the House in the first instance. In some cases there were 30 or 40 additional items placed in the Supplementary Estimates which had never appeared in the old Estimates at all, and, of course, all the circumstances were almost forgotten when it became necessary to consider the Supplementary Estimates. In addition, it was quite evident that the original Estimates supplied only very imperfect *data* for arriving at any conclusion as to the actual expenditure. He hoped that nothing of that kind would be attempted this year; and that although there appeared to have been a reduction of £500 upon this item, which would look very pretty in the eyes of those hon. Members who advocated economy in the Public Expenditure, he trusted that there was a real and substantial reason for the reduction, and that the place would be mentioned in which the reduction had been effected. If there was some County Court which was to be suppressed or otherwise, the Committee ought to know the fact; and it was desirable on every ground that they should be informed of the object with which this reduction of expenditure had been effected.

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, that it would be somewhat inconvenient to give a detailed list of the rents paid in respect of all the County Court buildings throughout the country. The list would be a very long one; but, of course, any hon. Member who desired any information with regard to any particular County Court could easily obtain that information. The hon. Member for Preston (Mr. Tomlinson) had asked him to what the decrease under Sub-head C was due. There was nothing very dangerous in that item, and nothing which was calculated to impair the efficiency of the County Courts. The decrease was due to the fact that rent was no longer payable in respect of the County Court buildings at Birmingham. If the hon. Member would refer to page 38 in the Votes, he would find that new buildings had been provided at Birmingham; and, of course, the old buildings, hitherto provided for the use of the County Courts, were no longer required, and no charge for rent in connection with them appeared in the present Vote.

MR. WARTON said, he was obliged to the hon. Member for the more full information he had now given; but he thought the fact mentioned by the hon. Gentleman justified the complaint he had made. Whenever there was a diminution in the Vote, owing to the circumstance that no rent was required for a particular County Court, it ought to be stated in a foot-note. A short note on page 37 would have been quite sufficient to place hon. Members on the right scent. He must confess that what he admired in the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Estimate was his perfect truthfulness and ingenuousness; but he thought that the hon. Gentleman stood almost entirely by himself in that respect. Perhaps when the hon. Gentleman had seen a little more of official life he would not be as ready to tell so much, but he would acquire the art of those Members who had preceded him, and whose chief characteristic was to be found in the manner in which they had succeeded in mystifying the Committee. He was glad, at any rate, to find that the hon. Member, at present, was completely honest. The hon. Member told them that the reduction arose in consequence of new buildings having been provided for Birmingham; but why, in common honesty, had that little simple fact not been stated in a foot-note? It would not have occupied more than a line of print simply to say that the reduction was owing to no rent being further required for County Court buildings in Birmingham. The only remark he had to make on the information which had been so kindly and candidly given to the Committee was that it showed the way in which the time of the House was unnecessarily occupied. He was not aware that there ought to be any cause for concealment. The fact ought to be

stated plainly and simply in the Estimates, and hon. Members ought not to be obliged to put a series of questions in order to get the information. They ought to have had the fact that the diminution of £500 was due to the new provision made in the case of Birmingham fairly explained in a foot-note, and he was quite sure that if the hon. Member the Junior Lord of the Treasury, who was in charge of the Vote, could have had his own way it would have been explained. He trusted that next year the hon. Member, gaining experience from what had just occurred, would add a short note either in the case of Birmingham or whatever other place might be concerned. What he (Mr. Warton) wanted was to save trouble and the waste of time and labour which was involved in finding out these things. Such trouble and waste of time would be altogether unnecessary if the facts of the case were fairly explained in the Estimates. While thanking the hon. Gentleman for his candour, he desired to add that in future, whenever a County Court rent was cut off, the fact should be mentioned in the Estimates. He could not help reminding the Committee that they had very minute information as to the remuneration of rat-catchers and so on, and he could not understand why the same minute information was not supplied in an important case like this. Of course, Birmingham was an appendage of a very important and powerful Member of the Cabinet, and they were now informed that the reduction in this item was due to the provision of new County Courts for that borough. It appeared that a sum of £35,000 had been voted for the County Court at Birmingham, and he should be glad to find some explanation of the manner in which that sum had been obtained. He only mentioned the circumstance with a view of obtaining information as to what these figures meant. Where was it shown that the sum of £35,000 for County Court buildings in Birmingham had been voted? What period of years had the sum been spread over, and why should Birmingham have been specially selected for so large an expenditure? Perhaps the Secretary to the Treasury, or some hon. Member who had been longer in Office than the Junior Lord of the Treasury, would be able to recollect how long this expenditure had been going on?

MR. HIBBERT said, he was afraid that he could not give the information which his hon. and learned Friend seemed to think he possessed. Indeed, the hon. and learned Gentleman was a little out of Order in drawing attention to a matter respecting Birmingham which was not included in the Vote at present before the Committee. There was no Vote for Birmingham in the present Estimate, and as far as the sum referred was concerned, it had already been voted and spent. He thought his hon. and learned Friend was disappointed in finding that he had not succeded in discovering a job—[MR. WARTON: Hear, hear!]—and in having received a satisfactory explanation.

MR. TOMLINSON said, there was an item on page 38 of £3,060 for new works, additions, and approaches. He wished to know whether that was the first, second, or third item; whether the Committee was sanctioning the expenditure for the first time, or whether it was to be regarded as an item that would be further continued?

MR. HIBBERT: It is for the whole.

MR. PARNELL asked whether any of the money proposed to be granted under this head would be expended upon County Court buildings in Ireland? Was there any money to be spent in Ireland at all? In looking through the Irish Estimates he did not find that there had been any sum allocated for this purpose, and, therefore, if any sum was to be expended in Ireland he presumed that it was included in the present Vote.

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, that this was not so, and that any sum given for the purpose would be found in the Irish Votes, he believed, under the Estimate for the Office of Public Works in Ireland.

MR. CALLAN asked where any sum of the kind was to be found? He was unable to see any Vote for Ireland for purposes similar to that which they were now asked to vote for England. The total sum they were asked to vote for County Court buildings was £32,210—for new works, additions, and approaches, alterations, maintenance, and repairs, rent and insurance, payment to care-takers £6,500, for furniture £900, and for fuel, light, &c., £3,350. He

wished to know whether any similar Vote appeared in the Estimates in regard to the County Courts of Ireland, and, if not, what was the explanation of its omission?

THE CHAIRMAN said, that that information would be given when they came to discuss the Irish Votes, which, however, had nothing whatever to do with the present Vote. It was out of Order to discuss the question of County Court buildings in Ireland upon an English Vote.

MR. CALLAN said, he objected to the Vote on the ground that there was no similar Vote for Ireland, and he would divide against the Vote because he did not see why they should vote £32,000 for County Court buildings in England, when there was no Vote of the same character for County Court buildings in Ireland.

MR. CAUSTON said, that instead of being a matter for surprise that there was no similar Vote for Ireland, it ought to be a matter for congratulation to Irish Members that it appeared that the business was so well conducted in Ireland that there was no need for County Court buildings there.

MR. SEXTON remarked, that if the hon. Member for Colchester (Mr. Causton) was so ignorant of matters connected with the administration of public affairs in Ireland as the remark he had just made seemed to imply, it was not a matter of regret that he intervened so seldom in the debates of the House. The Vote for the Office of the Board of Works in Ireland related to salaries only, and had nothing to do with buildings. He thought it was objectionable that a sum of £32,000 should be voted for the maintenance of County Courts in England, when buildings of a similar character had to be provided out of the county cess in Ireland. There was no corresponding Vote for Ireland to that which they were now discussing. Large sums of money appeared to be expended upon County Court buildings in England, and for Police Courts, and he could not see why the expenditure should be paid for out of the Imperial purse, when similar expenditure in the case of Ireland was ignored. It was only reasonable that some explanation should be given as to the distinction which appeared to be made in the treatment of the two countries.

MR. PARNELL said, that before the Vote was taken he should like to know if they were to understand what the policy of the Government really was in throwing the cost of County Court buildings upon the whole of the Three Kingdoms in reference to England, and taking it from the local rates in regard to Ireland? He was of opinion that there ought to be one general and uniform plan, and he, therefore, wished to know why an exception was made in the case of Ireland? Of course, the matter was one which had been to a certain extent settled as regarded England. The County Court Acts in England were of old date, and, consequently, had become part of the settled policy of Parliament. Under that policy it appeared to be the practice to throw the cost of the erection and maintenance of the buildings for the administration of secondary justice in England upon the Imperial Exchequer, and thus to take the charge off the local rates. He was not prepared to object to that policy if it was to be a uniform policy. But the corresponding Act in the case of Ireland was only passed in the last Parliament, and, consequently, it had been a matter which had not attracted very much attention. He thought it was a great and glaring injustice that while the town of Birmingham was assisted, or supposed to be assisted, in regard to the erection of County Court buildings, to the extent of £35,000, there was not a single case in which the Government had undertaken to erect a single building in connection with the administration of justice by the County Court Judges in Ireland. In some of the large Irish counties there was a considerable amount of work for the County Court Judges, and in almost every case the County Court accommodation was most insufficient. The County Court Judges were compelled, in many instances, to take refuge in the Petty Sessions Courts. He submitted that this was not a proper state of affairs; and if the Irish Members were to be asked to consent to vote considerable sums of money, year after year, for the erection of these buildings in England, under precisely analogous circumstances to those which existed in Ireland, the Votes certainly ought to be extended to the case of Ireland also, and a fair proportion of the money granted should be

allocated to the erection of similar buildings in that country. The matter was, of course, a fresh and a novel one, which had never been raised before, because the Act in regard to Ireland was only of recent date. The question had not, therefore, been properly brought under the attention of the Government; but now that it had been brought under their attention, he hoped some assurance would be given that the scope of the Vote would be extended in future, and if it was irregular to include Ireland in this particular Vote, he trusted that a separate Vote would be submitted which would deal with the case of Ireland.

MR. WARTON said, he thought the complaint of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) was a reasonable one; but probably the facts of the case, as they affected Ireland, were capable of explanation. For instance, it might be the fact that in England the County Courts paid for themselves, while in Ireland they did not. Of course, the Secretary to the Treasury would know whether that was the fact or not. He believed that in England the County Courts paid a great deal more in the shape of fees than they cost; but he did not know whether that was the case in Ireland.

MR. MOLLOY said, that was also the case in Ireland.

MR. WARTON said, he had not been aware that that was the fact, and was under the impression that that might account for the absence of a similar Vote in the case of Ireland. The fees paid in England were more than enough to pay the salaries of the County Court Judges and of the officers connected with the Courts, as well as to provide for the maintenance of the buildings. He wished to know whether there really was any distinction drawn between the two countries, and, if so, for what reason? Although he was not an Irishman, he was just as anxious that justice should be done to Ireland as any Irish Member, and he thought that some notice should be taken by the Government of the complaint which had been made by the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). He was quite satisfied that the sum charged in the Vote for the English County Courts was amply provided for by the fees charged. He regretted that no Member of the Government had risen to reply to the hon. Member for the City of Cork.

MR. HIBBERT said, he could assure the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) that it was not from any want of courtesy towards the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) that he had not risen at once to take notice of the remarks which the hon. Member had made. He had simply waited because he was anxious to hear all that was to be said upon the question, seeing that it was altogether a new point which had been raised. He was quite prepared to admit that there did not appear to be any Vote in the Estimates for this purpose so far as Ireland was concerned; but whether the Courthouses there were in a better position than those in England he was not able to say. He believed, however, that the County Court system in Ireland was not exactly on all fours with that of England; but he was quite prepared to admit that there should be an equality of treatment. The whole question of local taxation would have to be considered whenever an opportunity was afforded for taking up that question; and, of course, among other points for discussion would be whether Ireland was able to make out any real and substantial grievance. Whenever the question of local taxation came under discussion, he promised that the point raised by hon. Members for Ireland, as to whether these buildings should be paid for by the State in Ireland, should receive the best attention of the Government.

MR. MOLLOY remarked that a Supplementary Vote might be submitted.

MR. HIBBERT said, he could go no further at present than make a promise that the subject should be fully considered, and he hoped that hon. Members, under the circumstances, would not feel inclined to prevent the present Vote from being taken.

MR. SEXTON said, it suited the hon. Gentleman to express an opinion that the question raised by his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) was a reasonable one, and he (Mr. Sexton) might say that whatever the disposition of Irish Members might be towards any other Member of the Government, they had never accused the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury of any want of courtesy towards them. The hon. Mem-

ber said that the County Court system in Ireland was not on all fours with that in England. But it might be pointed out that neither was the system in Scotland on all fours with that in England. Indeed, the dissimilarity was far more marked than in the case of Ireland. In Ireland they had a body known as County Court Judges, who presided in the Courts of that country under a system which was generally assimilated to that which prevailed in England; whereas in Scotland there were Sheriffs and Sheriff Substitutes, who were entirely different both in name and in prerogative from the English County Court Judges, and yet it would be found that the public money was voted for keeping up their jurisdiction. Her Majesty's Government appeared to extend to the County Court buildings throughout Great Britain generally the most paternal care. In the first place, they built them where they were needed, and after they were built they repaired and maintained them, furnished them, provided them with fuel and light, and gave salaries to care-takers for protecting them; whereas in Ireland every penny of the expenditure upon all these items fell upon the local ratepayers, who were certainly heavily burdened enough without having to bear this additional charge. The position which the Irish Members took up was this—either that the cost of these buildings in England and Scotland should fall upon the localities, or else that the County Courts in Ireland should have provision made for them out of the Imperial Exchequer, in the same way as in England and Scotland. They had no wish to be exacting; but they demanded that either one course or the other should be taken. After the explanation which had been given to his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), that the Government would look into the matter and see whether an arrangement could be made, his hon. Friend would in all probability be satisfied.

MR. CALLAN said, that in England about one-half of the expenses of erecting these buildings was borne by the Imperial Exchequer, and there was also an annual contribution for their maintenance and repair, whereas in Ireland no contribution whatever was made either towards the cost of erection, or of maintenance afterwards. It should also be borne in mind that although there were County Courts in England, and Sheriff Substitute Courts in Scotland, the Irish Courts, which were used for the County Courts, were also employed for other Governmental purposes. It was only fair, therefore, that they should be held to impose a greater amount of liability on the part of the Government for their maintenance, and instead of receiving no contribution at all from the Estimates, they were entitled to a larger amount of support than either the English or the Scotch Courts.

Vote *agreed to.*

(6.) £5,012, to complete the sum for Metropolitan Police Court Buildings.

MR. RYLANDS said, he did not wish to allow this Vote to pass *sub silentio*. He recollected that his hon. Friend the Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler), who now sat upon the Treasury Bench, had last year opposed this Vote upon very sound grounds, and he believed also that upon that occasion he (Mr. Rylands) had appealed to the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary on the subject, who told the Committee that he was agreed upon the main principle that it was most unreasonable that these charges should be placed on the Estimates, while the Local Authorities throughout the country had to erect their own buildings and support their own Police Courts. But the right hon. Gentleman, although he said he was anxious to procure the removal of this injustice, stated that if the Vote were rejected, there would be no means of raising the money—that was to say, there would be no means of imposing rates except by Act of Parliament. If that were so, he (Mr. Rylands) was bound to say that while he did not like to allow the Vote to pass without entering a verbal protest against it, and while he agreed with all that his hon. Friend the Member for Wolverhampton had expressed with regard to it last year, he did not think that the Committee could with any propriety, under the special circumstances of the case, divide against the Vote. Not only in this case, but in others of a kindred character in which there was a large expenditure, he hoped it would be considered by the Government whether the charges now thrown upon the taxpayer might not be

thrown upon the localities concerned. He protested against this Vote as being a very unjust one.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he thought the proposal of the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) was a very reasonable one. But while the Government pretended to look after the Metropolitan Police buildings, they really did nothing of the kind. There were certain Metropolitan Police Courts which were a disgrace to the Metropolis, and the Government had, over and over again, pleaded as an excuse for their condition that at some time they hoped, at no very distant day, to pass a Bill relating to the administration of London, in which it would be provided that all these matters should be dealt with by the Local Authorities, and that all these charges should be taken over and the Estimates relieved of them. But although that might be all very well when the Bill became law, yet in the meantime they had the disgraceful spectacle of thousands of people having the right to enter the Police Courts who were absolutely excluded from them, and who, from want of space therein, would be nearly suffocated if they were not. If any hon. Member would go down to Wandsworth Police Court, he would be as indignant as he (Mr. O'Connor) had been at the conditions on which the gentleman who sat there had to administer justice. The magistrate went to Wandsworth from Hammersmith, and the place in which he had to administer justice was such that it would not be rented by anyone for business purposes of any kind. It was difficult of access, it had a staircase which might lead up to a loft, it was badly ventilated; the ceiling was so low that one might touch it with the hand, and the magistrate administering justice sat, so to speak, with one elbow on the window-sill and the other on the hob; it was exceedingly narrow, and so hot that it would be injurious for anyone to remain there more than 10 minutes. Such was the place in which the magistrate sat year after year. Then the outbuildings in connection with the Court were also very defective. A shed had been recently put up for the convenience of persons who came to the Court on business, or on summons for not sending their children to school. Those persons were absolutely without any shelter, and one could see women with babies in their arms standing out in the rain, the magistrate being unable to afford them any relief, and the police standing by and commiserating them. The Government had said they must wait until the Metropolis could take over the charge in connection with those Police Courts; but the fact was that, for a very small expenditure, any builder of moderate ability would erect premises with five or six times the space of the Wandsworth Police Court, which would enable persons attending the Court to have light and air and other reasonable accommodation. He should imagine that £1,000 would be more than sufficient to meet all the requirements of this case, and he said that prompt arrangements ought to be made to deal with it. Considering the crush of applicants to the Court, which must go on increasing with the population, it seemed only reasonable that the Government should do at once what they could to remedy the evil to which he had drawn attention.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, with regard to the difficulty connected with Wandsworth Police Court, if the hon. Gentleman had been in his place on a former occasion he would not have said that the Government had persistently refused to deal with this case. Early in the Session his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Childers) stated that the question had been discussed between the Home Office and the Treasury, and that an arrangement had been arrived at for the settlement of this matter. He was happy to inform the hon. Member that since that time, within the last fortnight or three weeks, a plan had been arranged between the two Offices, under which the grievance complained of would be removed. He would revert now to the subject which his hon. Friend the Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) had alluded to with such moderation. He had always been of opinion that London ought to pay for matters of this kind; but he pointed out that the arrangements made were such that they could not be altered except by legislation. The subject, however, formed part of the much larger one of London Government, and they must be dealt with together. It had always been his hope that arrangements would be made to put these matters upon a fair basis,

MR. WARTON said, although the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary had denied that the Government persistently refused to consider this question, and had referred to an arrangement arrived at within the last fortnight, he would point out that he himself had called attention to this subject in 1881, 1882, 1883, and 1884, on which occasions it did not receive the attention to which it was entitled. He had been referred by the Home Secretary to the Attorney General, and from him again to the Home Secretary. [Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT dissented.] The right hon. Gentleman shook his head, but that would not settle the question. It was all very well, when a General Election was approaching, for the Government to make a show of vigour and liberality; but he trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would not consider it unreasonable, under the circumstances, if he repeated the statement of the hon. Member for Queen's County (Mr. A. O'Connor) that the Government had persistently refused to consider this question.

MR. BIGGAR said, he agreed with the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) in his remarks as regarded the London Police Courts. He remembered that in former years the argument in favour of the existing arrangement was, that matters of national importance were decided in the London Police Courts. Now, however true that might be with regard to one or two of them, it certainly could not apply to cases like those of Lambeth and Wandsworth. He thought that the only way to enforce legislation, which was so much desired in some quarters, would be to refuse to grant public money for purposes that strictly appertained to the Metropolis. That being so, it appeared to him that the present Vote ought to be refused. £1,500 would, in his opinion, be quite sufficient payment on account of all the work done in the Police Courts that was alleged to be of a public nature; and with regard to the purely police business of the Metropolis, he thought that the different Vestries, who were not prepared to give proper accommodation in their own neighbourhoods for the administration of justice, should be compelled to do so. There was a great want of reform of the law in this respect; and it was in the power of the Government, by stopping this payment, to make the position rather more uncomfortable for those who stood in the way of the reforms which the Government said they were anxious to bring about.

Vote *agreed to.*

(7.) £8,000, to complete the sum for Sheriff Court Houses, Scotland.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he noticed in this Estimate a strange peculiarity. The Vote was distributed under six sub-heads, and last year the amount under each sub-head had been given separately. This year the amount under the first sub-head was given, but the amount under the other sub-heads was lumped together, the total amount for this year being £7,000, as against £5,000 for last year. Now, it struck him that this peculiarity, if not suspicious in itself, was, at any rate, a departure from established practice. Of course, it would be satisfactory to any Department to have a lump sum given to it to spend as it might choose. But it had been found conducive to economy, inasmuch as it enabled the Treasury to exercise a prompt check on the expenditure of different Departments, to have smaller sums appropriated to certain subordinate branches of the Service. Hence it was that sub-heads were distinguished in almost all of these Votes. He asked why, in the case of this particular Vote, that system had been changed? The result of such change would be simply that the Department would be enabled to divert from maintenance and repairs sums which might be used for the purpose of giving individuals pecuniary advantages. In that way the personal allowances would be increased, while the real object for which the money was voted would be neglected. That was the natural effect of having a lump sum to deal with. In the case of the Army and Navy, the benefit of alloting definite sums to each Vote had been acknowledged. If at the end of a year a Department sent in a Supplementary Estimate, the Treasury, although it sometimes required information with regard to the claim, as a general rule, passed it on the mere statement of the Department that the money was required. In certain cases, however, they required a

statement in detail under sub-heads, and when that information was given, they had a practical check on the Department; but when a lump sum was voted to any particular Department, that efficient check, which was so conducive to economy, was abandoned. As a matter of fact, the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General with regard to this Vote showed that the House of Commons really voted the money in the dark. It appeared that in one case last year £2,500 had been voted for Paisley. But of this sum only £1,000 was spent at Paisley, for which the money was voted, while £150 about was spent on Kirkwall and £900 on Glasgow, which money had never been voted at all. No doubt the Treasury considered that the best way to avoid inconvenient inquiries was to put down a lump sum, and not to say how it was to be disposed of. But he objected to that. He said the House ought to know what the money was asked for in all these cases, and he would ask the Secretary to the Treasury to say that, in taking this Vote, he would distribute the amount between the respective sub-heads, as they had been distributed last year. He did not ask him to confine himself to any particular sum; he asked him to distribute the money under the various sub-heads, so that the Treasury and the Comptroller and Auditor General, as well as the Committee, might have something like a check upon the expenditure which took place.

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE pointed out that under 42 *Vict.* there was a fixed sum payable for these Courts, based on the average of the last three years.

MR. HIBBERT said, that the Treasury were not compelled to obtain money in this form, but they were empowered to do it.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he was afraid the hon. Gentleman had not understood one part of his objection. On page 41 he would see that about two years ago the House was asked for £2,500 for Paisley, and that the money was voted. But the Department did not spend the money for the purpose for which it was voted; they spent only £875 at Paisley, and then proceeded to spend £145 at Kirkwall, and £900 at Glasgow, for which no money had been voted at all. He said this system was perfectly illusive, because, under it, the House of Commons did not know what was being done. No doubt, there were good reasons for asking money for Glasgow; but if the money was to be obtained in this manner, the Government might just as well ask for a round sum to cover the Estimates and spend it as they pleased. While, however, they went through the formality of asking money for these separate Services, the least that should be done was to say how the money was to be spent.

SIR HENRY HOLLAND agreed with much that had been said by the hon. Member for Queen's County (Mr. A. O'Connor) as to the taking a lump sum for the last five items of this Vote, instead of distributing the sum amongst the several items. He was partly answered by the Secretary to the Treasury, who referred to the Act 47 & 48 *Vict.* c. 42. But as the Treasury were only empowered, not compelled, by that Act to sanction this new arrangement, he hoped they would reconsider the matter, and present future Estimates in the old form. The more complete check there was upon the Department, the more careful would be the expenditure; and he was unwilling, therefore, to see even this slight check relaxed. He was not so sure that he agreed with the hon. Member for Queen's County in his observations upon Item A, New Works, and for this reason. Of course, it was very desirable that money voted by Parliament should be strictly applied to the purposes for which it was voted; but it might well be that in the course of the financial year it might become absolutely necessary to undertake some other work, while, at the same time, the work brought under the notice of Parliament, and for which the money was voted, could stand over and be temporarily postponed. Now, if the diverting the money from one work to another could be done at the mere will of the Department, he should entirely dissent to the voting money for new works in a lump sum; but, as a matter of fact, the sanction of the Treasury had to be first obtained, and the Treasury were bound to look closely into each case, and to judge of the necessity or expediency of diverting the money from the original work, and unless satisfied upon the point, they would refuse their sanction.

MR. RYLANDS said, he was not prepared to accept the opinion of the hon. Baronet on this matter to the extent to which he had carried it. No doubt it was a convenient mode of procedure to grant a lump sum for new works, and no doubt no diversion could be made in the expenditure of the money without the sanction of the Treasury; but he thought that that sanction should only be given under the most exceptional circumstances. The case which the hon. Member for Queen's County (Mr. A. O'Connor) had brought under the notice of the Committee was a very remarkable one. There was a sum of money expressly voted by Parliament for a certain purpose, and which had been spent upon objects of which that House had no knowledge at all. It was quite true that the Treasury might have sanctioned such application of money; but he thought that the hon. Baronet rather agreed with him in the opinion that it was extremely important that such changes in the application of money voted by Parliament should be looked upon with great jealousy. They knew that when Parliament was asked to vote money for a particular object in connection with the Army or Navy, cases to which the hon. Baronet had referred sometimes arose; they knew that in the case of money voted for works sanctioned by Parliament for those Services it was sometimes diverted to other works, and although the sanction of the Treasury was obtained, the whole thing was really done without the sanction of Parliament. No doubt, when the Appropriation Account came forward Parliament was placed in possession of a knowledge of the facts; but he was bound to say that he looked with a great deal of jealousy on that mode of dealing with the public money.

SIR HENRY HOLLAND begged leave to say a word in reply to the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands). In a case like the present, when the whole sum voted was declared to be for a special purpose, the Treasury would not sanction any other application of the money except under very special circumstances. Nor was it correct to say that this could be done without the cognizance of the House, as at a later stage the House would become aware of it. The facts would all appear in the Appropriation Account, and would be submitted to the Comptroller and Auditor General. He would report the matter, and it then would be considered by the Public Accounts Committee. They had a high Official of the Treasury before them, whom they examined upon such matters, and then they reported to the House. There was thus a check upon the Department by the Treasury, and a check upon the Treasury by the Public Accounts Committee and the House.

MR. HIBBERT said, there was, no doubt, great force in what the hon. Member for Queen's County (Mr. A. O'Connor) had said. But this Vote had actually been prepared under the Act passed last year. That Act had been passed with the idea of providing an economical arrangement in these cases, because it provided for a lump sum being taken upon the average of three years, and also that in the case of excessive expenditure such excess should be defrayed by the county. That, the Committee would perceive, was throwing all the excess of the sum which might be spent in future years upon the Local Authorities. With regard to the consent of the Treasury to the application of money voted by Parliament, he believed that everything would be found to be in order, and in accordance with the Act of Parliament.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, that, unfortunately, the hon. Gentleman had failed to see the canniness of the Scotch arrangement which he had endeavoured to point out. The Act provided that if there were a balance under any one of the six heads, such balance should be paid to the Treasury. Now, the Scotch advisers of the hon. Gentleman had arranged that the six sub-heads should be reduced to two. This arrangement would enable more money to be spent on various objects than was intended by Parliament. Before this lumping system took place, whatever surplus there might have been under any one of those six sub-heads would have to be repaid. But it was not so now. If there were any surplus under any one sub-head, it would be repaid; but the Scotch Department had eluded that check, and they would now probably get a great deal more public money than they would otherwise have obtained.

Vote *agreed to.*

(8) £210,500, to complete the sum for Surveys of the United Kingdom.

CAPTAIN AYLMER said, there were several items in the Vote, and he should like to ask under which of them came the sum in respect of Surveys in connection with the Land Courts in Ireland? It was necessary to know that, in order that the amount might be put with the other expenses of the Courts.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, that, seeing that these Survey maps were practically of very little use to the people at large until an Act had been passed for the conveyance of land by the registration of titles, he wished to ask the Government whether it would not be wise to make the price of the maps as high as possible, in order to obtain the largest possible sum in reduction of the Estimates for the Survey?

MR. ACKERS said, he should like to point out how very incomplete had been the Survey in certain parts of England. In his own district it had been very badly done. Some three years ago, or more, the sappers had come round and had surveyed the whole of the district; but since then it had been ascertained that the districts surveyed by the different parties did not fit, owing to there having been no proper oversight, and the result was that last year a certain part of the Survey had to be done over again. In that district they experienced this extreme inconvenience—that while some parts of the parishes were surveyed others were not; and, consequently, whilst residents could get maps of some parts, maps of other parts were not yet issued. If there had been a proper oversight when the Survey was made, such an inconvenient state of affairs would not have arisen.

MR. PARNELL said, he should like to ask the hon. Member in charge of these Votes what was the difference between the Cadastral Survey and the Irish Survey for Valuation?

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, that, in reply to the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Ackers), all he could say was that if there were complaints to be made of the manner in which the Survey was made and information on the subject were sought, he would do his best to obtain it. The hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold) had put a question to him as to the price of the Ordnance maps. That matter had been under consideration for a long time. The profit from the sale was extremely small; but he was not able at that moment to say that any change in the price could be made. He would undertake, however, that the hon. Member's suggestion should have every consideration.

MR. RYLANDS disputed the accuracy of the statement of the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold) that the Ordnance maps were of no use.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD: I did not say that. I said they are of no use to the people at large. Of course, they are of great use to landowners.

MR. RYLANDS said, he was speaking for the people at large. He agreed with the hon. Member that when they had Courts for the conveyance of land and the registration of titles it would be a good thing; but, in the meantime, those maps were of great use to the public at large. They were constantly used by them. People who neither owned nor bought land were glad to have the Ordnance Survey maps, in order that they might make themselves familiar with the roads of the country and with all the valuable information the maps contained. He was not at all disposed to share the view of his hon. Friend, his opinion being that they ought to go on the principle of having a large sale of the maps. The sale was increasing; and he was disposed to think that, with the view of securing the convenience of the public, they ought to continue to charge a low price for the maps. No doubt, looking at the additional amount asked for under the present Vote, they might assume that the expenditure was going on at a much more rapid rate than in former years. He should be very glad indeed if they could get on with the Survey; indeed, he was particularly anxious that it should be got on with as rapidly as possible, because when delays occurred it was often found that whilst one county was being proceeded with the circumstances of others entirely changed. No doubt there would be a great deal of work to do with regard to the Survey for a long time to come.

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, he did not express any opinion as to the price of the Ordnance Survey maps; but he would consider what had been said on both sides of the question. As to what had fallen from the hon. Gentle

man the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), the difference between the Cadastral Survey and the Irish Survey for Valuation, he imagined, was to be accounted for by the fact that the Survey of Ireland on the 6-inch scale was completed some time ago, and was now being revised. It was simply a revision of the old Survey.

MR. PARNELL: Does the charge for that revision come under this Vote?

CAPTAIN AYLMER: Will the hon. Member tell the Committee how much is added on account of the new Land Court in Ireland?

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: I am afraid I cannot give the hon. and gallant Member the information he asks for.

MR. PARNELL said, that this question as to the different Surveys in Ireland was rather a confusing one. He wished to ask the hon. Member (Mr. H. Gladstone) whether he meant that the revised Survey now proceeding in Ireland under the Ordnance Survey Department was paid for under the first column or the second? Was it paid for under the head of the Cadastral Survey, or under the head of the Survey for Valuation?

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: Under the second head.

MR. PARNELL: That of the Revision of the Irish Valuation Survey?

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: That is the head under which the charge is made.

MR. PARNELL said, he found that in Class II. of the Estimates, Vote 41, there was an item of £23,804 for the Valuation and Boundary Survey in Ireland. There were evidently, then, two distinct Surveys, one known as the Ordnance Survey, and the other called the Valuation and Boundary Survey, the first being paid for under the Vote they were now discussing, and the second paid for in Vote 41 of Class II.

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: That refers to the actual Survey now being carried on in Ireland. This money is for the revision of the 6-inch maps, the Survey for which the Office of Works is responsible.

MR. PARNELL: Which Department carries out the work of the Survey? Is it the Ordnance Department?

MR. HIBBERT: I believe it is the Valuation Board in Ireland who carry it out.

MR. PARNELL: That is to say, the work under Vote 41 in Class II. is being carried out by the Valuation Board, and has no reference to the 6-inch Survey. The work under the second column of the present Vote is being carried out by the English Department—that is to say, by the Ordnance Survey Department, and has reference to the 6-inch Survey?

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: Yes; I believe that is so.

MR. PARNELL said, that in that case, having obtained the desired information, he wished to direct attention to the very great discrepancy between the amount spent on the Survey in England and that spent on the same Survey in Ireland. He found, judging from what the hon. Member had just told him, that that the Cadastral Vote was for the English Survey—that was to say, for the revised 6-inch Survey in England which was now proceeding. Provision for this, to the extent of £200,148, was asked for; whereas for the same work in Ireland only £12,494 was to be provided. This discrepancy between the two amounts would, no doubt, explain the very backward condition of the Irish 6-inch Survey.

MR. HIBBERT asked the hon. Member to remember what had been done in Ireland during the past year. Maps of the whole of Ireland could now be obtained on the 6-inch scale, and an edition of the 6-inch map had been published in regard to certain places. The revised 6-inch plan, engraved and published during the year, included an area 34,000 acres in extent. It appeared that in regard to the 6-inch scale the Irish Survey was in advance of that of England. The whole of England had never yet been included in the 6-inch Survey; and it would, therefore, seem that the re-issue if the 6-inch scale maps was going on in Ireland *pari passu* with the issue of the maps of that scale relating to England for the first time.

MR. PARNELL said, his complaint was that whereas they had over a great part of England completed the 6-inch Survey, and really reliable maps on the 6-inch scale could now be procured of by far the larger portion of the country, in respect to Ireland the Survey had only proceeded to a very partial extent. According to the statement of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hibbert) it had only proceeded over four counties.

MR. HIBBERT: It has proceeded over five counties in Ireland, and some additional towns.

MR. PARNELL said, it was true that a great many years ago the Irish Survey was in advance of that of England—that was to say, that Ireland was surveyed first. But that Survey was a very ancient one, and was utterly unreliable; in fact, for all practical purposes it was absolutely useless. It gave the old boundaries, fences, and so forth, which were in existence in 1848, when the country was very much more thickly populated than now. All the alterations which had since been made were, of course, absent from the maps; consequently, there remained a vast amount of work to be done, and a great expenditure of money would be necessary in order to bring up the Irish 6-inch Survey to the same position as the English 6-inch Survey. According to the hon. Gentleman, the English 6-inch Survey was nearly completed, and the Irish Survey of the same scale was an old one and unreliable, the revised edition having only covered five counties up to the present. What, under the circumstances, he (Mr. Parnell) wished to ask the Government was, whether they would not pay some attention to the matter, and, by increasing the staff in Ireland and spending more money on the work, take steps to bring the Irish Survey up to the same position as the English Survey? It was obvious that if they only went on spending on the Irish Survey £12,500 a-year, whilst they spent on that of England over £200,000 a-year, the latter would make the quickest progress, and they might all be very old or dead before the former was completed. He wished to direct the attention of the hon. Gentleman opposite to another fact. He saw that in this Vote there was a column for expenses under the various sub-heads, including the Geological Survey. Now, if the Ordnance Survey was bad in Ireland, the Geological Survey was ten times worse. The Survey itself was of a very old date, and of an exceedingly imperfect character. It might have been—it probably was—made by experienced men; but they evidently had not sufficient time to make it it in a thoroughly efficient manner. They had delineated the geological features of the country in such an imperfect fashion as to enable no sort of reliance whatever to be placed in the geological maps of Ireland. He had often had an opportunity of looking over English geological maps, and had been struck by the amount of care and attention which had been evidently devoted to the accurate marking down of the mineral and other geological features of the country. A Survey which was of so much importance to the development of the industrial life of a country was particularly necessary in Ireland. One of the great troubles those who were interested in the welfare of that country had to face with regard to industrial matters was the impossibility of getting any information from the result of the labours of the Government in regard to this important question of the Geological Survey. He did not wish to dwell at any considerable length on the matter now, because the present Vote had reference only to the cost of engraving for the Survey. He found that the cost of engraving in connection with the Geological Survey was £1,500. He was afraid that not a single 1*d.* of that would be spent on the Irish Geological Survey, for he did not believe that the result of the labours of the very small geological staff in Ireland was yet in a position to be published, or that any attempt had been made to publish it. The gentlemen connected with the Geological Survey in Ireland had been for several years past engaged in re-surveying the county of Wicklow, the old Survey being entirely worthless. The Irish Members had been unable to hear anything as to the result of their labours, and they found now that the Department was not able to fix a date when the new revised maps would be issued. The revised Geological Survey had only proceeded over a few of the Irish counties; in fact, it was in a similar position to the Ordnance Survey. As a consequence, an enormous portion of Ireland in this respect was left entirely out in the cold. The people of Ireland had not benefited by the very partial labours of the Geological Survey—even by the Survey which had been completed up to this time. It was evident to him, both as regarded the Ordnance Survey and the Geological Survey, that the expenditure was being scandalously starved and stinted in Ireland as compared with England, to the manifest disadvantage of the former

country. He earnestly hoped, now that the question had been raised and the attention of the Government had been drawn to it, and they had shown a desire, at all events, to appear to do something to develop the industrial resources of Ireland, that more consideration would be given to these two important sources of information from an industrial point of view. He trusted that the people of Ireland might ere long see their way to obtaining important information as to the geological formation of their country and as to local boundaries.

CAPTAIN AYLMER said, he hoped the Government would take notice of what the hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) had said about the Geological Survey of Ireland, because at present the geological maps of that country were most unreliable. He had had to go down to the South-West of Ireland in connection with a land survey on one occasion, and he had discovered that where sandstone was put down only slate was to be found.

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, that the question of the Geological Survey could be more conveniently raised in Class IV. With regard to the remarks of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), he would undertake to make inquiries as to the position of the 6-inch Survey in Ireland, and to see whether its progress could be accelerated.

MR. PARNELL asked, whether the hon. Member was able to say whether any of the money asked for in this Vote concerned the Department of the Geological Survey; and whether any of it would be spent in expediting the publication of geological maps of that country?

MR. MUNDELLA: There is nothing whatever in this Vote which relates to the Geological Survey. That will come under Class IV., and not under the present class at all. When we come to Class IV. I shall be able to show the hon. Member that in connection with this matter Ireland is in a much more forward position than either England or Scotland.

MR. PARNELL: I beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon; but there is a column here—the 5th column—involving the Geological Survey.

MR. MUNDELLA: Yes; but only on a small point.

MR. PARNELL: I am glad to see the right hon. Gentleman in his place, because he will be able now, perhaps, to give us some information which it has been promised shall be given a little later on. I think he will admit that my question comes more pertinently at the present moment. I would ask whether any of this £1,500 is to be allocated to the advancement of the Geological Survey, and the publication of the geological maps?

MR. MUNDELLA: I cannot give an answer on that point. The engraving for both Surveys come under this Department; but with respect to the Geological Survey itself that will come under under Class IV. I think that when we reach that Vote I shall be able to satisfy the hon. Gentleman that we have made great progress with regard to the Geological Survey in Ireland.

MR. PARNELL said, that perhaps the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Vote could give him the information he sought?

MR. WARTON wished to know whether, under the present Vote, the cost of the maps supplied to the Land Court in Ireland was included? He thought that an answer which had been given by the Junior Lord (Mr. H. Gladstone) was rather a misleading one. He had said that the expenses were £183 paid to a Colonel; but if he would run his eye over the Estimates he would find that, in addition to the £183 paid to a Colonel, there was a sum paid as "Extra pay and allowances to non-commissioned officers and sappers," and other sums paid under such heads as "Pay of Civil Assistants, meresmen, and labourers," "Travelling expenses," "Stores," and "Contingencies." All that showed that the Junior Lord was not altogether *au fait* with the question of expense. That only showed that these Estimates, which were defective in so many ways, would be much more intelligibly prepared if at the bottom of the items, which were so badly strung together, it would be possible to give the totals in each case in bold type, as, for instance, "Maps for the Land Court in Ireland." Could they not have these items given separately, without being mixed up with others? If these Estimates, owing to the manner of their preparation, were misleading to hon. Members, how much

more so must they be to people outside the House who were honestly stumbling after the truth?

MR. E. STANHOPE asked whether the Junior Lord could tell them if the Survey of all the English counties was begun? He had understood that they were all to be commenced by the end of 1885.

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: They have not all been surveyed.

MR. E. STANHOPE: Have they all been begun?

MR. HIBBERT: The Surveys have been commenced in all the English counties.

MR. E. STANHOPE: Has progress been made in all of them?

MR. HIBBERT: Yes. There are only three counties in which the Surveys have not been commenced, and they are in Wales.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: The hon. Member is not, then, able to tell us what this item of £1,500, in Column 5, of page 42, is for?

MR. HIBBERT: It is for engraving.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: But we are led to understand that there is no engraving going on.

MR. MOLLOY: I understand there has been none for Ireland in connection with the Geological Survey. Is that so?

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: I cannot say.

MR. MOLLOY: Can the right hon. Gentleman the Vice President of the Council tell us?

MR. MUNDELLA: I have nothing to do with the engraving. The Geological Survey itself comes under Class IV.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, it appeared to be a hopeless task to endeavour to elicit information on that point. He would ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, under this Vote, anything was to be taken for the carrying out of Surveys by civil surveyors who were not in the employ of the Ordnance Survey? Some years ago—the year before last, he thought—plans were prepared by civil surveyors who were paid out of this Vote. The work of those private surveyors ought to be most valuable; and he would ask whether the experiment of the employment of those gentlemen had been successful? Had they performed their task satisfactorily, and was the experiment to be repeated? If the work had been satisfactorily performed, would it not be desirable to do away with the whole of this Vote, and to have the work done by civil contract?

MR. HIBBERT said, the experiment was so far satisfactory that it was being continued.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hibbert) if he could explain why it was that, when the charge was first made, there was a separate sub-head furnished, and called "the Appropriation Account;" why it was, if the same system was now being pursued, there was no mention of it in this Vote? If the hon. Gentleman looked at page 45 of the Appropriation Account, he would find that Item I. was a separate item provided on account of this new Service. If the system was to be continued, why was there not a separate item?

MR. HIBBERT said, that if the hon. Member (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) turned to page 42, he would notice that a considerable sum was set down for Civil assistants.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, the charge to which the Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hibbert) referred was for Civil assistants for the officers. The item he (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) meant had reference to Civil surveyors, not assistants; men who were Civil engineers or land surveyors. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hibbert) had said that the plan had been found satisfactory, and would be continued this year. Under such circumstances, why was not Sub-head I. continued?

MR. RYLANDS said, he was very glad indeed the question of surveying had been mentioned, because he would like to know whether the cost of surveying by Civil surveyors compared favourably or unfavourably with the charge under this Vote? He presumed there would be some means of forming a comparison between the two classes of work. He had always been under the impression that the charge for surveying was very excessive, very good salaries were paid to the military officers engaged in surveying, and those gentlemen received in addition the Army pay which attached to their respective ranks. He supposed that was also the case with the non-commissioned officers and men. He could understand the position taken up

by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Queen's County (Mr. Arthur O'Connor), though, as they had gone so far, he could see the wisdom of adhering to the present arrangements. He was disposed to think, however, that, by the engagement of ordinary surveyors, an economy might have been effected. Perhaps his hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hibbert) could give the Committee some information on the point.

MR. HIBBERT said, he did not understand all the different details of the Vote, inasmuch as the Vote was one which came within the province of the Office of Works. He was not able to give the Committee the information for which his hon. Friend (Mr. Rylands) asked; but he would be pleased to make inquiries.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that some years ago, in consequence of the great increase in the work of surveying, a large increase was made to the staff of surveyors. There was no doubt that the head of the Surveying Department preferred military men to civilians. He did so because they were more under control.

MR. SEXTON said, the hon. Gentleman the Member for Leeds (Mr. Herbert Gladstone) had promised to make inquiries into the part of this Estimate which related to the Irish Survey. Perhaps it was hardly necessary that the hon. Gentleman, who had a good deal of work to do, should do so. If he would look at page 41, he would see there were 31 officers engaged in this Service, and that only two of them, a colonel and a captain, were concerned in the Survey of Ireland. There were, in all, a director, a colonel, three lieutenant-colonels, three majors, 19 captains, three lieutenants, and one quartermaster, and only the colonel and a captain were engaged in Ireland. Under Sub-head D a total of £4,480 was charged for travelling expenses; but of this sum only £210 was spent in Ireland. Furthermore, the activity of the Department in Ireland might be judged by the fact that the expenditure for instruments and repairs in Ireland was only £5, while the total charge under this head was £1,984. Finally, the charge for fuel, light, water, &c., was £1,380; but the expenditure in Ireland was represented by a blank. It was perfectly apparent from the Estimate that the Services in Ireland were merely nominal.

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, that the figures on page 41 were for the United Kingdom.

MR. SEXTON asked the hon. Gentleman to refer to the Estimate. He would find that the salaries of the 31 officers engaged in the Cadastral Survey amounted in the aggregate to £8,530. The pay of the colonel and captain engaged in Ireland amounted to £429.

MR. ACKERS said, that, with reference to what had been stated with regard to the employment of civilians in the work of surveying, he would like to point out that in the part of Gloucestershire in which he lived the work had, in the first instance, been carried out by sappers, and not by civilians. The result was that the surveys had been very improperly made; indeed, in some places they would not fit together, and, therefore, were quite useless. There was no proper supervision; parts of parishes had been surveyed, and other parts had not.

Vote *agreed to.*

(9.) £14,363, to complete the sum for Science and Art Department Buildings.

(10.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £7,446, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for the Maintenance and Repair of the British Museum and Natural History Museum Buildings, for Rents of Premises, supply of Water, Fuel, &c. and other Charges attendant thereon."

MR. E. STANHOPE asked the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hibbert) what provision was being made in respect of the allocation of rooms in the British Museum for the Department of Prints and Drawings? Anyone who knew the Museum would admit that this Department, as compared with all the other Departments, had been treated with very scant courtesy; it had hardly had fair attention to its important demands; and he would like to know whether steps were being taken to give it a fairer and a legitimate amount of space?

MR. HIBBERT said, he understood that in the new buildings provision was made for prints and drawings. A Com-

mittee had been sitting lately to inquire into the best mode of distributing the objects which had not been properly provided for, and the distribution of prints and drawings had engaged their attention.

Mr. E. STANHOPE said, he understood that most of the new space had been given to the Department of Antiquities. He did not object to that; but, at the same time, he thought the claims of prints and drawings had hitherto been neglected, and it would be well if more attention were given to them. There would be an opportunity subsequently for raising the question; perhaps the hon. Gentleman would make inquiries in the meantime, and then say what provision was being made.

Mr. HIBBERT said, he would make the inquiries desired.

Mr. MOLLOY asked if any arrangement had been made with the Trustees of the British Museum as to the opening of the Museum at night? For the last two years the matter had been discussed, and it had been said that an expenditure of £14,600 would be required to fit up the Exhibition with the electric light. It was promised last year that arrangements would, in the course of the then ensuing 12 months, be made with the Trustees to enable them to open the Museum to the public at night. He would like to know if any arrangement had been made with the Trustees; and, if so, what arrangement? If no arrangement had been made, he would like to know why the promise made last year had not been kept?

Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, he was afraid he could not answer the hon. Gentleman's question; but he would make inquiries.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS said, there was one question which he had asked for many years past, and which he was anxious to repeat now. If the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Herbert Gladstone) preferred to answer the question on Report, he (Sir R. Assheton Cross) would defer it until that stage. The point on which he was extremely anxious was the prevention of fire, and how far the invaluable collection at the British Museum was safe from fire. His attention was called to the matter, in the first instance, by a visit he had to pay to the Register House in Edinburgh. He found there probably the most dangerous state of things as to fire it was possible to find. Happily, things were now altered. But from accounts he had heard from sources which were most likely sources of authority, he was not at all satisfied with the measures which were taken for the effectual protection of the British Museum from fire; he understood that if fire were to break out, there would not be sufficient means of coping with it. The effects of a fire in that building would be so disastrous that he was sure the Government would not feel he was pressing the matter too hard in asking his question again. It would be most re-assuring to the public to know that every precaution had been taken against fire at the British Museum.

Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, he was not able to answer fully the question of the right hon. Gentleman. Captain Shaw, however, had charge of the British Museum and the Natural History Museum, and for this received an allowance of £100 a-year. Therefore it was to be presumed that the apparatus was sufficient to cope with any fire that might occur.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he was aware that the British Museum had been placed under the able supervision of Captain Shaw; but then Captain Shaw had a good many other places to superintend besides the British Museum. Moreover, Captain Shaw was really a servant of the Metropolitan Board of Works, and he had only a very limited staff; as a matter of fact, the staff was regulated by the Act of Parliament, which only allowed a certain rate to be levied for Fire Brigade purposes. He was sure that if Captain Shaw were asked what staff he would like to have, he would say a very much larger one than he had at present. It was quite true that Captain Shaw was able to call upon the Metropolitan Police in certain cases; but, notwithstanding that, he (Sir R. Assheton Cross) was not at all certain that power enough was placed in Captain Shaw's hands, so as to be able to cope with such an emergency he had pointed to. He trusted inquiries would be made, with a view of making every provision against an outbreak of fire at the Museum.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the subject had not been neglected. He could assure the right hon. Gentleman that there was a complete staff looking

after the building in the direction he desired—watching against fire. That staff was under the immediate superintendence of Captain Shaw, and all the apparatus was ready in the building that was required for the purpose. If the right hon. Gentleman wished for any further information it should be provided.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS said, the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) only confirmed his (Sir R. Assheton Cross's) impression. The point he wished to press upon the Committee was that Captain Shaw had only a very limited staff for all the fires of the Metropolis; he was a servant of the Metropolitan Board of Works; and that Board were tied by Statute only to levy a certain amount of rate for Fire Brigade purposes. It might happen that the whole of Captain Shaw's staff was engaged at a distant part of London when a fire broke out at the Museum. In such a case, was the staff at the Museum sufficient to cope with the outbreak? He thought the Government ought to take the matter into their serious consideration, because the Collection at the British Museum was simply invaluable. He was sure the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir William Harcourt) would agree with him that the staff of Captain Shaw should be greatly increased.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that, with reference to the provision against fire generally in the Metropolis, there was a feeling that it would be extremely desirable that the Fire Brigade should be strengthened. He was under the impression that the Metropolitan Board of Works had already made application to Parliament for that purpose. Certainly, any influence he had would be used in the direction of encouraging and supporting the Metropolitan Board of Works to increase the staff for the use of the Metropolis generally, and for the protection of such National Collections as those to which reference had been made.

MR. MOLLOY said, that perhaps the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) could say what had been done with regard to the opening of the British Museum at night.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the matter rested with the Trustees of the British Museum, and not with the Government. Last year he said the matter would be referred to the Trustees; but he made no promise on the part of the Government.

MR. MOLLOY asked if the question had been referred to the Trustees? As a matter of fact, the Trustees had, on two different occasions, recommended the opening of the Museum at night; but the Government had refused the £14,600 necessary to fit up the building with the electric light. The question he had now to ask the right hon. Gentleman was, Will the Government now give this £14,600, or will they refuse it? It was a very simple question, which had nothing to do with the Trustees.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, the Natural History Museum at South Kensington formed a very valuable Collection, and it was well that that should be open to inspection by the working classes at night.

MR. WARTON said, he would very much like to know whether the Members of the Treasury Bench knew anything at all about this matter? He found that, both as regarded the British Museum and the Natural History Museum at South Kensington, there was a considerable increase in the charge for gas—in the one case an increase of 30 per cent, and in the other case of 50 per cent. What was the reason of this increase? One of the Trustees was a Member of the House. Surely he could give the reason.

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, that, in the case of the British Museum, the increase was occasioned by the new buildings; while in the case of the Natural History Museum it was found that the Estimate for 1884-5 was insufficient.

MR. WARTON said, he was not satisfied. The charge for gas had increased at the British Museum, and they were led to suppose that the increase was produced by the lighting of the new buildings. But at South Kensington there had been no new buildings. How, therefore, was the increase in respect of that establishment to be accounted for? Besides, why should they spend more for gas and not for coals, coke, and firewood? He really thought that Ministers should send for the Trustees.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he hoped the Committee would receive some indication of the views of the Government with regard to the opening of the Natural History Museum at South Kensington at night. During the daytime the Museum was visited by a great many nursemaids and children, but not by the working classes. The working classes, in fact, had no time except at night to inspect the Collections. If, therefore, the Museum could be lighted at night without danger, and at a moderate expense, it would, he was sure, prove a very popular and useful resort.

MR. TOMLINSON said, that under Subhead "E," there was an item for "Forming Entrances to the Museum Gardens from Cromwell Road and for minor Works." He would like to know what that meant? Did it mean there was a connection with the Museum Gardens from the underground passage from South Kensington to the Exhibition grounds?

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: It has nothing to do with that.

MR. TOMLINSON: What has it to do with?

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE: The formation of entrances to the Gardens from Cromwell Road, and the fixing of ornamental railings on the copings of the parapet walls.

MR. TOMLINSON: There is nothing about railings here. The item is for "Forming Entrances to the Museum Gardens from Cromwell Road and for minor Works."

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, he would take care to bring the question of the lighting of the British Museum at night to the notice of the First Commissioner of Works (Lord Rosebery), and to inform him of the views entertained by hon. Gentlemen.

MR. MOLLOY said, the question had been brought to the notice of the First Commissioner for two years past. The assurances of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Herbert Gladstone) were not sufficient; and the Committee ought to mark their dissatisfaction at the refusal of the Government to afford the working classes facilities of inspecting the Collections at the Museum. He was astonished that the Government could not see their way to a paltry expenditure of £14,000, in order to allow the working classes to visit the Museum at night, particularly when they could give as much as £70,000 for a single work of Art for the National Gallery, an institution which, also, by the way, was practically kept up for the enjoyment of the upper classes. The working classes could not visit the National Gallery in the daytime; and to cap matters, he understood that the Gallery was closed during the Easter holidays on the plea of making repairs. To mark his sense of the action of the Government with regard to the opening of the British Museum at a time when it could be visited by the bulk of the people, he begged to move the reduction of the Vote by £1,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £6,446, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for the Maintenance and Repair of the British Museum and Natural History Museum Buildings, for Rents of Premises, supply of Water, Fuel, &c., and other Charges attendant thereon."—(*Mr. Molloy.*)

MR. WARTON rose to Order. He wished to know if it was possible for the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Molloy) to move a reduction of the Vote, when he wanted the Vote to be increased?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is quite competent for the hon. Gentleman to do so. Whether that course would further his desire is another question.

MR. GORST said, he protested against the most unsatisfactory mode in which the Estimates were being discussed this evening. These were Estimates which affected the Department of the First Commissioner of Works, and the particular question now before the Committee was one for the First Commissioner of Works and the Treasury. It was complained that the First Commissioner, having promised to induce the Treasury to make provision for lighting the British Museum and the Natural History Museum by electricity, had not fulfilled his pledge. The present head of the Board of Works, a great spending Department, was not a Member of the House, and hon. Members could not approach him, or get at him in any way. The hon. Gentleman the Junior Lord of the Treasury (Mr. Herbert Gladstone) did his best, and they all sympathized with him, because of the most unsatisfactory position in which he

was placed. Not only had they not got the First Commissioner of Works present, but there was no one in the House who really represented the Treasury. The hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hibbert) could not explain why the Treasury refused the money. The only person who could give the Committee any information on the point was the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and he was not present. They were, therefore, discussing questions which affected the administration of the First Commissioner of Works and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, when neither of those official persons were present. He sincerely sympathized with the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Molloy), who had moved a reduction of the Vote; and he thought the hon. Gentleman had a right to ask why the Chancellor of the Exchequer or the First Commissioner of Works had not fulfilled the pledge made to the House.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he understood the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Molloy) to have stated that the First Commissioner of Works made such a promise last year to the House.

MR. MOLLOY said, he had stated that a promise was made.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the complaint made by the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) was that he (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had made a promise which he had failed to keep in regard to this matter.

MR. GORST said, he had stated that that complaint had been made by Members of the Committee.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the hon. and learned Member for Chatham had stated that someone else had complained that he (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had made a promise to the effect mentioned, and that that promise had not been kept. Now, for his part, he (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) distinctly denied that he had ever made any such promise. When the matter was brought before the House by the hon. and learned Gentleman, all that he (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had promised to do was that he would refer the question to the Trustees of the British Museum for their consideration; and in so doing he had expressed no opinion as to what course they ought to pursue. The matter was, in point of fact, one which rested between the Trustees of the British Museum and the Treasury, and was not one with which the First Commissioner of Works had anything to do. All the First Commissioner of Works could undertake in regard to the British Museum was to see to the construction of works in connection with that institution, and to provide for the maintenance of the building. This was his sole duty in the matter. If the Treasury, on the recommendation of the Trustees of the Museum, should decide that it was advisable to light the building with the electric light, they would then call upon the First Commissioner of Works to see that the works necessary for that purpose were performed; but it did not rest with the First Commissioner to decide whether the electric system should be adopted as the mode of lighting the Museum. It had been stated that the Trustees had recommended the adoption of the electric light; but, for his own part, he very much doubted whether the Trustees had ever arrived at the conclusion that it would be a wise thing to light the building in the way suggested. It had also been stated that the cost of lighting the Museum by electricity would be £14,000; but the hon. Gentleman who had made that statement (Mr. Molloy) would see that it was not merely a question of the expenditure of £14,000 in making the provision necessary in the first instance for that mode of lighting, but that it also involved the consideration of a considerable addition to the permanent staff of the establishment. Moreover, the introduction of the electric light would necessitate an increase in the number of hours during which the staff were employed; and when the gigantic extent of the building, and the large number of persons necessarily retained in looking after the different departments, were considered, it would be seen that the proposed change must add very materially to the amount of the permanent charge for the maintenance of that institution. However, the subject was one which was open to careful inquiry; and one of the first things to be ascertained was, whether the Trustees of the British Museum really did desire that the electric light should be adopted. As he had already stated, he had very great doubt on that subject; but after the assertions that had been made, and the discussion that had taken place, he

would promise the Committee that inquiry should be instituted as to whether it really was the wish of the Trustees that the electric light should be introduced.

Mr. MOLLOY said, that last year one of the Trustees of the British Museum who sat in that House stated that the Trustees had made an application to the Treasury for the necessary funds for the introduction of the electric light into the building, so that the institution might be open to the working classes in the evening, and that application had been refused.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he had understood that last year the then First Commissioner of Works had said he would refer the matter to the Trustees of the British Museum; and, that being so, he was surprised that the right hon. Gentleman was not able to inform the Committee what was the opinion of those gentlemen now that the question was repeated in another form. Were the Committee again to be told that the Representative of the Department did not know what that opinion really was?

Mr. MOLLOY said, the Committee had already been told that the Trustees of the Museum had made an application to the Treasury last year, and that that application was refused.

Mr. BIGGAR said, it would appear, from what had been stated in the course of the discussion, that the Postmaster General did not know what the real object of the British Museum was. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that that institution ought not to be opened in the evening, which was the only time when it could be made available for the working classes, because the introduction of the electric light and the extra hours during which the building would be open would entail an increase of the permanent staff of *employés*, and would add to the expenses of maintaining the Museum. If that argument were to be accepted, the best thing that could be done would, in his (Mr. Biggar's) opinion, be to pay off the staff, and close the building, as, under existing circumstances, it was practically useless; because during the day time it was only taken advantage of by nursery maids and young children, and he did not think it necessary to vote a large sum of money every year for a purpose that would be sufficiently fulfilled by any park or garden. In point of fact, if the Government were to hire a few Guardsmen to walk about the grounds with the nursery maids, they would find that such a procedure would be much more successful—at any rate from the nursery maids' point of view—than the maintenance of a large and costly National Museum. At the same time, while it was thought desirable to keep up the British Museum, he thought the building ought to be properly lighted, and at such times as the people generally could go and see it. Moreover, for the sake of students who desired to study the objects contained in the Museum, it was very desirable that the building should be lighted during the evening, and that the works of Art should not be rendered unavailable at such hours only as were at the disposal of a very large number of individuals. He thought that, upon the whole, the most practical way of dealing with the question was that which had been proposed by his hon. Friend (Mr. Molloy), who had moved a reduction of the Vote. By adopting such a course a greater amount of pressure would be brought to bear on the Treasury, with a view of compelling them to do that which was reasonable. He did not think that sufficient pressure had been brought to bear on that Department hitherto. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who was now present, had not been in the House when the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hibbert) had replied on behalf of that Department; and the Committee would probably be glad to hear from the right hon. Gentleman what the Treasury had said to the Trustees of the British Museum, or what they were now prepared to say in regard to the question that had been raised. The Secretary to the Treasury was the official mouthpiece of the Department, and ought to have been able to have given such a reply to the statements made on the subject as would have amounted to a satisfactory explanation, so that the Committee need not have been driven about from one official to another in the vain attempt to elicit definite information.

Mr. E. STANHOPE said, he thought the Committee entitled to ask Her Ma-

jesty's Government to answer one question, and it was this. He considered that the Trustees of the British Museum were fully justified in exercising every possible precaution which might be deemed necessary to insure the safety of the building under their guardianship before they insisted very strongly on the introduction of the electric light. The security of the Museum was, of course, the first consideration; and he should like to be informed whether, in the opinion of the Trustees, it was deemed desirable that the building should be opened during certain hours in the evening? He did not wish it to be thought, for a moment, that he was disposed to find the least fault with the Trustees for any hesitation they might feel in taking such a step; but the Committee had been told that the Trustees of the Museum, a year or more ago, had represented to the Treasury that the time had come when, in their opinion, the building ought to be lighted with the electric light. If that were so, he desired to know what was the answer the Treasury had made to that representation? It had been stated that the Treasury had refused to comply with the application of the Trustees; and if this were the case, he thought the Committee were entitled to know on what ground the refusal had been based; because, if the Trustees of the British Museum had applied for the additional expenditure that would be necessary to carry out such an object, he felt sure they had not done so without due regard to all the circumstances of the case, and that a representation, so made by that Body, was entitled to the fullest consideration on the part of the Treasury.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, with reference to the question put by the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. E. Stanhope), that, as far as he was personally concerned, he had no knowledge on the subject. The question was one that, in reality, belonged to the Secretary to the Treasury; but he would undertake to look into the matter.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS said, as the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer was now in his place he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would allow him to put a question on a subject to which he had already made allusion in the right hon. Gentleman's absence. He referred to the important subject of insuring that proper provision was made to guard against the possible outbreak of fire. What he had stated before the right hon. Gentleman had entered the House was that the Metropolitan Board of Works had only a certain sum at their disposal for fire brigade purposes, and only a certain staff that could be employed; and he felt bound to put it to Her Majesty's Government whether, having regard to the great importance of providing for the safety of such buildings as the National Gallery and British Museum, it would not be a wise and prudent course to offer something in the shape of Government aid as a provision for duly guarding those valuable institutions. It might be said that there was already a certain staff, watching over London, and charged with the protection of our public institutions; but this was a fact of which he was well aware, and it was not the point he desired to raise. What he wanted to call attention to was the fact that Captain Shaw had only a very limited number of men under his control in the Metropolitan Fire Brigade; and if they were called away at any time to fires in different parts of the Metropolis, he would have no means on which he could fall back in case of the sudden emergency of a fire breaking out at one of these great public institutions. He did not wish to ask for any definite assurance on the part of the Government at the present moment; but rather to call the attention of the Prime Minister to this point—that the Government should be prepared, if necessary, to make such provision for the protection of the great public institutions in case of fire as would constitute an efficient supplement to the means possessed by the Metropolitan Board.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, the question raised by the right hon. Gentleman was one that had been the subject of a good deal of discussion and consideration in that House, and the necessity of bestowing due attention upon it had already been recognized by Her Majesty's Government. A considerable amount was annually raised for the purposes of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade;

and he was not disposed to say that the burdens on the Metropolis in this respect ought to be largely increased. But the grant by Parliament in aid of this Service was fully as large as the circumstances warranted, especially now that all Government property was rated.

MR. BIGGAR said, he wished to point out that, although the question was one on which the fullest opportunity had been given to the Representatives of Her Majesty's Government to offer the explanations that had been asked for in the course of the debate, those explanations had not, up to the present moment, been given. He still hoped the Government would be able to give such an answer to the question put by the hon. Member for King's County (Mr. Molloy) as might save the Committee the trouble of going to a division. During the debate on this subject, they had had speeches from the Postmaster General, the Secretary to the Treasury, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Secretary of State for the Home Department; and surely, from such a galaxy of talent, the Committee ought to have been enabled to elicit what was the reply which the Treasury had given to the representations of the Trustees of the British Museum. The question was a very simple one; but it was one which seemed to be so difficult to answer that they were unable to obtain the desired information from either of the Gentlemen then occupying the Treasury Bench. He (Mr. Biggar) could not but think that it was in the power of the Government to give some definite information on so simple a matter.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, he did not think the question referred to had been brought before the Treasury in 1884; but, as he had already promised, he would take care that the matter should be carefully looked into.

MR. MOLLOY said, it had been positively stated, on the one hand, that the Trustees of the British Museum had applied to the Treasury last year for the means of utilizing the electric light; and all the Members of the Treasury who had spoken had asserted, on the other, that they had never received any such application. Surely the question was a matter of fact, which was capable of definite explanation.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, the application, so far as he was aware, did not come last year to the Treasury; but he would make further inquiry.

MR. GORST asked, whether the Committee were to understand that it was customary in the Treasury Department for a subordinate official to refuse any application such as that said to have been made by the Trustees of the British Museum, without referring the matter to his superior?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) replied, that the matter was one that would be brought before and dealt with by the Secretary to the Treasury, who was by no means a subordinate official, in dealing with Civil Expenditure, and it was not customary for him to refer to the Chancellor of the Exchequer on all questions of that kind. He had, however, undertaken, now that the subject had been brought under his attention, to look into it.

MR. MOLLOY said, he should not ask the Committee to go to the trouble of a division, as it was now clearly understood that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer would himself examine into the matter; but he would repeat that promises were also made upon the subject last year, and the year before that—that, in point of fact, promises had been made for three years running, but, up to the present moment, without any result. The Committee had now had a distinct promise from the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he would personally inquire into the subject; and he would then see whether the grant of £14,000, involved in the application of the Trustees of the British Museum, could be complied with.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(11.) £13,002, to complete the sum for Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, this was an item to which he felt bound to object, and on which, unless he received a satisfactory assurance from the

Government, he should take the sense of the Committee. He was of opinion that, if it were possible to devise a piece of legislative absurdity that should be more ridiculous than another, it would be found in the state of things evidenced by this Vote. The Harbour Commissioners of Harwich owed the Government a large sum of money. The Commissioners were not able to pay the money out of their Harbour Dues; and in order to enable them to pay the amount they were indebted into the Treasury, the Government induced that House, year after year, to vote a sum amounting to a good many hundreds of pounds, which they inserted in the Estimates. This year the sum was £738, which showed an increase of £350 on the Vote of last year. The year before that there was a Vote of £430, but the expenditure was £1,170, so that £740 more than was estimated for was expended, and that additional expenditure of £740 was sanctioned by the Treasury letter of the 2nd of January, 1884. Upon this the Controller and Auditor General reported that the excess of the expenditure over the sum granted was £740, this being the sum sanctioned by the Treasury letter dated the 2nd January, 1884; but it appeared, from the accounts of the Harbour Commissioners, that £764 13*s.* 4*d.* not provided by the actual income of the Harbour for the year was expended in excess of the sum voted, and the difference between that sum and the £740, which was not provided either by income, or by Vote, or by Treasury sanction, and must be met out of the next year's funds, and which had been actually expended in the year 1883-4, should have been included in the account. The Committee here had before them an account which was, as far as possible, arranged for the benefit of the Commissioners of Harwich Harbour, at the expense of the public at large. But the Commissioners did not seem to be able to cook or prepare their accounts with anything like accuracy, or even common sense, because, although able to obtain a Vote from that House, they made it appear that they expended money which they did not possess. It was set forth, on page 49 of the Estimates, that the repayment of principal and interest of the loan advanced by the Public Works Commissioners was £413, that the charge for maintenance was £600, and for works £950, making a total of £1,963, while the estimated receipts from dues and ballast were put down at £1,225, so that there was a deficiency of income to the amount of £738. Now, because the Harwich Harbour Commissioners owed the Government a certain amount, that House was asked to vote a deficiency of £738. Would it not, he asked, be much better, both for the Commissioners of Harwich Harbour and for the public account, that the sum of, he did not know how many thousands of pounds, which was now due from the Commissioners to the Government, should be wiped off? Year after year they had Bills introduced into that House in which liabilities due to the Treasury were thus wiped off. Why, then, should not steps be taken to wipe off this Harwich Harbour claim? The result would be a nominal loss, but a real gain, because, as it was, the money was only taken out of the public accounts and given to the Commissioners, to be handed back again by them in the nominal discharge of their debt. He considered that such a mode of procedure constituted one of the most ridiculous blots possible on the financial system of the country, and why the Government insisted on its perpetuation he was totally at a loss to understand. He would propose the reduction of the Vote by £738, unless he obtained some satisfactory reply from the Government.

Mr. Arthur O'Connor

Mr. J. HOLMS said, the Vote was one that was recommended by the Commissioners on the subject of Harbours of Refuge in 1844; and, as had been pointed out by the hon. Member (Mr. Arthur O'Connor), this year the amount of the deficiency to be made up in the case of the Harwich Commissioners was £738, which was a little more than was the case last year. If his hon. Friend would allow the Vote to pass without moving the Amendment he had in contemplation, he (Mr Holms) would make inquiry, and see whether he could not arrange to meet the view expressed by the hon. Gentleman as to wiping off the whole sum.

Vote *agreed to.*

(12.) £135,985, to complete the sum for Rates on Government Property.

(13.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £7,500, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for the Contribution towards the Funds for the Establishmennt and Maintenance of a Fire Brigade in the Metropolis."

MR. CAUSTON said, that reference had been made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross), in a discussion that had taken place on a previous Vote, to the necessity that existed for making adequate provision for a Fire Brigade in connection with the British Museum and National Gallery; and he should now like to ask Her Majesty's Government whether they were prepared to take any steps to insure that the Metropolitan Fire Brigade should be rendered really efficient in regard to all the purposes for which it might be required? Speaking on behalf of those who had places of business in the City of London and in the Metropolis generally, he was bound to say that the Metropolitan Fire Brigade at the present time was considered to be in anything but an efficient state. It was a significant fact that insurance rates had recently been very considerably increased in the Metropolis, the Insurance Companies stating that the ground on which this increase was deemed to be necessary was the inefficient state of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade. Not that he believed there was any cause for complaint as to the efficiency of the admittedly very gallant men composing the Brigade, who always did their work well; but he knew that there was an impression very generally prevalent in the Metropolis that the appliances at the disposal of the Fire Brigade were inadequate to the duties they were called upon to perform. Therefore, he hoped that Her Majesty's Government, in bringing forward the Estimate as the public contribution towards the Metropolitan Fire Brigade, would take care to see that the work towards which that sum was to be devoted was done in a thoroughly efficient manner; otherwise it might one day be found that in consequence of a want of efficiency in the arrangements made for this important department of the Public Service some terrible conflagration, of an unusually extensive character, would take place. It should be remembered that in consequence of the enormously increased value of land in the Metropolis the buildings erected at the present day were usually carried up to a much greater height than was the case in past times; and the result was that the appliances at the disposal of the Fire Brigade, which used to be sufficient, were now now found to be unequal to the work required.

MR. H. H. FOWLER said, the control of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade was vested in the Metropolitan Board of Works, and Her Majesty's Government had no control over it whatever. The annual contribution of £10,000 was made in accordance with the Act of Parliament.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he did not desire to extend the debate on this Vote; but as the question of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade had been raised he felt bound to bear his testimony to the efficiency of the chief officer of that fine body of men. He did not believe there was a more efficient officer in any service in the United Kingdom than Captain Shaw. He was very glad that he had had the opportunity afforded by this Vote of saying so much in testimony of the merits of that officer; but, at the same time, he must express his concurrence in the statement of the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Causton) that Captain Shaw had not an adequate force at his disposal. There were great public institutions which it was absolutely necessary to preserve; and, therefore, if, in the opinion of Parliament, the powers at present possessed by the Metropolitan Board of Works were not sufficient, or so large as they ought to be, then they ought to have further powers given to them to enable them to carry out their work.

MR. GORST said, the statement made by the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) was not quite accurate. The Government were not bound by law to pay £10,000 a-year, but such sum as Parliament might grant, and the amount of the sum was entirely within the discretion of Parliament, which might grant or withhold it at its pleasure. It followed, therefore, that Her Majesty's Government were clearly entitled to obtain from the Metropolitan Board of Works such information as might be necessary, in order to induce Parliament to grant the sum required,

and he could not accept the doctrine of the hon. Gentleman that the Government had no power in the matter. They had the great power of saying—"If you do not give us such and such information we will not vote the money." Parliament had the most absolute discretion in voting the sum.

MR. MOLLOY said, he wished to know whether it was not the fact that the Metropolitan Board of Works alleged that the sum voted by Parliament was not enough to enable them to make the Fire Brigade thoroughly sufficient for the purpose for which it was required, and that they had already asked for double the sum now granted?

MR. H. H. FOWLER said, a larger sum than £10,000 could not be voted without fresh legislation. If any change was to be made, fresh legislation, as had been pointed out by the right hon. Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross), must be asked for. As the law stood at present, the maximum sum allowed was £10,000. As to the power of the Government to control the Board of Works, or to interfere in its internal management in reference to the Metropolitan Fire Brigade, he could only repeat what he had said before—that it seemed to him that Parliament had vested the control of the Fire Brigade in the Metropolitan Board of Works, and that as the power had been given to them it ought to remain with them.

MR. E. STANHOPE said, that, as he understood it, what the Government did was to ask the House of Commons to vote a sum not exceeding £10,000 to be expended on the responsibility of the Metropolitan Board of Works. But did the Government ask the Metropolitan Board, or Captain Shaw, for any Report as to the special precautions taken for the protection of Government property? Was the £10,000 really expended for the purpose of looking after Government property? Did Captain Shaw ever give any Report to the Government as to the special precautions taken on account of, or in return for, the grant?

MR. H. H. FOWLER said, he could only re-echo the sentiments already expressed by the right hon. Member for South-West Lancashire, and declare that the Government had entire confidence in Captain Shaw, and in his efficient management of the Fire Brigade. He did not think there was a Fire Brigade in the world which was better conducted.

MR. MOLLOY said, the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. H. H. Fowler) had not answered his question. It was said that a Report had been made by Captain Shaw to the Metropolitan Board of Works, setting forth that the sum allowed by Parliament was not sufficient for the purpose of affording ample protection to the property of the Metropolis. Was that so, or not?

MR. H. H. FOWLER: I am not aware of any such Report.

MR. RYLANDS said, this opened up a very much wider question. The hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Molloy) talked of protecting the property of the Metropolis; but Parliament was not called upon to vote money to protect the Metropolis from fire—it only gave this sum for the purpose of protecting Government property. What the House of Commons had a right to ask was this—was the Metropolitan Fire Brigade so conducted, and altogether so efficient, as to justify Parliament in being satisfied that the money was judiciously expended? He could not suppose for a moment that £10,000 was too small a sum for the purpose to which it was to be applied—he thought it was a very substantial contribution on the part of Parliament to the Metropolitan Fire Brigade. If there was any reasonable ground of complaint, that would be another affair. If the Committee had reason to believe that the Brigade was inefficiently managed, they would expect that unless an improvement was made the Vote would be refused; but he did not anticipate that there was any such charge in the present case. He thought they might well assume the efficiency of the Brigade, though what he would like to see—and no doubt many hon. Members would agree with him—would be that the Brigade should be under the control of the Municipality, and therefore under the control of the ratepayers. But that was altogether a different matter to asking Parliament to give such a sum as would be necessary to make the Fire Brigade efficient for the Metropolis generally.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS said, that no accusation was made, so far as he understood, against the administration of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade. He

believed the Brigade was as perfect as it could be; but the Metropolitan Board of Works, in dealing with it, was limited by statute; and the real question was, whether the Brigade had a sufficient number of men; and whether the money spent was expended economically? However, both the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Secretary of State had promised to look into the matter, to see whether it was necessary to enlarge the powers of the Metropolitan Board of Works.

Mr. R. BIDDULPH MARTIN said, the question was whether the property at stake was sufficiently covered by what might be taken to be a premium? It could scarcely be supposed that the Government property could be insured for the sum paid.

Mr. CAUSTON said he had never, for one moment, wished to convey the idea that Captain Shaw and the firemen were not efficient. All he had said was that the Brigade had not sufficient appliances at their disposal to enable them to discharge their duties properly, and that was a most serious matter.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he understood the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department to say that, in regard to legislation or re-arrangement, this was part of the general question of Local Government for the Metropolis, and that they must wait until that general question was settled before any change could be made. Now, that was always the answer to any criticisms upon these matters. On the other hand, when it was proposed to introduce a Bill for the Local Government of the Metropolis, it was always said—"Oh, that cannot be done now; there are too many other subjects before us." The grievances of Londoners, therefore, were constantly relegated to the Ides of March. But things could not always remain in this position, and the inhabitants of the Metropolis would have to find some remedy for themselves within a measurable distance of time.

Mr. R. N. FOWLER said, he must take exception to the statement that the Metropolitan Board of Works did not represent the Metropolis. That was a matter of opinion. He did not agree with the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands), for he thought the Metropolitan Board of Works probably—and certainly on a question of this kind—represented the Metropolis as well as any other constitution could represent it. He had been very glad to hear the high testimony borne to Captain Shaw by those who had practical knowledge of the subject.

Mr. WARTON said, he had been exceedingly glad to hear the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. H. H. Fowler) say not a generous, but a just word on behalf of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade. He had also been very glad indeed that the right hon. Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross) had said the same thing, and that the hon. Member for Colchester (Mr. Causton) had explained away what he had said. He (Mr. Warton) knew something of the Fire Brigade, and he did not fear to say that they had always discharged their duty nobly and well. He would defy any Member of the Government, or any cheeseparing economist, to find the least fault with the officers of the Fire Brigade. Not only had they always discharged their duties well, but it was within the knowledge of the Government that they had themselves taken every additional precaution that they possibly could take to guard against accidents under such circumstances as might arise. A more gallant body of men did not exist. It had pained him to the heart to hear the observations made, in a spirit of grudging economy, over the expenditure of this paltry sum of £10,000—a sum the amount of which was fixed 20 years ago, when the value of property was not what it was now. However, he had the consolation of reflecting that the observations he complained of had been made by persons who knew nothing at all about the matter.

Mr. BIGGAR said, he thought they need not discuss the Vote at any great length, because the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department had told them that though they had to vote the money there was no Department of the Government which had any right to interfere with its expenditure, or to make any inquiry into it; it was simply so much of a sop to the ratepayers of the Metropolis. He did not think the reason given by the hon. Member for Colchester (Mr. Causton) why the rate of premium should be increased in this country was the real one. The real

reason was, not because the fire offices were unfortunate, but because persons made fraudulent claims, and got more payment than they were entitled to. The result was that fire insurance was unprofitable, and the Insurance Companies were bound to raise the general rates in order to recoup themselves for the loss on that part of their business. But the present Vote in favour of the Metropolis involved a real injustice to other parts of the Kingdom, for London obtained £10,000 a-year towards fire insurance, aad no other part of the country had any similar grant. There was a good deal of Government property elsewhere than in London, and there was not the least argument in favour of giving grants to London which was not equally strong for giving grants to other places. He thought the only proper way of settling this question was to strike off this grant altogether, and then, if it should be considered desirable at some future time to give grants by way of fire insurance towards the Fire Brigades of different parts of the country in proportion to the amount of Government property in each particular locality, it would be legitimate to do so. But the money should not be given unless some Government Department had power to interfere with and criticize the conduct of the body to whom the money was given. In the present case no interference was allowed by the Metropolitan Board of Works over their fire department; and for that reason, as well as for the reason that the Vote was only intended for a limited part of the Kingdom, he should divide the Committee against the Vote, even though all the London Members might vote against him.

MR. CALLAN said, there were Government Offices in Dublin. There were the Custom House, the Castle, and other places, and probably the Castle required the aid not only of the Fire Brigade, but of the waterworks. He did not know whether any contribution was made by the State to the fund for the Fire Brigade in Dublin. He took it for granted that this Vote of £10,000 was given mainly for the protection of Government Offices; and as there were a large number of such Offices in Dublin he wished to know whether any contribution was made to the Corporation Fire Brigade Fund for that City? If no contribution was made to Dublin as well as to London, he should be against the Vote; but if the two cities were treated in a similar manner he should vote for it.

MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE said, the present grant was made not so much in return for security from fire as in compensation to the Metropolitan Board of Works for the loss occasioned by so large a part of the area of the Metropolis being occupied by Public Offices, instead of by ratepaying houses.

MR. GORST said, he wished to know how the Dublin Fire Brigade was maintained? He was informed that it was maintained out of the general Corporation rates of the City; and, if so, he wished to know whether, under the last Vote agreed to by the Committee—the Vote for a contribution for rates on Government property in Great Britain and Ireland—any sum of money was given to the Dublin Corporation in respect of the Government property in Dublin?

MR. HIBBERT said, there was a contribution made to the rates of Dublin on account of Government property, and in the case of the Metropolis this charge in respect of the Fire Brigade was made in place of rates which would otherwise be paid if the contribution were made in the same way in the two cases.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he would point out that the previous Vote showed that in England the Government paid rates to a very large amount on various descriptions of property, including Customs, Post Office, criminal lunatic asylums, prisons, public buildings, Law Courts, Parks, and War Office property. Did not the War Department, for instance, pay rates to the Metropolitan Board of Works?

MR. HIBBERT: No—not for this particular purpose.

MR. GRAY thought the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hibbert) was rather misleading the Committee when he conveyed the impression that in Dublin and other places contributions were given in lieu of rates for this particular purpose. He (Mr. Gray) was strongly of opinion that the contribution was given in Dublin before the Fire Brigade was initiated; but, in any case, it did not amount to anything approaching the sum that would have to be paid if the Government property were rated. It was, therefore, not right to say that the contribution in lieu of rates was given for

Fire Brigade purposes in every place except London. In London the Fire Brigade was maintained partly by rates, partly by an enforced contribution from the insurance offices, and partly by this Parliamentary Grant; and it was, therefore, a completely exceptional case, and it would be better to justify it on exceptional grounds rather than endeavour to show that it stood on all fours with other cases.

MR. HIBBERT said, that in Dublin the Fire Brigade was kept up out of either the borough or the City rates, and was part of the ordinary expenditure of the City. The Government properly made a contribution in place of rates, and therefore the Government did pay in Dublin—in the form of that contribution—a sum towardsthe Fire Brigade which it did not pay in the Metropolis except in the form of this particnlar Vote.

MR. PARNELL said, he wished to know whether the Government property within the area guarded by the Fire Brigade of the Metropolitan Board of Works did not pay some contribution to the rates; and, consequently, whether the Government property within that area was not in the same position as Government property in Dublin, on account of which no contribution was made from the Imperial Exchequer towards the Fire Brigade? The hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hibbert) did not do well in conveying, however unintentionally, an erroneous impression to the Committee. The question of contributions in aid of local rates was a very important question, which would have to be gone into very fully. It would have been better if the hon. Gentleman had based his position on the exceptional circumstances of the government of the City of London, and of those portions of the Metropolis which were guarded by the Metropolitan Fire Brigade, instead of trying to produce an erroneous impression upon the Committee.

MR. BIGGAR said, he had no very high opinion of the suggestion which had been made—that the powers of the Metropolitan Board of Works should be reinforced by fresh legislation. He doubted very much whether any legislation on the subject would make matters any better than they were at present. His own impression was that it would only make them worse. The most desirable thing was to make the Metropolitan Board as efficient as possible for its duties, instead of bringing in some narrow Bill which would take a great deal of time to pass, and which would probably do a great deal more harm than good when it was passed.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 65; Noes 11: Majority 54.—(Div. List, No. 90.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIAN ATTACK ON THE AFGHANS AT PENJDEH.

QUESTION.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS: Perhaps it might be convenient to the House, and I am sure the country would like to know, whether the Government have any further explanation to offer, or any further statement to make, in addition to that which we heard in the early part of the evening, as to the Russian advance in Afghanistan; whether they have received any further news from St. Petersburg or from Sir Peter Lumsden?

MR. GLADSTONE: I had intended, either on the Motion to report Progress, or on the actual Report of the Resolutions with the Speaker in the Chair, to make a further communication to the House. Since I spoke at the commencement of the evening a telegram has been received from Sir Peter Lumsden, which conveys what I may call a qualification of one of the statements which he had made. The statement I made on the authority of Sir Peter Lumsden was—and it will be remembered by the House that I repeated it twice—that the Afghans had not made any advance either before or after the telegram of the 17th of March. But Sir Peter Lumsden states to us in a later telegram that when the Russians immediately threatened an attack on the Afghan position by advancing in force from Imaken to Ak Tapa, the Afghans threw out vedettes to their front and extended their pickets to Pul-i-Khisti, on the left bank of the Khushk, and gradually strengthened it, until, on the 30th the bulk of their force had been transferred across the river.

That is the qualification which he conveys. He goes on to say that, in his opinion, that does not properly constitute an advance, but was the occupation of a more advantageous military position. But I presume he evidently considers that the question might be raised as to what did or did not constitute an advance; and he is desirous that the British Government should be placed in the possession of all the facts. I give the qualification to the House precisely as Sir Peter Lumsden has given it.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

EGYPTIAN LOAN BILL.—[BILL 122.]

(*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Hibbert.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, that after the conversation early in the evening, from which it was understood that the more serious debate should take place on the Motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair, he begged to move the second reading of the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS said, that after the conversation that took place at the commencement of the Sitting it was not his intention to take up the time of the House by making any lengthened remarks upon this matter. But he could not help protesting in the strongest way against taking the second reading of such an important measure as this on this particular day; because, by the ordinary practice and custom of the House, the day on which the House reassembled after the Easter Recess was always supposed to be one on which no Business of any great importance was brought forward. It was all very well to say that it was necessary to proceed with the Bill as fast as possible; but surely the House of Commons had a right to express its opinion upon the matter. Judging from the character of the division which took place the other night it was quite clear there was a large proportion of the people of the country who held very strong views upon the subject. No one could have spoken more strongly than the Prime Minister himself did, just 30 years ago, as to the danger of an agreement of this kind in giving opportunities to the Powers who joined in a guarantee of interfering politically in the country in respect of which the guarantee was ourselves. [Mr. GLADSTONE dissented.] The Prime Minister shook his head; but, probably, before next Thursday, he would have an opportunity of reading again the speech he made in 1855, after he had referred to some of the precedents quoted the other night. It also appeared to be clear, from the attitude of the Government at the London Conference, that they, at that time, held the same views which the Prime Minister did in 1855—that it was one of their chief objects there should be no Joint Guarantee. He did not wish to enter into debate on this point now, but simply to enter his protest against the explanation given in regard to it by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer the other day. He (Sir R. Assheton Cross) was quite sure that anyone who read the Protocol must be struck with the idea that the Government felt at the time that document was drawn up that it was absolutely impossible to propose to Parliament an International Guarantee. If anything else were wanted to establish the view which he (Sir R. Assheton Cross) took, and which he held very strongly, it was the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the Wednesday afternoon that he announced the result of the negotiations with the Powers. The right hon. Gentleman then stated that the Government did not object to an International Guarantee, provided there was an understanding, a promise, or an arrangement, or something or other, he (Sir R. Assheton Cross) would not quarrel about words, that it should not lead to anything like International interference in Egyptian affairs; and it was perfectly clear, from the cheers which followed the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, that the House took it as an assurance that the Government had provided ample security against any such interference. But when the Agreement itself appeared there was a feeling of universal dis-

satisfaction and disappointment, because it was found that no such securities existed. All these, however, were matters for serious debate on a future occasion; but he could not help, on the second reading, making this protest. He was not one of those who cared to put off until going into Committee the debate upon the principle of a Bill. He believed the feeling of the country was against the arrangement which had been made; indeed, anyone who referred to the speeches of hon. Gentlemen opposite in debate on the Resolution upon which the Bill was founded would find that they were against the proposal of the Government, though the votes of hon. Gentlemen were in favour of it. Having entered this protest against the second reading of the Bill, he would reserve any further observations until a later stage.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he could not congratulate the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir R. Assheton Cross) on the rather peculiar course which he had pursued. The right hon. Gentleman began by saying he would not enter into a discussion after the arrangement that had been made at an earlier hour; but then he went on to make every statement and every allegation the most extreme, and the most extravagant, that he could possibly have adduced in the most elaborate argument. That was a course which was extremely inconvenient. He (Mr. Gladstone) did not choose to follow the right hon. Gentleman by doing what would be the proper counterpart to his speech — namely, making a series of contradictions to his series of propositions; it was not a convenient or usual way of conducting a debate of grave importance in this House. The Leader of the right hon. Gentleman having agreed to postpone the debate until the Motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair, the right hon. Gentleman now took the opportunity of saying that that was an inconvenient practice, so that even the right hon. Baronet (Sir Stafford Northcote) was not exempt from the right hon. Gentleman's profuse and exuberant criticism. The right hon. Gentleman went back to a speech of his (Mr. Gladstone's), which had nothing to do with the matter, made several years ago—a speech in which he referred to a case very unlike that of Egypt. The reference simply illustrated the weakness of the right hon. Gentleman's position. The right hon. Gentleman protested against the measure of the Government, and he (Mr. Gladstone) protested against the speech of the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he had no intention to prolong the discussion unduly; but he thought one might very fairly, upon the second reading of the Bill, make one or two observations in the way of inquiry. The House was hurried—he might even say hustled—into passing the Resolution upon which the Bill was founded; and the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer showed, by the remarks he made earlier in the evening, that he regarded that Resolution as the vital and most important part of the whole proceedings, so far as this House was concerned. But a good many things had happened since that Resolution was passed; and he (Mr. Sclater-Booth) thought the House might well ask whether those occurrences affected this country in any way, or altered the circumstances under which this loan was proposed to be raised? Since the Resolution was passed in this House, the French Chamber had been seized of the measure, or one analogous to it; but it was now said that the debate upon it was to be adjourned till the 4th of May. A significant and important statement had also been made with regard to the Austro-Hungarian share in the transaction. Hon. Members had learned by telegraph that the legislative sanction of Austria could not be granted until the autumn of the year. He supposed that there also the matter would be hung up and postponed. If that were so, it was entirely contrary to the understanding upon which the Resolution was passed before Easter.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he must express his surprise, not about the anxiety of the Government to get this measure passed, but at the fact that they were now discussing the second reading of the Bill at all. He was in the House on the 30th of March, when the Resolution of the Committee, on which the Bill purported to be founded, was brought up for Report. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer brought up the Resolution, and then, on the Motion that the House do

agree with the Committee in the said Resolution, and while the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross) was addressing the House, an hon. Member moved that the House be counted. The House was counted out, and the Resolution was never, as far as he recollected, adopted by the House at all. He was, therefore, very much surprised indeed to see that, in his Parliamentary Papers of the following day, the Resolution was given as passed, and that it was on the further question that leave be given to bring in the Bill the counting out took place. He referred to the newspapers, especially to *The Times*, and there he found that his recollection was perfectly borne out—namely, that it was on the question that the House agree to the Resolution of the Committee that the count out took place. If his recollection was right, and if the report in *The Times* was correct, the Resolution never reached the stage which would admit of the House being called upon now to read this Bill a second time; the report in *The Times* and his own recollection were entirely against the entry in the Votes and Proceedings. He did not think they had reached the second reading stage of the Bill at all.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, the hon. Gentleman the Member for Queen's County (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) thought that the Resolution upon which this Bill was founded was not passed on the 30th of March. The hon. Gentleman was mistaken. The Resolution was passed; he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) moved it, and it was passed. On the Motion for leave to bring in the Bill, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross) rose, and during his remarks the House was counted out. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Hants (Mr. Sclater-Booth) had said that several things had occurred since the Resolution was passed on the 30th of March, and had asked what was to happen if the approval of the Convention was withheld by the French Chamber and the Austro-Hungarian Legislature. As to the last point, he had no information; but as to the first, he might say that until the French Chamber assented to the Convention it would be impossible to raise the loan. But by the passing by this House of the Resolution authorizing the loan, and approving of the Convention, the credit of the Egyptian Government would be sufficient to enable that Government to borrow the amount necessary to make the requisite payments in April without violating the Law of Liquidation. It would not have been able to do that if the Resolution had been either postponed or rejected.

MR. RYLANDS asked if he was right in supposing that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer said that until the French Chamber and the Austro-Hungarian House of Representatives had passed their respective measures in relation to the Convention, no steps would be taken to raise the money for which the House were now asked to pass this Bill?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, he was not prepared to give a detailed statement on the subject; but it was clear that it would be impossible to raise the actual loan until the different Chambers had adopted their Acts.

MR. W. H. SMITH asked, whether the Correspondence between the Government and the house of Messrs. Rothschild would be laid before the House?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) thought the right hon. Gentleman had better give Notice of his question.

MR. W. H. SMITH said, that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said the credit of the Egyptian Government would be sufficient to enable that Government to borrow the necessary money. Hon. Members were well aware of the means by which the money was to be obtained. Last year money was obtained as the result of correspondence between the Government and the house of Messrs. Rothschild. He wished to know whether the Correspondence which had taken place on this occasion would be produced? It would be remembered that the Correspondence which passed last year was laid before the House.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): I wish the right hon. Gentleman would give Notice of the question.

MR. WARTON said, he did not intend to follow the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire

(Sir R. Assheton Cross) in his observations with regard to the nature of the Bill, because he had no wish to incur the anger of the Prime Minister. He thought it his duty, however, to say a word in respect to the way in which the Bill had been hurried through the House. The hon. Member for Queen's County (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) was under the impression that the Resolution which gave rise to the Bill was not passed on the 30th of March. He (Mr. Warton) was quite willing to accept the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the Resolution was passed, and that it was on the Motion for leave to bring in the Bill that the count out took place. He was not a little surprised, however, that very early the next day, Tuesday, when scarcely any hon. Members were present, and certainly before any of the Leaders of the Conservative Party had come down to the House, the noble Lord the Member for Flintshire (Lord Richard Grosvenor) should, with that agility and dexterity for which he was famous, walk up to the Chair, and move quietly that leave be given to bring in the Bill. The thing was done in a second of time, and the day appointed for the second reading. [Lord Richard Grosvenor dissented.] The noble Lord might shake his head; but he certainly did the thing very skilfully. He (Mr. Warton) protested against to-day being fixed for the second reading of such an important Bill as the present. It had always been understood that the day on which the House re-assembled after the Easter Recess was one upon which they did not enter upon any very important Business. He hoped that the future stages of the Bill would not be taken as quickly as the previous stages. To-night, the second reading had been moved by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer without a word of explanation. That, in itself, was hardly respectful to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross), a distinguished Member of the Conservative Party, who had evinced considerable interest in the measure.

Baron HENRY DE WORMS said, he would like to ask what was the exact position they were in with regard to the proposed loan? It appeared to him that if they were to allow the Bill to be read a second time the position of affairs ought to be clearly defined. It was generally believed that the loan would be a joint one; but, as a matter of fact, Austro-Hungary had not yet given its assent, the French Chamber had postponed the consideration of the matter, and it was needless to point out that Russia was, to say the least, placed in a very delicate position with regard to ourselves in the guaranteeing of this loan. Before the House agreed to the second reading of the Bill, they ought to receive some information from the Government as to whether it was to be understood that the guarantee was really a joint and several one, and as to what position the English Government would be placed in in regard to the loan in the event of the joint and several guarantee failing.

Mr. SEXTON said, he wished to remark that he also was present on the 30th of March, when the Egyptian Loan Vote was reached. He remembered perfectly the Motion upon which the House was counted out. He was quite at a loss to understand the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer. If leave had been given to bring in the Bill, it would have been necessary to state who were prepared to bring in the Bill, and certainly no such statement was made.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers): I said there were two Motions—one agreeing to the Resolution, and the other for leave to bring in the Bill.

Mr. R. N. FOWLER said, he was surprised that no Member of the Government had given any answer to the very pertinent question of his hon. Friend behind him (Baron Henry De Worms). He (Mr. R. N. Fowler) did not wish to anticipate by any remarks the discussion upon the question which would come forward on Thursday next; but he must point out that they were practically the guarantors of the loan, and, therefore, he could not conceive what advantage there could be in taking the guarantee of other countries. If Egypt could not repay the money, England, as a rich country, would be able to do; and assuming that Egypt was unable to redeem the loan—the possibility of which the right hon. Gentleman had intimated—England would, no doubt, have to do it. In view of the circumstance that we were taking the whole re-

sponsibility upon ourselves, it seemed to him that the taking of other guarantees could only have the effect of involving the country in difficulties for no reason whatever. His object in rising was to express the hope that some Member of the Government — perhaps the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke), or the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs— would return an answer to the question of his hon. Friend.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said, he thought they were a little anticipating the discussion of the question which would take place next Thursday, on the Motion "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair;" but he would offer one or two remarks to the House. The hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. R. N. Fowler) appeared to him to be a little inconsistent with himself on the present occasion; because he was one of those who protested against the Convention on the ground that it involved the joint and several guarantees of Foreign Powers. Now, he seemed to be complaining that this guarantee might not be effective, and that in that case this country would be solely responsible—an den which he had supposed the hon. Member and his Friends had in view. In reply to the hon. Member for Greenwich (Baron Henry De Worms), he thought that the answer which he expected had been anticipated by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had, in his (Mr. Chamberlain's) opinion, put clearly before the House the position in which they stood with regard to this matter. The Convention which the House was asked to agree to was a Convention for a Joint Guarantee of this loan; that Convention had to be confirmed by the Resolutions of the Parliaments of those countries which had Parliamentary institutions; and it was, of course, but reasonable for the Government to wait a proper time in order to allow those Parliaments to be consulted. In the meantime, no embarrassment could arise; because, on the faith of the Resolution of the House, the Egyptian Government could utilize its own credit at once. The hon. Member had put forward the supposition that, this matter having been referred to the several Parliaments, one or more of them should refuse to confirm the Agreement which this Government had made, and had asked what would then happen; but that was one of those hypothetical questions to which he did not think the Government ought to be called upon to say anything in reply.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR rose to ask Mr. Speaker whether leave could be obtained to introduce a Bill of a public character without Notice being placed upon the Paper? Since the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated, with perfect correctness, that leave had been given to introduce the Bill on the 31st March, the day after that on which the House was counted out, he had looked into the Votes and Proceedings, and found that in the time occupied by Private Business, without there being any Notice upon the Notice Paper, or in the Orders of the Day, upon the Motion of someone, the question had been put from the Chair that leave be given to bring in the Bill. He asked whether it would not be in accordance with the Orders and established practice of the House of Commons that, when leave was applied for to bring in a Public Bill, there should be a Notice on the Notice Paper; whether it was in accordance with the usual custom to move for leave without Notice, and at an unusual time?

MR. SPEAKER: The course indicated by the hon. Gentleman is in Order. The Bill was brought in in accordance with a Resolution previously agreed to. Under those circumstances, no Notice was necessary. The Bill was based on a Resolution passed, and was brought in in accordance with the usual practice.

MR. WHITLEY said, that the fact that other Powers might retire from the arrangement altogether changed the aspect of the question. The Bill did not say that England was to repay the money borrowed by Egypt; but assuming that, as would probably be the case, two or three Powers retired, would the country be satisfied with having to pay £4,000,000 or £5,000,000 for this purpose?

MR. TOMLINSON drew attention to the fact that the Bill only empowered the Government to join in a guarantee with the other Powers named in Article VII. of the Protocol, and in accordance with the Articles of the Protocol set out

in the Schedule. He referred to the fact that by a note attached to the Articles, but not forming one of them, the Russian Government had limited the share in the guarantee. He thought that consideration ought to be given to the question whether the Bill as framed would empower the Government to participate in a guarantee to which all the Powers named did not join on terms of equality.

Question put, and *agreed to*.

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday* next.

MOTIONS.

—o—

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HOLMS, Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under "The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861," relating to Cattewater, Dingle, Lee-on-the-Solent, North Sunderland, Plymouth, Saint Leonards, Saint Monance, and Southbourne, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HOLMS and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 123.]

OYSTER AND MUSSEL FISHERIES PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HOLMS, Bill to confirm an Order made by the Board of Trade, under "The Sea Fisheries Act, 1868," relating to Poole, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HOLMS and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 124.]

EAST INDIA (UNCLAIMED STOCKS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. KYNASTON CROSS, Bill for making provision for the transfer to the Secretary of State in Council of India of Unclaimed India Stock and Dividends, and for amending the East Indian Railway Company Purchase Act, 1879, and the East Indian Railway (Redemption of Annuities) Act, 1881; and for other purposes, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. KYNASTON CROSS and Mr. HIBBERT.

INDUSTRIES (IRELAND).

NOMINATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Select Committee on Industries (Ireland) do consist of Twenty-one Members."—(*Sir Eardley Wilmot.*)

MR. JOHN REDMOND said, he rose to move, as an Amendment, "That the Committee consist of Twenty-three Members." He regretted that no Member of the Government was present, because he believed Irish Members on those Benches had been treated rather badly with reference to the nomination of this Committee; and for that he thought the hon. Baronet who moved its appointment (Sir Eardley Wilmot) was himself somewhat to be blamed. This was a proposal to deal with Irish matters; and how was the Committee to be constituted? There were nominated 10 English and Scotch Members, the remainder being Irish Members, who, however, were not selected fairly from amongst Irish Parties in the House. For instance, there were only four Members representing the opinions held by hon. Gentlemen on those Benches, while there were no less than seven Irish Members who represented the Whig and Tory factions. He ventured to appeal to the Government not to have any wrangling over this matter; but to consent to the appointment of a Committee of 23 instead of 21. In the event of the Amendment being agreed to, he should propose that his hon. Friends (Mr. Molloy and Mr. Kenny) be Members of the Committee. He and his hon. Friends felt it their duty to take up a determined attitude with reference to this question, with the object of their views obtaining full and fair representation on the Committee.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "Twenty-one," in order to insert the words "Twenty-three,"—(*Mr John Redmond,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'Twenty-one' stand part of the Question."

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at a quarter before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 10th April, 1885.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee —Resolutions* [April 9] *reported.*
PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—East India (Unclaimed Stocks) * [125].
Committee—Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) (*re-comm*) [49]—R.P. [*Eleventh Night*]; Local Authorities (Expenses of Conferences) [88]—R.P.

QUESTIONS.

—o—

FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—CLOGHER HEAD, CO. LOUTH.

MR. SEXTON asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, With reference to the project for the erection of a pier at Clogher Head, county Louth, for sheltering fishing boats and coasters, the request for survey in which case was made so long ago as the 21st January 1884; and the plans and specifications in respect of which were forwarded by the Board of Works to the Fishery Piers and Harbours Commissioners on the 25th April 1884; whether the Fishery Piers and Harbours Commission officially intimated in February last, that they would be prepared to recommend a free grant of three-fourths of the amount (£17,000) estimated by the Board of Works, namely, £12,750, if the remaining fourth, £4,250, were made up by the locality; whether, accordingly, a subscription of over £700 has been publicly made, and presentments, duly fiated, one from the Grand Jury of the county of the town of Drogheda for £700, and one from the Grand Jury of the county of Louth for £4,000, were lodged with the Fishery Piers and Harbours Commission at the beginning of March; and, whether, the conditions prescribed by the Commission having been thus complied with, the Commission have furnished to the Board of Works their final recommendation, and how soon the construction of the pier will be commenced?

MR. HIBBERT: The statements in the Question are substantially correct; but the Fishery Piers and Harbours Commissioners have not yet definitely recommended the case. That Commission is not in my Department; but I understand that the reason of the delay is the very proper one that they are engaged in elaborating a scheme for the complete allotment of the funds at their disposal?

COLONEL NOLAN: With reference to the answer of the hon. Gentleman, may I be allowed to say a word? The simple reason of the delay is that the Chief Secretary for Ireland stopped communication with the Treasury on the subject.

MR. SEXTON: I beg to give Notice that I will put a Question to the Chief Secretary for Ireland with reference to the statement of the hon. Gentleman.

FRANCE AND CHINA—THE HOSTILITIES—RIGHT OF SEARCH FOR CONTRABAND OF WAR.

MR. COLERIDGE KENNARD (for Sir TREVOR LAWRENCE) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the French claim the right to search for contraband of war neutral vessels bound to Hong Kong, which is British territory; if so, whether Her Majesty's Government have conceded this right?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: A claim of this nature has been advanced, but has not been admitted by Her Majesty's Government, who are in communication with the Law Officers of the Crown.

FRANCE AND CHINA—THE TREATY OF PEACE—CONTRABAND OF WAR—RICE.

MR. GOURLEY asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If it is correct that a Treaty of Peace has been arranged between France and China, and that one of the stipulations is the maintenance of the declaration making rice (food) contraband of war; and, whether Her Majesty's Government contemplate promoting an International Conference for the purpose of defining "Contraband of War," and an extension of the policy laid down in the Treaty of Paris (1856), and as then advocated by the Government of the United States?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Her Majesty's Government have not been officially informed that such a Treaty has been concluded; but they have reason to believe that the state-

ments which have appeared to that effect are correct. But they have no information as to any such stipulation as that referred to by the hon. Member. I am not aware that there is any intention of promoting a conference for the purpose indicated by the hon. Member.

MR. GOURLEY asked the noble Lord whether it was not a fact that it had been stated in the French journals that a Treaty had been concluded which recognized rice as contraband of war?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I saw what purported to be an account of such a Treaty, and there was a statement in regard to rice; but, as I have said, we have no official information on that subject at all.

NAVY—PROTECTION OF THE BLACK SEA AND BALTIC.

MR. NORWOOD asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, If he will state what provision, if any, is being made for the protection of British commerce in the Black Sea and Baltic?

SIR THOMAS BRASSEY: The subject of this Question has engaged and is engaging the anxious attention of Her Majesty's Government; but it would not be consistent with the public interest to reply to the Question.

MR. NORWOOD: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the navigation of the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov has reopened; that there are 200 British steamers there; and that the Lower Baltic has also resumed business? This is a matter of great pressure and importance.

SIR THOMAS BRASSEY: I have already told my hon. Friend that the subject has engaged and is engaging the anxious attention of the Admiralty.

ARMY—EXTRA WORK—THE ROYAL ARSENAL, WOOLWICH.

MR. BOORD asked the Surveyor General of the Ordnance, Whether it is a fact that the men and boys employed at the Royal Arsenal at Woolwich have been working overtime for many months, and that they now are, and for some time past have been, working fifteen hours a day, Saturday afternoon and Sunday often included; and, if so, whether, in view of the large number of mechanics at present idle, such pressure could not be relieved by the employment of additional hands; and, whether it is intended to remove any of the work at present executed at the Royal Arsenal at Woolwich to the Arms and Ammunition Factory at Birmingham, which has been recently purchased by the Government?

MR. BRAND: During the recent pressure at the Royal Arsenal, men and boys have been employed extra time and occasionally on Saturday afternoon, and even on Sundays, in order to enable the urgent needs of the Public Service to be met. The requirements in such cases could not have been provided for in another way, or to take on extra hands. There is no intention of removing work at present executed in Woolwich Arsenal to the Arms and Ammunition Factory at Birmingham, which has been recently purchased by the Government.

NAVY—MERCHANT STEAMERS AS TRANSPORT CRUISERS.

MR. GOURLEY asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, If he will be good enough to inform the House of the names, tonnage, coal endurance, speed, and terms upon which the Government have engaged the *America*, *Oregon*, and other merchant steamers as transport cruisers; whether they are intended to be utilised as ordinary transports, unarmoured cruisers, or in both services; if they are to be manned by seamen of the Coastguard and Naval Reserves; if he will state the calibre, description, and penetrating power of the guns with which they are to be fitted; and, whether the decks and machinery are to be protected with shell-proof sheathing?

SIR THOMAS BRASSEY: I regret that I am obliged to give the same answer to this as to a previous Question. I cannot, consistently with the interest of the Public Service, give any reply.

MR. GOURLEY: I would like to ask, whether it is not already well known that the Admiralty have hired a certain number of vessels at specified rates for six months?

[No reply.]

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACTS — IMPORTATION FROM GERMANY—FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE.

MR. BIRKBECK asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether

the restrictions on the importation of live animals from the ports of Hamburg, Bremen, and Geestemünde have been withdrawn; and, if so, whether Germany has been declared free from foot and mouth disease?

MR. TREVELYAN: The Order prohibiting importation from the three ports has been revoked in consequence of the cessation of foot-and-mouth disease in Hamburg, and of the measures which the German Government have taken to prevent the exportation of animals from any district in which foot-and-mouth disease exists. It is not necessary that a country from which animals are admitted for slaughter should be absolutely free from foot-and-mouth disease. All that is required is that the circumstances are such as to afford reasonable security against the importation therefrom of animals affected with foot-and-mouth disease.

MR. BIRKBECK asked what steps the Government had taken to obtain official information as to the prevalence at present of foot-and-mouth disease throughout Germany?

MR. TREVELYAN: As regards the recent prevalence, we are in possession of the German Returns; and as regards the prevalence at the moment, I stated to the House a little while ago that all our Consuls throughout Germany are directed to communicate with the Government by telegraph as soon as there is a new outbreak, and since that Order was issued there have only been three such communications from the whole of Germany.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (SCOTLAND)—KIRKINTILLOCH SCHOOL BOARD.

DR. CAMERON asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether his attention has been called to a complaint that the School Board authorities of Kirkintilloch have refused to sanction the erection of a polling station at Lenzie, a populous place containing a large number of persons entitled to vote at the approaching School Board Election; and, whether, if it be true that the polling station at which Lenzie voters will have to vote is two miles distant from Lenzie, he will exert his influence with the local authorities to prevent those electors who wish to record their votes from being put to so much avoidable inconvenience?

MR. MUNDELLA: The School Board of Kirkintilloch have notified to us that they propose to have an additional polling station at Lenzie, and the Department has sanctioned the arrangement.

TRADE AND COMMERCE — CHINESE DUTIES ON TEA — THE "LI-KIN DUES."

MR. HOPWOOD asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is the fact, as currently stated, that the Chinese Government has imposed an additional tax of three and a-half taels per cent., or other amount, on tea, under the name of "Li-kin dues?"

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: No such information has been received; but Lord Granville has caused inquiry to be made by telegraph on the subject, and I will communicate with the hon. and learned Gentleman.

EGYPT—SEIZURE OF THE "BOSPHORE EGYPTIEN."

MR. O'KELLY asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the Home Government was consulted by the local authorities at Cairo before the suppression of *The Bosphore Egyptien* was carried into effect; and, whether he can indicate the article or articles published in that paper on which the act of suppression was grounded?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Yes, Sir. The Egyptian Government informed us that, in view of the excited state of public opinion, they consider that the publication of *The Bosphore Egyptien*, of whose conduct they had long had reason to complain, should no longer be allowed, and that they intended to take steps to stop it. As the editor of a foreign newspaper has a remedy at law in Egypt, Her Majesty's Government saw no reason to interfere with the action of the Egyptian Government in this matter. The articles on which the suppression was grounded have not been communicated to Her Majesty's Government.

MR. O'KELLY: Will the noble Lord state whether the reason why this journal was suppressed was not that it sometimes told the truth?

[No reply.]

EGYPT (AFFAIRS OF THE SOUDAN)—GENERAL GORDON'S MISSION.

Mr. BAXTER asked the First Lord of the Treasury, If his attention has been called to the following passages in a book just published, on authority, intituled *Charles George Gordon. A Sketch*, by the Rev. Mr. Barnes:—

Page 73. "He (Gordon) saw certain of Her Majesty's Ministers, and it was decided that he should proceed to the Soudan as the representative of the British Government, but in no way responsible to the Khedive. His Mission was to superintend the evacuation of the Soudan;"

Page 75. "At Cairo Gordon's functions were greatly extended. He accepted from the Khedive the office of Governor General of the Soudan, and, in the firman conferring on him this appointment, he was instructed not only to effect the evacuation of the Soudan, but to take the necessary steps for establishing an organised Government in the different provinces of the Soudan, for the maintenance of order, and the cessation of all disasters and incitement to revolt;"

if these extracts correctly represent what took place both in London and in Cairo, and if the instructions of the Khedive were at variance with those of Her Majesty's Government; if it is true that, in his diaries, General Gordon states that there were serious differences between himself and Colonel Stewart, the latter having repeatedly and strongly urged that, by remaining in Khartoum, they could do no good whatever, but might cause much bloodshed; and, if any confirmation has been received of the intelligence that it was an emissary of Zebehr who betrayed Khartoum and murdered General Gordon?

Mr. GLADSTONE: The Question of my right hon. Friend imposes on me rather a difficult duty—namely, to answer various Questions which I am afraid I cannot undertake to do in a way satisfactory to my right hon. Friend. But I may tell him that I have not seen this work of Mr. Barnes until to-day, and I have not had an opportunity of making myself thoroughly acquainted with its contents. I have reason to believe, however, that Mr. Barnes is a gentleman of character, and was on terms of friendship with the late General Gordon. My right hon. Friend says that Mr. Barnes said that General Gordon was in no way responsible to the Khedive; but in that I think he is certainly mistaken. General Gordon left this country on a mission of a comparatively humble nature intrusted to him by Her Majesty's Government—namely, to inquire into the best means of evacuating the Soudan—and that mission was intrusted to him by the Government in answer to the request of the Egyptian Government for an officer for that purpose. Subsequently the object of that mission was enlarged with the privity, and undoubtedly under the responsibility, of Her Majesty's Government; but the principal enlargement that took place was the conferring on General Gordon the office of Governor General of the Soudan. That, of course, was done by the Egyptian Government, and General Gordon could not be exempt from responsibility to the Egyptian Government in respect of what he did in that capacity. In Lord Granville's original instructions to him he was told that he was to consider himself authorized and instructed to perform such other duties—those duties beyond the function of inquiry—as the Egyptian Government might desire to intrust to him. My right hon. Friend refers to a Firman issued by the Khedive of Egypt empowering General Gordon to act in the capacity of Governor General of the Soudan; and he quotes an extract which states that in this Firman General Gordon

"Was instructed not only to effect the evacuation of the Soudan, but to take the necessary steps for establishing an organized Government in the different provinces of the Soudan."

I cannot say that that is a totally incorrect quotation; but it certainly conveys an entirely different effect to my mind from that which we considered to be due to the Firman, and which I still consider to be due to it, after having referred to it again. The Firman is to be found in a despatch at pages 27 and 28 of No. 12 of the Egyptian Papers of last year, and I would recommend my right hon. Friend to refer to the original documents. What I understood the Firman to say is this—that after the evacuation of the country General Gordon was to take steps much like those described by Mr. Barnes. The evacuation of the country meant the withdrawal of all material means. Therefore, undoubtedly, I understood, and still understand, that the instructions meant that by amicable correspondence General Gor-

don was to give effect to the plan he had described—namely, to invite the local Sultans to resume the exercise of those powers which they and their families before them had exercised in the Soudan previous to the Egyptian invasion. I do not, therefore, consider that the extracts quoted in the Question do represent with perfect accuracy what took place. I would not say that the instructions of the Khedive were at variance with those of Her Majesty's Government; but, so far as I know, they certainly went beyond those which General Gordon had received from Her Majesty's Government. But Her Majesty's Government recognized them, and accordingly became responsible for them. My right hon. Friend asks me whether there were serious differences between General Gordon and Colonel Stewart, the latter having repeatedly and strongly urged that by remaining in Khartoum they could do no good whatever, but might cause much bloodshed; and whether these statements are to be found in General Gordon's diaries? I should doubt that there were serious differences; but I would rather not answer Questions about the diaries of General Gordon for two reasons. In the first place, I have seen nothing, except the last of these six volumes; and, in the second place, the question with regard to the publication of these diaries is one on which Her Majesty's Government feel a peculiar delicacy. It is very much in the hands of Sir Henry Gordon, and no ultimate decision has as yet been arrived at. I would not, therefore, wish at the present time to refer to those diaries. The last paragraph of the Question of my right hon. Friend asks—

"If any confirmation has been received of the intelligence that it was an emissary of Zebehr who betrayed Khartoum and murdered General Gordon?"

We have no intelligence to that effect.

MR. O'KELLY asked whether it was not true that in some instances where the people had restored their local Sultans, as at Berber, General Gordon sent down his steamers and bombarded their town?

MR. GLADSTONE said, Her Majesty's Government had not, to his knowledge, received any such intelligence. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman could give Notice of the Question.

Mr. Gladstone

EGYPT (WAR IN THE SOUDAN)—THE CAMEL CORPS.

GENERAL ALEXANDER (for General OWEN WILLIAMS) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, considering the fact that no official Returns of the condition of the Camel Corps have been received of later date than 1st February, and that as this Corps is composed of picked men from the various corps d'élite, and therefore it must be considered as the flower of the Army, he will telegraph for an immediate report of the precise condition of this Corps at the present time, private reports representing it as most deplorable?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I have telegraphed to the Nile for particulars of the condition of the Camel Corps. The following is the reply I have received:—

"Camel Corps now in summer quarters; Lights at Shabadood, 19 officers, 290 non-commissioned officers and men effective; no serious case in hospital; exact number unknown, and no telegraph. Guards at Dongola, 19 officers, 295 men effective—six sick; Heavies at Hafir, 21 officers, 261 men effective—no sick. Men could not be in better condition. Corps in bad condition in the sense that men are dismounted. They are intended to be so for the present."

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIAN ATTACK ON THE AFGHANS AT PENJDEH.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I wish to ask the Prime Minister, Whether Her Majesty's Government have any further communication to make to the House in regard to the state of affairs on the Afghan Frontier?

MR. GLADSTONE: My reply will be very brief, taking up the matter where I left it yesterday, when I said that we had made references to St. Petersburg, with a view to obtaining explanations of the facts and whatever else might follow from the Russian Government, but that there had not been time to receive any reply. The reply was received in the course of yesterday evening, and was to the effect, as might not unnaturally be expected, that the Russian Government had already called on General Komaroff to give explanations of his conduct. The use of the word "already" may be subject to a certain ambiguity; but I am inclined to construe it as meaning that he had been called upon to give

explanations before Sir Edward Thornton entered into communication with M. de Giers. M. de Giers at the same time repeated his statement that the Russian troops did not occupy Penjdeh, but retired to their former positions.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Can the right hon. Gentleman say how long it will probably take for the Russian Government to receive explanations from General Komaroff? It must take a considerable time.

MR. GLADSTONE: I do not think we are in possession of precise information on that point. We are instructed by a British officer that from the point to which he supposes the Russian telegraph to have reached would be 120 miles; and he estimates that two days' express travelling would effect communication with General Komaroff one way.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: May I ask whether there has been any communication between Her Majesty's Government and the Viceroy of India; and is the Prime Minister aware whether there has been any communication between the Viceroy and the Ameer on this subject?

MR. GLADSTONE: It was stated yesterday that the first news had reached Rawul Pindi, where the Viceroy was; but I have not learnt that there has been any communication yet from the Viceroy on the subject, and, therefore, I am not in a position to answer the Question.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I shall put the Question on Monday.

MR. O'KELLY asked, whether, when the Afghan troops passed the River Khushk, they did not place themselves between the main body of the Russian troops and the advanced post of the Russians at Pul-i-Khisti?

MR. GLADSTONE asked for Notice of the Question.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL asked if the Government had any more precise information as to what was the former position of the Russian Forces to which they were now said, according to one account, to have retired?

MR. GLADSTONE: I think we have given to the House all the information we possess. I feel with my hon. Friend that it is in the first place incomplete, and, in the second place, not perfectly clear in some parts; but we have taken steps to obtain more consecutive and complete information.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Has there been any more recent communication from Sir Peter Lumsden?

MR. GLADSTONE: No; not from Sir Peter Lumsden.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (REDISTRIBUTION) (*re-committed*) BILL.—[BILL 49.]

(*Mr. Gladstone, The Marquess of Hartington, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Attorney General, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 25th March.*]

[ELEVENTH NIGHT.]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

FIFTH SCHEDULE.

CONTENTS AND BOUNDARIES OF BOROUGHS WITH ALTERED BOUNDARIES.

Amendment again proposed,

In page 24, at end, to add the words,—

"Dublin	The present Parliamentary borough of Dublin. The township of Rathmines. The township of Kilmainham. The township of Drumcondra, Clonliffe, and Glasnevin. The township of Clontarf. The townland of Grangegorman South, the townland of Cabragh, and so much of the townland of Grangegorman Middle as lies south of the road leading from Phibsborough to Cabragh, and so much of the said townland as lies south of Faussagh Lane, and east of Quarry Lane, all in the parish of Grangegorman, barony of Coolock, and county of Dublin. The townland of Dolphinsbarn, in the parish of St. James, barony of Uppercross, and county of Dublin. The townlands of Terenure, Kimmage, Rathfarnham, and Newtown Little, all in the parish of Rathfarnham, barony of Rathdown, and county of Dublin. The townlands of Rathmines Great, Rathmines Little, Farranboley, Churchtown Lower, Friarland, Roebuck, and Trimlestown, or Owenstown, all in the parish of Taney, barony of Rathdown, and county of Dublin.

"Dublin	The townlands of Simmonscourt, Annefield, and Priesthouse, all in the parish of Donnybrook, barony of Rathdown, and county of Dublin."

—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question again proposed, "that those words be there added."

MR. HEALY said, he hoped that in the interval of a fortnight which had taken place since this matter was under discussion there might be a better disposition evinced on the part of the Government to accept the proposal of his hon. Friend the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton). He wished to impress upon the Committee that in the Amendment now before them his hon. Friend had asked for nothing whatever in the nature of a concession. No demand was made for an additional Member; but the simple proposition was that an extension of boundaries should be given for the borough, which the number of Members allocated by the Bill to the City of Dublin would have to represent. It was proposed by the Bill that Dublin should in future have four Members; and his hon. Friend asked that the territory, in which those four Members were to have jurisdiction in the shape of representation, should be extended so as to take in certain districts which really, to all intents and purposes, belonged to the City of Dublin proper. He could not, for the life of him, understand why the Government should resist this very reasonable demand with the persistency they had hitherto maintained. He (Mr. Healy) had taken the trouble to go through the Bill in order to ascertain what had been the amount of extension of boundaries given to various other cities in England, Scotland, and Ireland. He found that in England the Government had extended the boundaries to no less than 38 towns; in Scotland the boundaries had been extended in 9 cases; but in Ireland the Bill only extended the boundary of one borough—namely, the borough of Belfast. In accordance with the arrangement entered into with Lord Salisbury, Belfast was to possess two more Members, and in order to justify this addition to the representation the boundaries had been enlarged. Now, if the boundaries of Dublin had been extended in the same way as in other cities in England and in Scotland, or as in Belfast, it would have been entitled to five Members, and perhaps to six. At the present moment Dublin had a larger number of population per Member than any other town in the United Kingdom. Each Member represented a population of 68,000, whereas the general average was only from 55,000 to 60,000. The Irish Members had given up in despair all hope of obtaining an additional Member for Dublin. It appeared to be quite impossible that they would be able to obtain that concession; but he could not understand what on earth could be the reason which actuated the Government in endeavouring to prevent the Committee from allowing them to have, for Parliamentary purposes, the extension they claimed, presuming that the original number of Members allotted to Dublin by the Bill—namely, four, was still to be retained. The answer which the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) and the Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had made to the claim of Dublin was that if it got this extension of boundaries it would be necessary, upon logical grounds, to allot five Members to the city. Now, he ventured to say that there was very little logic in the Bill at all. It was not a logical Bill in any respect, and one additional departure from the principles of logic would not impair the value of the measure. As a matter of fact, it was not on the grounds of logic that the Government objected to this proposition; but what really animated the opposition of the Government was a totally different reason—namely, that they were afraid if they agreed to it they would have to meet the opposition of the Tory Party, not only in the townships around Dublin, but in the House itself. He would like to address himself for one moment to the Tory Party in that House, simply in order to assure them that by no possibility, whatever the fate of this Amendment might be, would they succeed in returning a Member either for the county or the City of Dublin. He was prepared to pledge his credit to the fact that although Dublin had been jerrymandered in order to give to the Tory Party two seats—one in the city, and one in the county—they had not the ghost of a chance of returning one. Therefore, he did not see what difference it could make to them, either as prac-

tical statesmen, or as capable citizens, seeing that it was impossible for them to secure the return of a Representative. No doubt, the boundaries of the city had been manipulated by Mr. Peers White and the Boundary Commissioners in such a way that it was hoped that some advantage would be given to the Tory Party; but he was perfectly convinced that the Tory Party had no chance whatever of returning a single candidate in this district. Then what difference could it make to anybody if the Committee consented to make the boundaries what they ought to be according to common sense, seeing that they could not obtain the advantage which the jerrymandering of the boundaries was intended to give to them? He would make a suggestion to the Government—namely, that they should insert a date in the Bill up to which the proposed boundaries for Dublin should prevail, and that then, if it were found that the Tory Party were unable to carry either of the two seats for the county, or of the four seats for the borough, they should return to the plain principles of common sense, and fix the boundaries which Nature and geographical position pointed out. He would ask the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board to say that the existing boundaries provided for the City of Dublin should come to an end after — say, five years, or two General Elections; and then, if the Tory Party could show that they had been able to return a single Tory, either for the city or the county, let things remain as they were; but if not, let them substitute a boundary scheme that was dictated by common sense. Do not let them have a cast-iron arrangement like this staring them in the face. It was a matter of extreme importance to the people of Dublin that they should not have their wards unnecessarily broken up. It was something horrible to contemplate that Dublin should be the only city in the Kingdom which should have its wards broken up and made "pie" of, as a printer would say, for the purposes of jury lists and registration. He repeated that he was quite prepared to accept a provisional arrangement; and if, at the end of five years, it could not be found that the Tory Party had succeeded in returning a Representative in consequence of the jerrymandering which had taken place, let things remain as they were; but if not, let them give the boundaries which common sense and propriety dictated. In 38 English cities and in nine Scotch towns they had given an extension to the existing boundaries, having regard to the urban area. In only one instance had that been done in Ireland, and, curiously enough, it was in the case of Belfast. He thought the people of Dublin had very good reason to complain of the invidious way in which they had been treated as contrasted with the way in which the people of Belfast had been treated. Belfast had an existing population of 208,000, which would only entitle it to two Members, or perhaps to three; but something like 14,000 persons had been added to the population of the borough from the counties of Antrim and Down. They had been dragged in ruthlessly, in spite of their own protestations, for many of them were engaged in rural pursuits, especially in the case of those who weretaken from the county of Down. They were, however, notwithstanding their remonstrances, dragged in bodily in order to please Lord Salisbury, and to give the Tory Party an additional Member for Belfast. That having been done in the case of Belfast, in what position did Dublin stand by the extensions which had been made? Belfast was to have a population of 222,000 and four Members. The population of Dublin was already 273,000, or more than 50,000 above that of Belfast after the extension of its boundaries had been carried out, and yet, under the present Bill, it was only to receive the same number of Members. Now, that appeared to him to be an exceedingly invidious and unfair arrangement. It was an arrangement by which the citizens of Dublin were treated with gross unfairness in more respects than one, not only in regard to the refusal to allocate an additional Member, but also in regard to the fact that no additional Member was to be given for the excess of population already existing in the present boundaries. Dublin was certainly entitled to more than four Members with the existing population; but how much more would it have been entitled to additional representation if the boundaries recommended by the Exham Commission had been agreed to. It must be remembered that that was a Commission which

had been appointed by the late Government at the time when the Duke of Marlborough was Lord Lieutenant, that it sat for a considerable time, and that it was presided over by an able lawyer, who certainly could not be accused of having popular proclivities. In addition, the President of the Commission was checked by other Commissioners of still less popular proclivities; and yet those gentlemen unanimously recommended the inclusion in the boundaries of Dublin of the outlying townships. Upon that recommendation the Government had not deemed it right to act; and, therefore, the only conclusion that could be arrived at was that the recommendations of the Exham Commission had been adopted in the case of Belfast and refused in the case of Dublin, simply in order to give the Tory Party a fancy and bolstered-up representation which in good faith it was not genuinely entitled to. This arrangement, of course, was the offspring of the secret compact and most unfair arrangement between the two Front Benches, who seemed to have put their heads together in order to square off the Bill as Representatives of the Tory Party on the one side, and of the Liberal Party on the other. No disposition had been manifested to consult the wishes of the people of Dublin; and what Lord Salisbury appeared to have laid down was, that four Members should be given to Belfast to counterbalance the return of four Nationalists in Dublin. Certainly, such an arrangement was not in accordance with the principles of logic which the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board appeared to advocate in other cases. He (Mr. Healy) thought the Irish Members were entitled to know from the right hon. Baronet why he was anxious to enlarge the boundaries in the one case and restrict them in the other. At the present moment the residents of the township of Rathmines were, to all intents and purposes, part of the population of the City of Dublin; and he should be glad to learn what defence could be made by the Irish Law Officers of the Crown of an arrangement by which the two votes now enjoyed by the people of Rathmines were to be continued, while the people of Dublin were only to enjoy one? A person living in Rathmines and possessing a dwelling-house there had only to cross a canal in order to get into Dublin proper, just as a man crossed the bridge from Southwark to get into the Strand; but by crossing that small canal the resident of Rathmines obtained possession of a second vote for his business premises, being in the enjoyment of one already for his residence—that was to say, that by crossing a small stream of water a resident of Rathmines blossomed into a full-blown, double-breasted voter, with one vote for his residence and a second vote for the place in which he carried on his trade or business. Why should it be the fact that a man residing in a particular part of Dublin called Rathmines was entitled to two votes? What was the case with regard to the township of Pembroke? By some arrangement, which he had never been able to understand, Pembroke, for Parliamentary purposes, was within the City of Dublin; while, for municipal purposes, it was without the City of Dublin. The township was in precisely the same position as Rathmines, but having been included in the Parliamentary boundary of Dublin, the people of Pembroke would not have two votes, while those of Rathmines would. What logic was there in that? He should be glad to learn upon what principle of logic the people of Rathmines were to enjoy two votes and the people of Pembroke not? In order to be logical the Government, if they insisted on keeping Rathmines in the county, as the Bill proposed, should cut off the right to a county vote because the people residing there possessed a vote already for their business premises in the City of Dublin. A man might have a shop at a street corner and his residence next door, and because one happened to be in the county and the other in the city he enjoyed the privilege of two votes. Such an arrangement appeared to him to be a most extraordinary and unfortunate one. The Corporation of Dublin had put forward a scheme dealing with the boundaries of the city. He did not know what fault the Government had to find with the scheme of the Corporation; but he knew that the moment a proposal was made by the Emergency Society in regard to the county it was adopted by the Commissioners, the proposal being one that involved the paring off of a small portion of the county. When the Corporation of Dublin brought forward

their scheme it was not only rejected, but rejected with contumely. Why had the Corporation of Dublin been treated with derision and contempt in the matter, and why had the recommendations of the Emergency Society—an association instituted in order to prop up bankrupt landlords, and provide them with bailiffs for serving writs—been conciliated in every step? It was most extraordinary that the Corporation of Dublin should have been flouted, while the contemptible organization of landlords had their scheme accepted. He was himself present when the Emergency scheme was handed in. The agents of the Emergency Society, unsupported by a single argument, simply handed in a map, and at the sight of that map the Boundary Commissioners jumped at their proposal, and accepted it. In the course of the discussions upon the Bill, the Tyneside area, with which he was personally very well acquainted, and some of the areas about London had been mentioned. But the reason why those areas had been exceptionably dealt with was obvious—namely, that in all those cases the counties had had an additional number of Members allotted to them. For instance, eight or nine Members were given to Northumberland by the Bill; and, therefore, there was no injustice in grouping together the Tyneside populations, and forming them into a division in the way the Bill provided. In the same way Middlesex would have half-a-score of Members, if not more, under the Bill. Therefore, there was nothing incongruous in grouping together small portions of the county area in which the houses were clustered together. But the county of Dublin was only to have two Members; and he challenged the Government to point out, on any of the maps they had issued, any case which stood on all fours or would compare in any way with what had been done in regard to that county. He had assured the House that no jerrymandering of the boundaries would secure the return of a Tory candidate; and, under those circumstances, why should not the City of Dublin have the benefit of geometry and symmetry in the matter? It was upon that ground that he appealed to the right hon. Baronet to make the scheme for Dublin a provisional scheme, and not to make it a Procrustean bed which must stand for the borough for another generation. Let a provision be inserted in the Bill to provide that—say, until the year 1890, the present provision should remain in operation, and that it should then be subjected to revision. He could not understand the object of continuing this abortion in the schene as it now stood. It might be asked, "Why did the Irish Members desire this change?" He thought the fact that they asked for it was a sufficient evidence of their *bona fides*. They were not seeking for any political advantage, because the political effect would be the same under all circumstances. Then, if there could be no political result from the change, he intreated the Government to allow a provision to be inserted in the Bill, by which the plan now proposed would not be allowed to have permanent effect. A strong objection was entertained against breaking up the wards of Dublin, and adding very largely to the expense and trouble of the Revising Barrister. Moreover, what was of still more importance, greater symmetry would be carried out in connection with the Parliamentary divisions of the City of Dublin, if the proposal of his hon. Friend were adopted. Anybody who was acquainted with the City of Dublin—he did not know whether the right Baronet was acquainted with it himself—would be aware that Mountjoy Square was proposed to be placed in the same Parliamentary district as Ringsend, so that the swells of Mountjoy Square—Her Majesty's Judges and the aristocracy of Dublin—and the people who sold cockles in Ringsend would be required to vote in the same district. A grosser absurdity could not be imagined. It had been done in the hope of insuring the return of a Tory candidate; but in whatever way they manipulated the constituency that result was hopeless. There existed throughout the city an overwhelming mass of Nationalist opinion that would completely swamp the Tory Party notwithstanding the jerrymandering which had been resorted to. Why, then, continue this absurdity and perpetuate it, knowing that it was impossible for the Tory Party in Dublin to secure a representation of their particular views in that House? He thought it was a disgrace to the deliberations of Parliament that the House of Commons should be told that two Gentlemen, how-

ever distinguished, had come to an arrangement, and that, therefore, in the face of that arrangement, common-sense principles were not to prevail. He asked the Committee to import something of a deliberative character into the consideration of the Bill, and not to discuss things that were absolutely cut and dried. It would really appear that the Committee was engaged in carrying on a pantomime or farce, night after night, in pursuance of an iron-bound compact. Let them have something like a real discussion upon the merits of the proposals contained in the Bill without reference to any previous bargain. He hoped that, at any rate, the Government would consent to the boundaries laid down in the Bill being continued for four or five years only, especially when it was demonstrated that the Tory Party could obtain no benefit from them.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he rose out of courtesy to the hon. and learned Member who had just spoken (Mr. Healy); but the question had been fully discussed on a former occasion, and having himself already expressed his opinions upon it he would not now detain the Committee by repeating them. He only followed the hon. and learned Member out of courtesy, and not that he had anything fresh to say. He would not, however, follow the hon. and learned Member into the discussion of a question which would arise upon Schedules 6 and 7. He anticipated that there would be a full discussion upon Schedule 6, on the point which had been raised by the hon. and learned Member, and he would not enter into it now upon the present Schedule. Nor would he attempt to anticipate what he would have to say upon Schedules 6 and 7 by any reference to that part of the subject at the present moment. The hon. and learned Member had stated that there were 38 boroughs in England and nine boroughs in Scotland which had had their boundaries extended. In the latter case the hon. and learned Member made up nine by counting the extension of existing groups. He was quite justified in doing so; but it was a very small matter indeed, and the extensions were only made for the purpose of bringing the Parliamentary boroughs up to the municipal limits. In regard to the 38 English boroughs, the boundaries had, in almost every case, been extended to the municipal limits. In Ireland, by the Act of 1868, a general provision was made in regard to extending the borough boundaries up to the municipal limits, which had not been the case in England. The hon. and learned Member suggested that a provisional arrangement might be made in the case of Dublin. He (Sir Charles W. Dilke) was not aware of any case in which a constituency had been provisionally created for a given number of years, on the expiration of which it was to come to an end, and he did not think that would be at all a convenient or satisfactory arrangement, or one which he could recommend to the Committee. At the same time, he was quite ready to give the hon. and learned Member his personal assurance that he should be disposed to support a measure for the extension of the boundaries of the City of Dublin, for municipal purposes, to a reasonable degree, and he should also be inclined to favour a subsequent extension of the Parliamentary boundaries to the municipal limits. The hon. and learned Member had complained of persons living outside the boundaries of the city, in a township divided only by a canal, having two votes, whereas persons who lived in the city had only one. No doubt, that was an anomaly; but anomalies existed in regard to the English boroughs, and applied with a greater or less degree to the large towns throughout the United Kingdom.

MR. HEALY said, that it did not apply to the same extent.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the anomaly existed to a startling extent even in the Metropolis, and he had mentioned it in a previous discussion in connection with his own borough. In that case there was not even a division by a canal, but the one part of the district was absolutely undistinguishable from the other. There was no distinction whatever to the eye, not even to the extent of that which existed in the case of Rathmines. There was simply a continuation of streets, and it was an anomaly which existed in the case of nearly all the large cities in the United Kingdom, and was not in any way peculiar to the City of Dublin. He certainly did not like these distinctions; but it had been found impossible to avoid them altogether.

MR. HEALY said, he wished to put a question to the right hon. Baronet in regard to a matter of detail which might easily be remedied under the Bill. At the present time, the whole expense of preparing the registration lists was thrown upon the municipality of the borough proper; while the people of Pembroke and the people of Blackrock, who were included within the Parliamentary borough, but were not within the municipal limits, were not required to contribute towards it at all. As a matter of fact, they did not pay 1*d.* towards the expense. Some time ago a lawsuit took place in which the Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Walker) was counsel. The hon. and learned Gentleman was, therefore, perfectly acquainted with the matter. The lawsuit to which he referred was brought on in 1880, when the Corporation was represented before the Court of Queen's Bench by the hon. and learned Gentleman; and that Court decided that they had no power to make the Grand Jury present, for the expense of the registration of voters, any part of the Parliamentary borough that was situated in the townships of Pembroke and Blackrock. The Government would easily get at the facts of the case if they would consult their own Law Officer. He (Mr. Healy) thought it was not unreasonable to ask that the area of Pembroke and Blackrock should be charged with the expenses incurred within those districts for Parliamentary purposes. It would be a matter of satisfaction to the citizens of Dublin to find that in future the expense which was now entirely borne by the city would be thrown in proper proportion upon the districts he had mentioned, which hitherto had contrived to evade any contribution.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that if the hon. and learned Member was right in his facts—and he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had no doubt the hon. Member was—he would be glad to consider the question, if the hon. and learned Member would kindly aid him by putting his statement in writing.

MR. SEXTON said, he understood the right hon. Gentleman to express his willingness to consider the question of the payment of expenses in connection with Pembroke and Blackrock being thrown upon the Corporation of Dublin. If the right hon. Baronet desired to ascertain facts precisely, he would find them in a printed pamphlet issued by the City of Dublin in reference to the proposal to extend the boundaries of the city in this case. It was an undoubted fact that at present all the expenses were thrown upon the Corporation of Dublin. Pembroke was part of the Parliamentary borough of Dublin; but it was independently registered for Parliamentary purposes, and no portion of the expense of the Parliamentary register was borne by that township. That was undoubtedly an anomaly, and he thought the City of Dublin was very hardly treated under the Bill. Within the last two days an illustrious Person, who was now visiting Ireland, had delivered a speech in reply to an address, in which he spoke in terms of the highest praise of the public and private enterprize of the citizens of Dublin. He (Mr. Sexton) thought it was very strange that while the Heir to the Throne should be speaking to the citizens of Dublin in such terms, that city should be singled out for exceptionally harsh treatment under the present Bill. He was afraid, however, that the Government, in reference to the City of Dublin, were in the position of marionettes, and that the string was pulled by the man behind the screen—Lord Salisbury. They had heard before now that Lord Salisbury had already told the Tories that their position under the Bill would depend upon the spirit in which the Boundary Commissioners performed their duties; and, unquestionably, the way in which the City of Dublin had been treated was a remarkable and conclusive indication of the spirit in which the Boundary Commissioners had acted in Ireland. In every instance the people who were most interested had been required to give way. The right hon. Gentleman said that wherever there had been an extension of boundaries in England there had first been an extension of municipal boundaries. No doubt, in England and Scotland, wherever a municipal extension had been sought it had been granted, and the Parliamentary boundary had gone with it; while in several cases the Parliamentary boundary had even been carried beyond the municipal boundaries. Thousands and tens of thousands of persons had in certain towns been added in areas which had been previously outside the municipal boun-

daries. Broadly speaking, that had generally been the case; and, whether the boundaries were made co-extensive with the municipal boundaries or not, the Bill provided that in the case of England and Scotland the Parliamentary boundary of every important borough should coincide with the actual area of the borough.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that was not so in the case of Glasgow.

MR. SEXTON said, he would admit that the case of Glasgow was a singular and a single exception. In every other case the desired extension had been made, and why had it not been made in Glasgow? As a matter of fact, it had been made partially, and many thousands of people had been added by the Bill. Indeed, almost as many people had been added to the Parliamentary borough of Glasgow as he proposed to add to the City of Dublin.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that the number was much fewer in proportion, and very few compared with the number left out.

MR. SEXTON said, he thought that a population of some 25,000 had been added to the borough of Glasgow. The claim made in the City of Dublin was for an addition of 40,000. The Government had added 25,000 to Glasgow, and refused to do more, but for a reason altogether different from that which was assigned in this case. The citizens of Glasgow asked to have 200,000 added. That increase involved an enormous extension, and if it had been granted to the citizens of Glasgow the effect would have been not only to upset the proposals of the Bill in regard to the number of Members to be given to Glasgow, but also to upset the proposals of the Bill as to the number of Members to be given to the counties of Renfrew and Lanark. The reason why the Government had refused an application was, that it would involve a complete disturbance and an upheaval of the proposals of the Bill in regard to the rural constituencies. The case was notoriously different in Dublin, because, as his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy) had pointed out, whether they got an extension of the boundaries of the City of Dublin or not, the county of Dublin, which was the only county concerned, would still be entitled to its two Members, and no request was made for any increase in the number of Members at all. What were the facts of the case in regard to Glasgow? The granting of a fuller extension would have completely altered the number of Members for Glasgow, Renfrew, and Lanark; whereas, if the Government granted the request now made to them by the Irish Members, it would not make the slighest difference either in the representation of the city or of the county of Dublin. Admitting that exception, he emphasized his former assertion—that over the whole area of England and Scotland there was not an important city left by the Bill with a Parliamentary boundary more limited than the actual area of the city as it met the eye. He (Mr. Sexton) entirely supported the statement of his hon. and learned Friend that this Amendment had not been moved for any political purposes. The City of Dublin was to have four Members, and the County of Dublin two, and he did not think there was any man in Dublin who was able to speak with positive certainty as to the political effect of the change. His own opinion was that the National Party would certainly return five out of the six—in all probability the whole six; and it could not be urged that the acceptance of the Amendment would affect the question either in one way or the other. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) was quite as skilful in evading arguments as in advancing them, and he had not touched at all upon the question of the relative position of the townships of Pembroke and Rathmines in regard to the City of Dublin. They lay side by side; they were equally distant; they both touched the Parliamentary borough along the whole line of the inner boundary; they were about equal in size; and the only difference was that Pembroke was a good deal more rural in its composition than Rathmines. It was occupied chiefly by the owners of detached villas which had extensive grounds around them. They were occupied by the mercantile and official class who had made money enough in Dublin to enable them to have their villas outside, and if any township ought to be placed within the county, and not in the city, that township was Pembroke. But the township

of Pembroke was in the city already, while the township of Rathmines, composed as it was of streets undistinguishable from those of the city, and composed of streets joined in one continuous line with the streets of the city, was placed in the county. Reason was baffled in the effort to discover any cause for placing the township of Rathmines outside the city and the township of Pembroke within it. It was an indication of the way in which the spirit enjoined upon the Boundary Commissioners by Lord Salisbury had been manifested; and after this extraordinary effort of audacity so far as the Commissioners were concerned, he thought the least thing that could be done for Mr. Peers White was to make him a Judge. The right hon. Baronet said he would have no objection to favour the introduction of a Bill for the extension of the municipal boundaries of Dublin, and that when the municipal boundaries of Dublin had once been extended, he would then favourably consider a proposition for making the Parliamentary boundaries coincide with those of the municipality. The Committee would expect no less than that from the right hon. Baronet. The right hon. Baronet had repeatedly pressed against him (Mr. Sexton), upon this and previous Amendments, the argument that wherever Parliamentary boundaries had been extended in England, they had been extended because there had been a previous extension of the municipal boundaries. As the municipal boundaries of Dublin had not been extended, the right hon. Gentleman urged that that case was not on all fours with that of the English boroughs. It now appeared that the right hon. Baronet was indisposed to accept the present extension of the Parliamentary boundaries of the city, and he would only allow them one bridge by which at any period of time they might pass from their present position to an extension of the Parliamentary boundaries, that bridge being the previous extension of the municipal boundaries. He asked the right hon. Baronet to give the people of Dublin an undertaking that they would be allowed to pass over that bridge. Would the right hon. Baronet undertake that the Government would introduce a Bill for the extension of the municipal boundaries of Dublin, either upon its own merits solely, or upon its own merits accompanied with the necessity which existed for an extension of the boundaries of the Parliamentary borough? He would remind the right hon. Gentleman that such a project had for many years been agitated. It was recommended by the Commission which was appointed in 1877, and which reported in 1879; and if the municipal boundaries had not been extended, it was not because any objection had been raised to the extension on the score of equity and inconvenience. Both of those points told the other way. They had endeavoured to get the Irish Government to take up the question of the extension of the municipal boundaries of Dublin; and the only two reasons which had been given by Lord Spencer and the Irish Government for not taking it up were, in the first place, that a general measure was meditated on the subject of Local Government in connection with the towns of Ireland; and, in the second place, that the Irish Government and Lord Spencer had been so busily engaged with other matters during the last two years that they had not had time at their disposal for the introduction of a Bill. So far as the special duty of attending to the interests of the Municipality of Dublin was concerned, if they could by any arrangement be transferred from Lord Spencer to the right hon. Baronet, he would regard the solution of the question as much more hopeful. He trusted, on behalf of himself, of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), and other hon. Members who sat around him, that the right hon. Baronet who had charge of the present Bill would take this matter into his own hands, especially as the Irish Government pleaded very excessive occupation as a reason for delay. So far, no reason for deferring the settlement of the question of an extension of the borough boundaries of Dublin had been advanced upon its own merits; and as all the arguments of common sense were in favour of an extension, he would be disposed not to press upon the Government to any great extent the question of the extension of the Parliamentary boundaries, if the right hon. Baronet would give an undertaking, on behalf of the Government, that they would promptly introduce a Bill to

place the City of Dublin, in regard to its municipal affairs, on a parity with the cities of England. He understood that the right hon. Baronet would not oppose the extension of the Parliamentary boundaries up to the municipal boundaries if a Bill were passed to extend the latter.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that was so. He had already stated his own opinion upon the subject, and he was quite ready to repeat it. He was fully prepared to give his best attention to a proposal for the extension of the municipal boundaries of Dublin; but he could not at present see his way to an extension of the Parliamentary boundaries beyond the municipal limits.

MR. PARNELL said, the question of the municipal boundaries of Dublin, which was considered to be interfered with by the lines of the Bill as far as it was affected by the question of the Parliamentary boundaries of the city, was proposed to be left as it was. He could not help expressing a protest against the absence of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) at a time when an important matter of this kind was occupying the attention of the Committee. The name of the right hon. Gentleman was on the back of the Bill, and yet he was away from the House while this very important Amendment affecting the city within his own jurisdiction was under discussion, and when he must have known that other important Amendments relating to Ireland were to follow. He (Mr. Parnell) also thought that the hon. and learned Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Walker) should have been present on that occasion, and that the Irish Members ought to look for some more authoritative exponent of the views of Lord Spencer on this question of the extension of the Parliamentary boundaries of the City of Dublin than the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke). While he said that, he had no wish to be understood as in any sense being desirous of expressing any feeling in the matter after the statement the right hon. Gentleman had made with respect to the extension of the boundaries of Dublin. The Irish Members were in this position—that if they let this Amendment go by and allowed the seal of the House to be put on the present imperfect boundary system of Dublin by the adoption of a Parliamentary boundary of such an extraordinary character as that proposed in the Bill, they might very seriously damage the strong position which the Corporation of Dublin now possessed in regard to the extension of the boundaries of the city. Two Commissions had inquired into the matter. There was the Commission issued by the late Government of Lord Beaconsfield during the last Parliament. That Commission reported in favour of such an extension of the boundaries of Dublin as that which the Irish Members now claimed. The Exham Commission also reported in favour of the extension of the city boundaries in the following terms:—

"That the area of Dublin should be extended by including with it the townships of Rathmines, Pembroke, Kilmainham, &c., coloured yellow on map No. 2, and annexed thereto."

The position of the Corporation of Dublin with regard to its powers for the purpose of extending the municipal boundaries was this—it had not the same power which other municipalities possessed for the purpose of enabling it to spend the money of the ratepayers for the purpose of promoting Private Bills in order to extend the municipal boundaries. But those boundaries could be extended in another way—namely, by means of a Public Bill, in default of a Bill being first passed to enable the Corporation of Dublin to spend the money of the ratepayers in the promotion of a Private Bill before a Select Committee—the power enjoyed by all the English Corporations. The only method in which the Corporation of Dublin could obtain the judgment and consideration of Parliament on this question for the extension of boundaries was by bringing forward the matter in the shape of a Public Bill. Of course, they all knew perfectly well that even under the circumstances of an ordinary Session it would be practically impossible for a private Member to hope to be able to carry such a Bill as that through the House of Commons. The various stages and progress of the Bill would be blocked, under the existing Forms of the House, from the very commencement, and if it got further than the second reading, it would be exceedingly fortunate. But under the circumstances of the present Session, all the

time of the House having been absorbed by the Government, the difficulties were, of course, rendered still more insuperable, and it became almost impossible for any private Member even to obtain the second reading of a Bill. The matter, therefore, stood in this way—the Corporation of Dublin asked the Government to introduce a Bill to confer upon them the same powers in respect of the promotion of Private Bills as were enjoyed by the English Corporations; and the only way in which that matter could be brought under the notice of Parliament was by the introduction of a Public Bill. Such Public Bill would have to be introduced by the Government. There was, however, another alternative. There was the alternative of the introduction and passing of a Bill giving to the Dublin Corporation the powers which English municipalities enjoyed in respect of these matters, and the Corporation of Dublin had approached the present Lord Lieutenant, from time to time, with reference to this matter. It was, however, one of the misfortunes of Irish government to find, when a Liberal Administration was in power—that while the English people were governed in accordance with a Liberal policy, the Irish people were invariably governed from Dublin Castle in pursuance of a Conservative and reactionary policy. Lord Spencer had by no means manifested the same spirit which the right hon. Baronet had exhibited in that House. In reply to the Memorial of the Corporation of the City of Dublin, the Lord Lieutenant, through his Under Secretary (Sir Robert Hamilton), said that—

"The Government, having regard to public changes of a general character affecting the local government of cities, as well as of counties, would have to be considered. His Excellency does not think it desirable to include in this Bill any provision affecting public or general rates."

But he went on to say—

"The Government will further be prepared to introduce a Bill next Session for assimilating the law between England and Ireland with respect to the payment of the Parliamentary costs for the promotion of measures affecting municipal affairs. But His Excellency is of opinion that until the defects in rating, which he proposes to deal with next Session, are remedied, the question of the extension of boundaries of Dublin is not ripe for settlement."

The matter, consequently, stood thus—two Commissions had reported in favour of the extension of the municipal boundaries which was now suggested. The Corporation of Dublin had no power to promote a Bill for themselves; but the Government, through Lord Spencer, had promised to introduce a Bill this Session. [An hon. MEMBER: Last Session.] That was so. The Government, through Lord Spencer, had promised to introduce a Bill last Session for assimilating the law between England and Ireland with respect to the payment of the Parliamentary costs for the promotion of measures affecting municipal affairs, by means of which the Corporation of Dublin would be placed in the same position as that which was occupied by an English Corporation. But this pledge of Lord Spencer, imperfect as it was, had not been kept; and he thought the Irish Members were entitled to ask for a plain declaration from the Government on the present occasion. At all events, if they were not now entitled to ask for it on the next occasion, when the Amendments with regard to the divisions of the City of Dublin came up for consideration, he thought they would be entitled to ask the Government for a distinct reply to the question—"Will you introduce a Bill in the direction promised by Lord Spencer, and take all necessary steps to secure its rapid passage through the House of Commons?" If that were done, the Corporation of Dublin would be able to take the same action which the English municipalities were able to take respecting the question of boundaries, and the Government would at least have done something to carry out the expressions of goodwill which the right hon. Baronet had just made. He would repeat again that it was a monstrous thing that on this occasion they should not have the presence in the House either of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant or of the hon. and learned Solicitor General for Ireland, those Gentlemen being the only two Irish Officials in a position to understand the Parliamentary position of the Government of Ireland who possessed seats in the House of Commons. There were certainly plenty of officials in Ireland to discharge the duties those Gentlemen were now performing in that country.

[*Eleventh Night.*]

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he did not intend to recede from what he had already stated. His own opinion was very strongly in favour of the Corporation of Dublin possessing the same power as the English municipalities in respect of the promotion of Private Bills. In regard to the absence of the Chief Secretary and the Solicitor General for Ireland, he could only say that they were at present engaged elsewhere in the discharge of important duties in connection with the position they held in the Irish Government.

MR. HEALY said, it was certainly extremely desirable that they should have some distinct intimation in regard to the promise which had been made by Lord Spencer in January, 1884—something like 17 months ago—that a Bill would be introduced for assimilating the law between England and Ireland with respect to the payment of the Parliamentary costs for the promotion of measures affecting municipal affairs. That promise was given by Lord Spencer, in reply to a Memorial from the Corporation of Dublin. It was most courteous and kind on the part of the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) to give the pledge he had made; but the right hon. Baronet, unfortunately, could only express his own personal opinion, and behind him it would be necessary to move the dead weight of Dublin Castle. The right hon. Gentleman, he was sorry to say, would not be able to move it; and seeing that they had already had for 17 months a pledge from the highest authority—namely, the Viceroy—that a Bill would be introduced and passed last Session to enable the Corporation to obtain what they asked for—as that pledge had not been kept, what confidence or reliance—he meant no disrespect to the right hon. Baronet—could they place in the statement of the right hon. Gentleman? This was a matter in which they felt bound to endorse the complaint of his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). No doubt, it was necessary that the Chief Secretary for Ireland and the Solicitor General for Ireland should have a holiday, like anybody else; but, on the present occasion, they were absent from their places, not for holiday purposes, but for purely ceremonial purposes, in order to hold up the train of some Gold Stick in Waiting at Dublin Castle, in connection with the visit of the Prince of Wales. He was informed that the Chief Secretary for Ireland was engaged in bearing the Sword of State in some ridiculous ceremonies, of which the country ought to be ashamed, and the House of Commons were deprived of the advantages they would otherwise have possessed in the participation which the Chief Secretary for Ireland and the Solicitor General for Ireland would have taken in this important debate. Instead of being engaged in holding the Sword of State, he (Mr. Healy) thought it would have been far better if the Chief Secretary had been employed in holding up the pledges and faith of his Superior, the Lord Lieutenant, in this matter. The Lord Lieutenant had broken faith with the House of Commons, with the Corporation of Dublin, and with the Irish people, and it was a most suspicious circumstance, and extremely unfortunate, that the Chief Secretary for Ireland, at the time the subject was likely to come up for consideration, should be over in Dublin, taking part in some puerile and petty parades in connection with a Royal *levée*, or something of that kind. It was really absurd that the Irish Members should be treated in this way. What would the Scotch Members say if they found the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate absent when some question vitally affecting the interests of Edinburgh came up for discussion, and there was nobody to make a reply? What would they think, especially if they were told that the right hon. and learned Gentleman was engaged in some tomfoolery in connection with the Prince of Wales? His own opinion was that the Committee ought to report Progress upon this Schedule, in order to afford an opportunity of discussing it afresh, or they ought to have a distinct pledge from the Government that something would be done in the matter. If they allowed this opportunity of discussing the question on this Schedule to slip, when the Chief Secretary for Ireland got back he would feel that he had got the better of the Irish Members, and had practically dodged them out of a discussion. He therefore thought the best course would be to postpone the Schedule until the right hon. Gentleman returned. It was a matter that was absolutely vital to the existence of the City of Dublin. Any-

body who lived in that city, as he had to do, must see that much of the decay which had set in was owing to the fact that the city could not extend itself by a single brick in the direction of the outlying townships. The city was practically kept hide-bound by the extraordinary provisions which had been adopted, and anybody who lived there must see that it was a matter of vital importance to the very existence of the city that it should have this extension of boundaries. An opportunity for discussing the matter would not arise very often, and, in the absence of the two Officials who were supposed to speak the mind of the Lord Lieutenant, he failed to see how it could be properly discussed. No such breach of a distinct pledge and promise could take place in any other country over which Her Majesty ruled. It could occur only in Ireland under the despotic rule which Lord Spencer was able to exercise. Later on they would be told that the pledge had not been fulfilled for fear it might have interfered with the carrying out of the Coercion Act. He would ask the Government if they were able to give any more definite explanation of the failure to redeem the pledge of Lord Spencer than had already been given? He had a copy of the letter from Lord Spencer, and, if necessary, he would place it in the hands of the right hon. Baronet. It was dated "Dublin Castle, January 14, 1884." It was signed by Sir Robert Hamilton, and addressed to the Lord Mayor, and in it this passage, among others, occurred—

> "The Government will further be prepared to introduce a Bill next Session for assimilating the law between England and Ireland with respect to the payment of the Parliamentary costs for the promotion of measures affecting municipal affairs."

That might appear to be a very small matter; but underlying it was the fact that it was the only measure which would enable the Corporation of Dublin to promote a Private Bill for the extension of the municipal boundaries of the City. He saw the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Trevelyan) in his place, and he was sure it would be in the recollection of the right hon. Gentleman that this pledge had been given. Probably the right hon. Gentleman would be able to offer some explanation as to the serious breach of faith in regard to Lord Spencer's promise which had been committed?

Mr. TREVELYAN, after apologizing for his absence from his place during the last few minutes, said, the hon. and learned Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy) was quite correct in saying that the Government approved, as a matter of principle and detail, both of the larger and the smaller measure which had been referred to in the course of the debate. The principal objection to the larger of the two measures to which the hon. and learned Gentleman alluded —namely, a Bill for the extension of the boundaries of the borough—was, in the minds of those Members of the Government who were connected with Ireland, that it would meet with very strong opposition. Therefore, they had placed in the first rank the smaller measure, if he might so call it, which gave to the municipalities of Ireland that power of dealing with the money of the ratepayers for the purposes of Parliamentary legislation for municipal purposes which was enjoyed by the municipalities of England. The term "breach of faith" was a hard one to employ, because the inability of the Government to bring in and pass a Bill was entirely due to the want of time. He was quite certain that hon. Members sitting below the Gangway who attended the Sittings of the House up to the latest moment of last Session would remember that there was not much time to spare. If he recollected rightly, all the spare time was given by the Government to an Irish measure, which hon. Members opposite put in the front rank, as compared with the Dublin measure—namely, the Bill—likewise a Dublin measure—for giving assistance to the Recorder in connection with the revision of the Parliamentary votes. If he were not mistaken, after that Bill had passed through its various and multifarious stages, very little time was left except for the purpose of passing the Estimates. His own impression was, that if the smaller of the two Bills were brought forward in the present Session, from what he knew of the House of Commons it would probably pass, and he would use his own personal influence with the Irish Government to press forward such a Bill, and, if it would be of any value, he would lend his personal assistance in having it passed.

MR. SEXTON hoped that, after what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman, they would be able to arrive at some satisfactory arrangement. He entirely agreed with the opinion expressed by the right hon. Gentleman—that the only reason advanced by the Irish Government for not having dealt with the question last Session was want of time. Lord Spencer had never urged anything against the claim which was made by the Corporation of Dublin; but it must be borne in mind that not only had this plea of want of time been put forward last year, but the same excuse had been made every year since 1881 or 1882. Whenever the question of extending the boundaries of Dublin was raised, the Irish Government invariably pleaded pre-occupation and want of time. Probably the Irish Government were not so busily engaged at the present moment, and there was, therefore, a better opportunity and a more promising prospect of legislation. He would like, however, to have a definite understanding as to what they were to expect. What was essential in the matter was this—that the two right hon. Gentlemen opposite—the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) and the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster—should pledge the Government to the introduction of a Bill, and to facilitating the opportunities for passing a measure, which should comprise the two principal points dealt with in the Memorial of the Corporation of Dublin of January 14, 1884, addressed to the Lord Lieutenant, the first of which was the assimilation of the law between England and Ireland with respect to the payment of the Parliamentary costs for the promotion of measures affecting municipal affairs. Lord Spencer's promise, which had not been carried out, that the Government would introduce a Bill for that object in 1884, ought now to be carried out by the Government. In the second place, it would be understood that the question of the extension of boundaries would also be dealt with, the only reason why Lord Spencer had hitherto delayed dealing with that question having been his opinion—

"That until the defects in rating are remedied the question of the extension of boundaries of Dublin is not ripe for settlement."

Thirdly, in regard to the collection of rates, it was admitted that there were defects in the law, and therefore there were three questions now to be dealt with—namely, the collection of rates, the power of the Corporation to use the municipal funds for the purpose of promoting measures in Parliament for municipal purposes, and the extension of the municipal boundaries. After the pledges which had been given that evening, the Irish Members would certainly expect that the Government would facilitate the introduction of a Bill for carrying out these three objects, and if they were to understand that a Bill for that purpose would be introduced, and that the Government would use their influence to pass it, he should not feel disposed to press the Amendment further. Of course, he was aware that the right hon. Gentlemen opposite were only two Members of the Cabinet, and could not predominate the views of the Government. All he would ask of them, therefore, was that they would use their influence to secure the introduction and passing of a Bill.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he could say nothing further than he had said, and it was impossible for him to give any pledge that would bind others besides himself; nor could he give any pledge that a Bill would be introduced in regard to the collection of rates; but he would use his best efforts to have a Bill passed to assimilate the law in England and Ireland with regard to the employment by municipalities of rates for legislative purposes, and he was himself in favour of a Bill for the extension of municipal boundaries. As far as possible, he would assist in the passing of any Bill that might be introduced with that object.

MR. PARNELL said, there were two alternative measures by which the municipal boundaries could be extended. The first was the introduction of a Bill for the express purpose of extending the boundaries of Dublin; and, secondly, the same object might be effected by introducing a Bill to enable the Corporation to apply in the ordinary way for a Private Bill. He understood that the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke), in the course of the debate, had expressed himself in favour of both of those methods; and all he (Mr. Parnell) had to say was that he would very much prefer that the matter should be undertaken by the Government themselves.

He believed that was the opinion of the Corporation of Dublin also—namely, that Public Bills should be introduced by the Government for the extension of the municipal boundaries of the City of Dublin. On the understanding that the right hon. Baronet would use his influence with the Government for the purpose of introducing and passing such a Bill, he thought his hon. Friend the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) would be quite ready to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question proposed, "That Schedule Five, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

MR. WARTON said, he had hoped that the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would have paid some attention to a suggestion which he (Mr. Warton) had made some time ago. His suggestion was, to some extent, founded on a complaint which had been made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross) with regard to the extraordinary note now left standing at the bottom of page 22, which was as follows:—

"The law relating to the Parliamentary elections for the borough of Pembroke shall apply as if the places comprised in the present Parliamentary borough of Haverfordwest were named in the Act of the Session of the second and third years of the reign of King William the Fourth, chapter forty-five, as places sharing in the election of a Member for Pembroke, and the borough shall be called Pembroke and Haverfordwest."

He thought it would be in the recollection of the right hon. Baronet that the draftsman of this extraordinary Bill had devised a singular mode of making notes; and by Clause 22 it was provided that the Schedule to the Act and the notes thereto should be construed and have effect as part of the Act. To this Schedule a most extraordinary note was affixed at the end of that part of it which dealt with the English boroughs. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire had pointed out the absurdity of this process in connection with another Schedule, and, at his suggestion, the note to which attention was directed had been turned into a new clause. Following up that suggestion, he (Mr. Warton) desired now to call attention to a similar absurd note which stood by itself in the present Schedule, and which was the only one left. As he had said, it related to the grouping together of the boroughs of Pembroke and Haverfordwest, and he wanted the right hon. Baronet to consider what the effect of inserting this singular note, standing all alone as it did, would be. Why should these boroughs not be incorporated in the new clause; or was the note to be inserted in the Bill somewhere else; or what was to be done with it? He could not allow the Schedule to pass without asking the right hon. Baronet what he intended to do in the matter. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to have every possible point in connection with the Bill so thoroughly at his finger's ends, and had displayed so much courtesy in his dealings with the Committee, that he was quite sure the right hon. Gentleman would consider the matter at once, or promise to do so on the Report.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had already given the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Warton) the assurance for which he asked when the same point was raised on a former occasion. As to the necessity for inserting these notes in the Schedule, he had already promised that they should appear in the shape of clauses, instead of notes, and to that promise, of course, he intended to adhere. Before the Bill came up, upon the Report, a decision would be arrived at as to the precise mode in which the matter was to be dealt with.

MR. WARTON said, he quite remembered what the right hon. Gentleman had said before. What the right hon. Gentleman did say was that he would consider the matter; and all he wanted to know now was whether the right hon. Baronet had considered the matter.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

SIXTH SCHEDULE.

DIVISIONS OF BOROUGHS.

NUMBER, NAME, CONTENTS, AND BOUNDARIES OF DIVISIONS.

PART I.

ENGLAND.

MR. WARTON said, that, before moving the first Amendment which stood in his name, he wished to say that there were several others which he had put

down for the purpose of rendering this clause more intelligible.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he accepted the Amendment the hon. and learned Member was about to move.

MR. WARTON said, that, before moving the Amendment, he wished to call attention to the extraordinary and singular manner in which the Bill had been printed, especially in reference to the Schedules. Sometimes they had a page which read on in ordinary lines; while, in another case, the Schedules were cut up into columns; and sometimes the pages consisted partly of lines and partly of columns. The result was that hon. Members, in putting down Amendments, found it difficult to understand in what form they were to move them. He had proceeded on the ordinary plan of making his Amendment refer to the lines of the page; but it would be found that some of his Amendments referred to the first column, and others to the second. He thought it would have been better if the printers had followed the advice of Sir Benjamin Backbite in the *School for Scandal*, and allowed these trivial defects to be mended before the provisions of the Bill were submitted to the public. Whether they took the Schedule by the line or the column, or in some cases referred both to the column and the line, they would be led into confusion in consequence of the absurd way in which the draftsman or the printer had arranged the clause. As a point of Order, he would now move the first Amendment which stood in his name upon the Paper for the purpose of asking what the opinion of the Chairman upon the subject was?

THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that it would have been more convenient if both the columns in the Bill had had lines attached to them. It would then have been more easy to follow them; but I do not see that it is at all impossible, in consequence of the way in which the Bill has been printed, to discuss the Amendments of the hon. and learned Member, or any other Amendments which appertain to the Bill. As to the course I propose to take, I shall take the lines and follow them in dealing with the provisions of the Bill. I do not apprehend there will be any difficulty in doing so. I have paid attention to the matter, in consequence of an observation which fell from the hon. and learned Gentleman; but although I think it would have been better for the lines to have been numbered, I do not think any difficulty will arise in following the Amendments.

MR. WARTON said, he would move the first Amendment as it stood upon the Paper—namely, to leave out the word "name," in line 3, and insert "names."

Amendment proposed, in page 25, line 3, leave out the word "name," and insert the word "names,"—(*Mr. Warton,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'name' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he accepted the Amendment.

Question put, and *negatived;* word "names" *inserted* accordingly.

MR. WARTON said, his next Amendment was to leave out "No. 1, and No. 2," in page 25, column 1, line 9. This Amendment was of very considerable importance. He was glad to have received the direction of the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair as to the mode of procedure, and this was a case which applied to that point. Something of a similar nature applied to both columns of the same line.

THE CHAIRMAN: The first Amendment of the hon. and learned Member relates to the first column, and the course I shall take will be to put the Question, "That the words 'No. 1,' in page 25, column 1, line 9," be omitted. The other Amendment, with regard to the words "No. 2," will come subsequently.

MR. WARTON said, he had followed the lines, and the words he proposed to omit appeared in the same line, but in both columns. He gathered, however, from the ruling of the Chairman, that he must move first the omission, in line 9, column 1, of the words "No. 1," and that it would be necessary, afterwards, to move the omission of the words "No. 2," in the second column?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. WARTON said, he now fully understood the course which the Chairman proposed to take. This Amendment involved a very important question indeed, and he hoped to receive the same assistance in regard to it from the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the

Bill as he had received upon his first Amendment. He saw no necessity whatever for retaining the numbers which were inserted to signify the different divisions of the same borough. In the present instance, he was dealing with the new borough of Battersea and Clapham, which was divided into two divisions, each returning one Member. Surely the people of this country were not such children, or such savages, as not to be able to divide two without the words "No. 1 and No. 2" being added to the separate divisions. No confusion could arise as to the number of Members; there was no necessity why any distinctive number should be given; and, therefore, it would be better if the numbering were done away with altogether. If the numbers were retained, it might appear that some preference was given to one division over another. Everything in the shape of an invidious distinction would be avoided by dealing with the divisions as they were treated in the case of Lambeth and other boroughs—namely, by describing them as the Eastern or Western Divisions, or North and South. No difficulty would arise in that case, because it was only usual to give precedence to the North over the South, and the East over the West. He must again say that the Bill had been drawn up in an exceedingly slovenly manner, and the draftsman appeared to have preferred the stereotyping of these divisions as "No. 1 and No. 2," rather than saying "Battersea Division," and "Clapham Division." The districts included in the division would be clearly explained, as, for instance, in the case of the Clapham Division, which was to consist of "the parish of Clapham, No. 1 ward of Battersea parish, and No. 4 ward of Battersea, except so much as is comprised in Division No. 1 as herein described," and this system of numbering would be found to run entirely through the Schedule. In his opinion, it was entirely unnecessary to specify the divisions by numbers, whatever might be the case with regard to the wards. There could be no necessary or natural precedence of one division of a borough over another, and it was reducing the divisions of a borough to the level of wards to describe them as "No. 1," and "No. 2." He had no objection to the insertion in the Schedule of words describing a particular part of the division as "No. 2," or "No. 3" ward of Clapham; but he did object to the divisions themselves being described as "No. 1, the Battersea Division," and "No. 2, the Clapham Division." The best plan was to number the wards, and name the divisions. It was of no importance to any voter to know that he lived in No. 1 or No. 2 Division, because, after all, he would be connected with either the Battersea or the Clapham Division, and he might be found in either, as the case might be; whereas it might be difficult to find him as a voter in "No. 1" or "No. 2." It might be considered that this was a small matter; but he did not think so. He regarded it as a very important matter indeed. It had an extremely dangerous tendency, because it went in the direction which, he was sorry to see, too often prevailed, of trying to obliterate anything like local feeling. When a man became a convict, he lost his name, and was known as convict No. 1, or convict No. 2, and he thought it was not creditable on the part of the Government to reduce the divisions of a borough to the position of convicts by designating them "No. 1 and No. 2." Why should there be an attempt to hide respectable names under "No. 1 and No. 2," not making that distinction which, he thought, ought to be made between the dignity of the borough and the lesser dignity of the ward? He was satisfied that the voter in a respectable borough would be much more fond of local names than of being called an elector for No. 1 or No. 2 division. There was no earthly reason why these numbers should be given, except to save the trouble of writing down the name of the division wherever it was used. In order to relieve the Committee from any difficulty, he had taken pains to go through the Schedule, and if the present Amendment were accepted, he proposed to move a number of others, by which, in every case, names would be substituted for the numbers which at present appeared in the Schedule; and he was certain that the adoption of his proposal would have the effect of rendering the Bill more palatable in a good many quarters. Even the right hon. Gentleman himself must prefer to be Member for the Chelsea Division, rather than be known as the Representative of "No. 1" or "No. 2" Division.

[*Eleventh Night.*]

In obedience to the ruling of the Chairman, he would now move his first Amendment in this form—Schedule 6, page 25, column 1, line 9, leave out the words "No. 1."

Amendment proposed, in page 25, column 1, line 9, to leave out the words "No. 1."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Warton) had explained that his object in proposing his Amendment was to make the Bill more respectable. He could not, however, accept the Amendment, or treat it with the same consideration which he had given to the first Amendment moved in this Schedule by the hon. and learned Member. The object of referring to a division by numbers was to secure accuracy, and it had been done in the drafting for the purpose of avoiding future complication and error. He had discussed the matter at considerable length with the draftsman of the Bill, and he had arrived at the opinion that the danger of error would be greatly increased, if he were to accede to the Amendments of the hon. and learned Member. When the Schedules were framed by the draftsman, there was an objection made to the way in which some of the divisions of counties were described, and probably many of the names would be altered as the Bill passed through Committee. That remark, however, applied more particularly to Schedule 7, which was the County Schedule. It was obvious that if the name of a division was altered, all the references to that name would have to be altered also; and not only might mistakes be made, but mistakes which might have very serious consequences afterwards. He was further informed that considerable difficulty might arise in carrying out any alteration, having regard to the Forms of the House. For instance, he would take the case of Carnarvonshire. In that instance, "Division No. 1—" the Eivion Division—was to consist of the sessional division of Carnarvon, "except as much as is comprised in division No. 2, as herein described—Eifionydd and Portmadoc, and Pwllheli, and the municipal borough of Carnarvon." If this Amendment were made, it would be impossible to go back upon any previous references to this division in the earlier parts of the Schedule. Supposing that in regard to a borough a similar instance to that of Carnarvon were to occur——

MR. WARTON said, he had said nothing whatever about Carnarvon.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he was only giving the case of Carnarvon as an example of the manner in which the proposed Amendment would apply, because it was not at all likely that the House would take one course in regard to this matter in Schedule 6, and a different course when they came to deal with Schedule 7. Therefore, he cited the case of Carnarvon as a good illustration of what he meant. Then, again, changes might be made in such matters as this in "another place," and probably, either from hurry or some other cause, there would be a possibility of serious errors creeping in in regard to names. He could not but think that the intention of the draftsman—for it was a purely a draftsman's question—was one which every experienced man would appreciate. An hon. Friend near him called attention to the case of Liverpool, where there were nine divisions, and several references in particular divisions to districts comprised in other divisions. He had been distinctly informed that there would be the greatest possible amount of inconvenience if the change which the hon. and learned Member proposed were made. The hon. and learned Member said that a question of dignity was involved as between one number and another—that No. 1 Division would be considered more important than No. 2, or other divisions. He did not think that was likely to be the case. These numbers were not to be permanent designations at all. They were only designations in the Bill, and the names were what the divisions would be known by. The difficulty of finding all the references involved in making the proposed alteration would be very considerable, and even the hon. and learned Member, notwithstanding the great trouble he had taken with the Schedules, had not himself entirely avoided error. He only mentioned that fact, in order to show the difficulty of making all the consequential arrangements which would arise from some of the Amendments pro-

posed to be made in the Bill. It must also be remembered, as a reason against changes of this kind, that persons locally interested in the Bill had read those parts of it which affected themselves with great care. It might, therefore, be assumed, as a matter of course, that if there were any error in the Bill, it would have been pointed out in the great amount of correspondence which had taken place in regard to the measure. Of course, every change of this sort would involve a liability to introduce fresh errors. For all these reasons he would ask the Committee to reject the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member.

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, that the careful answer which had been made by the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) showed that the question was one which deserved serious consideration. He was glad to hear from the right hon. Gentleman that this sort of designation by number was only to be temporary, and that it would not be heard of after the Bill had been passed into an Act. He would like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it would be possible, before the Bill became an Act of Parliament at the last stage of all, to excise these figures, which he agreed with his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) were more or less unsuitable and annoying. The division which he hoped to have the honour to represent was called "No. 1;" but he thought it was a distinction which ought not to exist; and he quite agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that it ought not to be permanent. If, however, these numbers were permanently attached to the divisions upon the Statute Book, it would be hard to say that they would not be heard of again. Could the right hon. Gentleman tell the Committee whether on an ultimate stage in this Bill, in "another place," facilities would be afforded for excising the figures to which his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Bridport took exception?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would consider the question; but, of course, if it was practical, it could only be acted upon by general agreement in "another place." If it could be done without risk, some such course might be taken; but he must remind the Committee that it would be necessary to make an immense number of Amendments—several hundreds—of this kind, and it might be found that there was great practical difficulty in the way. There was another suggestion which occurred to him—namely, that on the Report words might be introduced into the Bill to say that the numbers should not be applied after the passing of the measure.

MR. TOMLINSON said, that if it was necessary to avoid errors, the sooner they devoted themselves to the task of correcting them the better, by striking out all extraneous matter. The more rapidly they set to work in that direction, the more likely would they be to avoid error hereafter. It, therefore, appeared to him that the best course would be to begin now. He saw no reason for supposing that any difficulty would arise in consequence of adopting the designation which his hon. and learned Friend proposed to substitute for the numbers now contained in the Bill.

MR. WARTON said, he was extremely obliged to the noble Lord the Member for North Leicestershire (Lord John Manners) for the support he had given to the Amendment. With all respect to the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke), he (Mr. Warton) must say that the arguments the right hon. Gentleman had brought forward against the Amendment were very weak indeed. He could not say that the right hon. Gentleman had paid him any high compliment in preferring the draftsman to him; and with regard to what the right hon. Gentleman had said in reference to the danger which was likely to arise, he maintained that no confusion whatever would occur owing to cross references from one column to another. The only correction that would have to be made would be in the striking out of "No. 1" or "No. 2," and substituting the name of the particular division referred to. The right hon. Gentleman had alluded to the case of Liverpool; but he presumed that this applied to Liverpool as well as to every other borough in the list. No harm could arise, because there were no cross references as between different boroughs; and every correction it would be necessary to make in consequence of the adoption of the Amend-

ment would be within the four corners of the particular borough that was dealt with. It was not a case of mixing up a number of boroughs with each other. On the contrary, it was a very simple matter indeed, and the consequential Amendments could very readily be effected. The right hon. Gentleman had commented upon the desirability of avoiding mistakes, and yet he suggested that the final decision of the matter should be left over until the Report stage. He (Mr. Warton) was afraid that many of the blunders which were frequently seen in Acts of Parliament arose from the bad habit of postponing difficult matters until the Report. When they reached the Report, there was a disposition to throw the whole thing off over to the other House, in order that the House of Lords should consider what ought to be done. At the present moment, the right hon. Baronet was perfectly able to put all these matters right. It was exceedingly slovenly work to speak of the divisions of a borough as "No. 1 and No. 2." They had already laid down one principle in regard to the population of a borough limited to 15,000, and another in regard to boroughs with 50,000 population. In point of fact, the Bill appeared to be drawn upon the principle of being rendered as confusing as possible. When they were able to give a name, whether it applied to a borough or to a horse, or to anything else, the best course was to give that name. Confusion only arose when they attempted to give two names to the same thing; and he challenged the right hon. Gentleman to show what harm could possibly arise from giving the name of the division instead of the number. The object of the Amendment was to rescue the Committee from the danger of enacting a number of absurd distinctions that were not necessary. In the interests of accuracy, it was far better to have the names properly given. All that need be done was to strike out "No. 1 and No. 2," wherever those words appeared in the Bill, and to substitute the name of the division—such as "Battersea Division" or "Clapham Division." No confusion could then arise. The right hon. Baronet had accepted the first Amendment he (Mr. Warton) moved, thereby admitting that the Bill had been drafted in an extremely careless manner. If he received any support from the Committee, he should certainly press the Amendment to a division.

Amendment *negatived.*

MR. WARTON said, the next eight Amendments were to the same effect as the one which had just been disposed of. He would therefore pass over them, and go on to the Amendment in page 26, column 1, line 32, to leave out the word "Mid," and insert the word "Central."

["Oh, oh!"]

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would consent to the adoption of the Amendment.

MR. WARTON said, it would appear that the only Members of the Committee who were allowed to be disorderly were the Members of the Government. He was glad that this Amendment would be accepted; but the right hon. Gentleman was desirous that it should be accepted before hon. Members had an opportunity of knowing what they were doing. It would be found all through this Schedule, with this one exception, that when a mid or central division was constituted, the word "central" was used throughout. In this case—namely, the case of Birmingham, the division was spoken of as the Mid Division. He thought it would be wrong to run the pen through the word "central," in order to insert the word "mid" in other cases; and, therefore, he had raised the question in order to give the Committee a chance of saying whether they preferred the word "mid" or the word "central." Personally, he did not strongly press either the one word or the other, because he thought that a fair argument might be raised on both sides. On the one hand, the word "mid" might be the right one, as it had now been consecrated by 17 or 18 years of Parliamentary usage in reference to the counties; but, on the other hand, it might be thought that the better word was the word "central." Then, again, it might be considered proper to confine the word "mid" to the counties, and to use the word "central" in connection with the boroughs. He, therefore, did not wish to have the Amendment too readily accepted, and he was sorry that it had been jumped at so quickly by the right hon. Gentleman. He trusted that the Committee would not accept the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman before they knew

what they were doing. Either course would be agreeable to him. All that he desired was to secure uniformity in drafting, and that they should not have in one place the word "central" and in another the word "mid." He did not care which word was taken; but he desired to ascertain which of the two the Committee preferred. On the one hand, they knew something of the word "mid," as they had now had it in existence for some years; but it had been confined to counties, and "central," which was rather an un-Parliamentary word, might be confined to the boroughs, or got rid of altogether. For the sake of bringing the question fairly before the Committee, he would move in page 26, column 1, line 32, to leave out "Mid," and insert "Central."

Amendment proposed, in page 26, column 1, line 32, to leave out the word "Mid," and insert the word "Central," —(*Mr. Warton,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'Mid' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had thought that he might save the time of the Committee by agreeing to the Amendment at once. He did not think it was a very important matter. There were several Mid Divisions in the case of counties; and in this instance, which applied to the town of Birmingham, the third division appeared to be included in the Bill under the title of Mid Division. As the hon. and learned Member had pointed out, this was an exception to the rule in regard to boroughs, and he thought it would be better to make the Schedule uniform; and, therefore, he was quite ready to accept the Amendment. As the phrase "mid" would probably always be used in reference to county divisions, it might be desirable to retain that word in connection with the counties; but, in the boroughs, it would be more desirable to make it "central." He had, therefore, no objection to the change proposed by the hon. and learned Member.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That the word 'Central' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. WARTON said, the rest of the Amendments which appeared on the Paper in his name were all consequential, or had been settled by previous decisions.

MR. LEWIS FRY said, he had placed an Amendment upon the Paper to substitute the words "Bristol West" for "The West Division," in page 27, column 1, line 24. There were three other similar Amendments, a little lower down on the Paper, with regard to the North, the East, and the South Divisions. He brought all these Amendments forward at the request of the Corporation of Bristol. They were very simple, and would not affect the other provisions of the Bill in any respect. The Corporation of Bristol were desirous that the four Parliamentary divisions into which that City was in future to be divided should be known as Bristol North, South, West, and East respectively. It was considered desirable that the four Members sent from Bristol to the next Parliament should be looked upon as Members for the borough generally; and the Corporation of Bristol were of opinion that that idea would be more fully expressed if the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would accept the designations which he had placed upon the Paper for the four Bristol divisions. The citizens of Bristol were in favour of the change, and the heads of both political Parties had made the suggestion to the Boundary Commissioner, who had received it favourably. He did not know whether his right hon. Friend objected to the Amendment on the ground of uniformity; but, as a matter of fact, the divisions in the Bill were not uniformly named—for instance, in the case of Swansea the new divisions were not spoken of as divisions at all, but one was called "Swansea town," and the other "Swansea district." Therefore, the provisions of the Bill were not strictly uniform. The question was not one of vital moment; but he would express a hope that the right hon. Gentleman would be able to accept the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, in page 27, column 1, line 24, to leave out the words "The West Division," in order to insert the words "Bristol West,"—(*Mr. Lewis Fry,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'The West Division' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, this was the only case, as far as he knew, in which exception had been taken by any borough or body to the course proposed to be taken in the Bill. There were numbers of cases similar to this in the Bill; and if an attempt were made to introduce uniformity in the nomenclature of the Bill in the direction of the Amendment a great number of alterations would have to be made. He thought it was not sufficiently remembered by hon. Members in dealing with the names that all the Representatives would be Members for the whole borough, whatever division they might take their seat for. At present, when there were more than one Member for a borough, one was usually described as the senior, and the other as the junior, Member for the borough. In future, when it became necessary to refer to one of the Members for Bristol, the hon. Member who desired to make the reference would consult his *Dod*, and state what division the Member for Bristol referred to represented. The hon. Member did not propose to leave out the description of the division as North, South, East, or West; but simply, in each case, to prefix the word "Bristol." He certainly thought the best plan would be to adhere to the proposal contained in the Bill.

MR. ACKERS said, he had the honour of representing a large number of persons who would come into two of the divisions of Bristol; and he believed there was a unanimous feeling on the part of both political Parties, and also on the part of those who were at the present moment outside the boundaries of the borough, but who were, under the present Bill, to come within the boundaries, that each division should be known by the name proposed to be given by the hon. Member for Bristol (Mr. Lewis Fry). The adoption of the Amendment would make the nomenclature shorter and easier. The argument of the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill was that the Amendment would interfere with uniformity. He would ask the right hon. Baronet whether the Bill was not filled with anomalies from beginning to end? The object of the Bill was to preserve and create anomalies. He would ask the right hon. Baronet to consider the Amendment as one which, although a small matter, so far as the drafting was concerned, was of great importance from the point of view of local feeling.

MR. WARTON said, that in view of the local feeling in this matter, which had received expression on both sides of the House, he thought the Government might yield to the proposal of the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Lewis Fry). For his own part, he was strongly in favour of consulting local feeling in matters of this kind; and why the Government should oppose that feeling in the borough of Bristol, or any other borough, he could not conceive. Everyone, he thought, ought to entertain a feeling of pride towards his county, borough, or parish; and although he did not profess to understand the exact amount of local feeling in this instance, he said, if the people wished to apply to any division of their borough a particular application, by all means let them do so, especially when their wish met with approval on the Liberal, as well as on the Conservative, side of the House. He could not but feel that the Committee were suffering too much at the hands of the draftsman — that unknown person who seemed to pull the strings from behind. He did not think that the difficulty which the right hon. Baronet apprehended from the adoption of the Amendment was at all likely to arise. On the contrary, seeing that there were to be a large number of Members representing some boroughs, as in the case of Liverpool, which was to have nine, and Glasgow seven, it would be necessary to discriminate, in some way or other, in referring to them, for it would require a wide stretch of the imagination to regard any one of them as the "hon. Member for Liverpool," or the "hon. Member for Glasgow." He was obliged to regard this proposal of the hon. Member for Bristol as an effort to escape from the difficulty in which, by using the terms "number one" and "number two," this matter had been entangled.

MR. LEWIS FRY said, he regretted that the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) could not accede to his proposal; but the question was one upon which he (Mr. Lewis Fry) did not feel justified in occupying the public time by dividing the Committee, and he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

MR. ACKERS said, he was obliged to own that he had not the same kindly feeling which the hon. Member for Bristol had with regard to saving the time of the Government in this matter. He had no wish, however, to waste one moment; still, he regarded this proposal as so reasonable that he must press upon the Government the right of his constituents to ask this simple concession from the Committee. He was aware that under the present arrangement, and in view of the Government majority, nothing could be done unless with the goodwill of the Government; and, therefore, he would again appeal to the right hon. Baronet to make this concession as one which could do no harm, and which local feeling was decidedly in favour of. Under the circumstances, he felt it his duty to press the Amendment to a division.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 65; Noes 19: Majority 46.—(Div. List, No. 91.)

Amendment *negatived.*

Verbal Amendments made.

On the Motion of Sir CHARLES W. DILKE, the following Amendment made:—In page 28, line 37, leave out "East," and insert "South."

MR. WARTON said, he had an Amendment to propose in page 29, line 15, with reference to the borough of Kensington. When there was already a clear definition of a thing, as in the case of Kensington, it seemed absurd to say—

"So much of the Parliamentary borough of Kensington as lies to the north of a line drawn along the centre of the Uxbridge Road."

If those words were retained the locality would be ill-defined, whereas the nomenclature which he proposed would exactly describe the borough. There was nothing in the Schedule to show what the Parliamentary borough was. Here, again, the work of that accomplished draftsman was to be found who defined a certain division to be so much of a Parliamentary borough as lay at the north of a road, or so much as did not. He was convinced that that great master of logic, the Prime Minister, would understand his (Mr. Warton's) meaning in saying that not only was this absurd in itself, but that it left the Committee completely in the dark as to an important provision of the Bill; therefore, he thought that they should put into the Schedule a definition of the Parliamentary borough of Kensington by inserting the words of the Amendment which he begged to move.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, column 1, line 16, to leave out the words "the Parliamentary borough of," in order to insert the words "the parish of Saint Mary Abbott's, Kensington,"—(*Mr. Warton,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'the Parliamentary borough of' stand part of the Question."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had considered the point of the hon. and learned Gentleman with regard to Kensington, which he also raised further on in the case of West Ham. He thought it best to retain the present description, which was in accordance with the precedent supplied by the Act of 1832.

MR. HEALY said, he should give his support to the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) on this Amendment. In the Irish section of the Bill, also, there was extreme haziness as to the borough boundaries. He thought that when he had paid 1*s.* 2½*d.* for the Bill, he ought to have in it every proper information relating to the places referred to. But that was not the case; for, in addition to the cost of the Bill, he would have to buy the Report of the Boundary Commissioners in order to find out what it was that formed any particular borough or division. If hon. Members would turn to the Irish portion of the Bill, they would find on page 101 the names and contents of the divisions of the county Londonderry. The Schedule had it—

"No. 1.—THE NORTH-WEST LONDONDERRY DIVISION.

The Baronies of—
Keenaght,
North-East Liberties of Coleraine,
North-West Liberties of Londonderry (except so much as is comprised in the Parliamentary Borough of Londonderry), and
Tirkeeran (except so much as is comprised in the Parliamentary Borough of Londonderry)."

He knew that this was supposed to be drafting of the most refined character; but, in his opinion, it was more correctly described as "scientific misleading," and

therefore he thought it required amendment at once. He intended, as the hon. and learned Member for Bridport had done, to put down a series of Amendments to deal with points of this kind in connection with the Bill. He thought that a man ought to find in the Bill everything necessary from a geographical point of view; but that was not so, and if that kind of information was wanted he would have to invest a further sum of 17*s.* 6*d.* in the purchase of the Report of the Boundary Commissioners. Take the case of Donegal. It was divided into four divisions; and in order to find out exactly how much was comprised in a particular division one must turn to the Boundary Report, where would be found whole pages of description which could not be obtained otherwise than by the payment of the 17*s.* 6*d.* referred to. He certainly thought that the Bill should give more information than it did. It might be the height of science to describe a portion of a borough or county as "so much as is not comprised in the other portion of it;" but it was not, he ventured to think, the height of common sense. He trusted the Government would accept this Amendment, because, although he did not always agree with the hon. and learned Member for Bridport, he was entirely with him on this question.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the Government would consider the proposals of the hon. and learned Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy) when they came forward. With regard to the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton), if the hon. and learned Member would turn to page 16, line 56, he would find the division of the borough of Kensington referred to as Saint Mary Abbott's, Kensington.

MR. WARTON said, he could not but think that the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had either misapprehended his point, or failed to understand the argument used by the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke). Hon. Members would find the substance of the answer given by the right hon. Baronet on pages 16 and 17. The right hon. Gentleman might not be able to perceive the absurdity he (Mr. Warton) complained of; but it was sheer nonsense to say "so much is to be the division that is not the other part." One would have thought that the genius of the Postmaster General, united to that of the President of the Local Government Board, would have had a more marked effect upon the drafting of the Bill.

MR. HEALY said, he entirely agreed with what had fallen from the hon. and learned Member for Bridport. It was a little matter, but one of extreme importance, that the boundaries of divisions in Ireland should be set out as clearly as possible in a Bill of this character. The cost would only be that of a few leaves of paper, and a great deal of difficulty would be avoided in having to hunt out the information required in the Report of the Boundary Commissioners.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, with regard to the question of the hon. and learned Member for Monaghan, he could only repeat the answer given by his right hon. Friend the Postmaster General—namely, that the point should be considered when it arose. He was, for the reasons already stated, unable to agree to the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Bridport.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 51; Noes 17: Majority 34.—(Div. List, No. 92.)

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would move the two Amendments in his name, the object of which was to correct a discrepancy and bring about a necessary transposition.

On the Motion of Sir CHARLES W. DILKE, the following Amendments made:—

In page 30, column 2, leave out lines 35 to 37, inclusive, and insert "Bramley Ward, except so much as is comprised in Division No. 5 as herein described;"

In same page and column, leave out lines 42 to 44, inclusive, and insert "so much of Bramley Ward as is included in municipal polling district No. thirty-five."

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, that in the course of the discussions which had taken place before the Easter Recess he had brought under the attention of the Committee, and of the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke), the desirability of making some provision in the Bill for the representation of the Irish minority in England and Scotland, amounting to some

2,000,000 of people. He had pointed out that the whole scheme of the Irish portion of the Redistribution Bill was to give adequate representation to the minority in Ireland, altogether apart from mere consideration of numbers. The Government, in discussing the Irish portion of the scheme, had declined to enter into the question of numbers at all. In dealing with Dublin University, the Government had not contended that the 4,000 voters of Trinity College were entitled to two Members on the ground of numbers. The defence of the Government and their suggestion was, that these two seats were required in order to preserve to the minority in Ireland some portion of the representation of the country. Well, he had put a question to the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board with regard to the provision it was proposed to make for the representation of the Irish minority in England, and the answer of the right hon. Gentleman was brief, but very significant. It was that the provision for the representation of minorities would be essentially the same in the Three Kingdoms. That was the principle on which he (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) was willing that his Amendment should be judged. He wished the Irish minority in England and Scotland to get as much representation under the Redistribution Bill as was given to the minority in Ireland under the same measure. That and no more. Well, he was sorry to say that, so far as he had been able to discover, the Boundary Commissioners did not take this question of nationality at all into their consideration in dealing with the Bill. They had confined themselves to a somewhat narrow interpretation of the rules laid down for their guidance; and he ventured to think that they would have acted more in the spirit of the principle of the Bill if they had taken this question of nationality into their consideration. He had pressed this question very strongly on the attention of the right hon. Baronet in a discussion which had taken place before the Easter Recess. He (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) did not suppose his arguments were capable of changing the right hon. Gentleman's views upon the question; but he had been glad to observe that the right hon. Gentleman had accepted the general principle that he had laid down—namely, that the Irish, as a minority in England, were entitled to the same representation as the minority in Ireland had obtained; and the right hon. Baronet, whilst accepting that principle, had said that the question was one the working out of the details of which would cause some difficulty. He (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) had understood the right hon. Baronet by that to imply that the Irish in England were so scattered that it would be very difficult indeed to give them anything like a representation for themselves. He had accepted that principle entirely, and the right hon. Gentleman and the Committee would be perfectly entitled to reject his general principle, if he were not able to lay before them a scheme which would be in accordance with the other principles laid down for the guidance of the Boundary Commissioners. Now, he thought he had succeeded in doing that, not according to the Amendment he had on the Paper, but according to a modification of it which he proposed to move. He very much regretted that he had not been able to put his proposal on the Notice Paper, so that every Member would be able to see it in print. He had not expected the matter to come on so soon, and had hoped to have been able to make some local inquiries which would have necessitated some delay. However, he had given a copy of the Amendment to the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill, another to the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, and he had intended to give one to the noble Lord the Member for Liverpool (Lord Claud Hamilton), only that his stock had become exhausted. He had given one to the hon. Member for Liverpool sitting on the Ministerial side of the House (Mr. S. Smith). He must say a word or two with regard to the boundaries of Liverpool as they were at present. The only two constituencies he proposed to touch were Exchange and Abercrombie. Those who were acquainted with the subject knew, and those who would cast their eyes over the Boundary Commissioners' map of Liverpool would see, that the Exchange Division was very peculiarly constructed indeed—that it jutted out as a sort of peninsula into the Abercrombie Division. That, at first sight, gave to the division an extremely awkward appearance, and deprived it of that

geographical compactness which it had been the desire of the Boundary Commissioners to secure on every possible occasion. That was the first objection to the boundary as at present arranged. The second was this—it was made up of heterogeneous classes, and of people of heterogeneous pursuits. One of the main principles of the Redistribution Bill was that persons of similar pursuits should be as much as possible joined together in the same constituency. That was not the case here. The Exchange Ward consisted largely of the working classes, while Abercrombie Ward, on the other hand, largely consisted of gentlemen engaged in mercantile pursuits; in fact, Exchange Ward was a working class division, and Abercrombie was a mercantile division. The division made by the Boundary Commissioners violated the principle he referred to, inasmuch as it dragged out of the Abercrombie Ward a considerable section of the persons engaged in mercantile pursuits. That portion of Exchange Ward which formed the peninsula jutting into Abercrombie Ward was inhabited by persons engaged in mercantile pursuits; and he believed that some of the gentlemen representing Liverpool themselves regarded this as a not altogether satisfactory arrangement. He thought there was a feeling that the arrangement of the Boundary Commissioners was rather an abnormal and unnatural division of the constituency. His proposal was this—to take out of Exchange and put into Abercrombie Ward that portion of the constituency which would begin at Moss Street in the north, and would then go down and exclude Lime Street Ward, for a considerable portion of it, and a considerable portion of the Exchange Ward for the Exchange Division. He would read out the Amendment, which would render the matter more intelligible—

"Schedule 6, page 31, line 42, column 2, add, after 'Lime Street Ward,' the words 'except that portion bounded by Moss Street, London Road, and William Brown Street."

He would move to add after "Exchange Ward" the words—

"Except that portion of Exchange Ward bounded by a line beginning at the junction of Moorfields and Dale Street, thence proceeding along Tithebarn Street, Old Hall Street, Union Street, Lancelot's Street, and that part of Prince's Dock in Exchange Ward."

The boundary he proposed would, he thought, have the advantage of being perfectly clear and intelligible, because it practically went almost in a straight line from the north to the south of the Exchange Division. He knew there was an objection, and a very strong objection, to this scheme, and that was that it divided up two wards; but his defence in regard to that matter was this—in the first place, it was the only way in which he could make anything like an intelligible proposal; and, secondly, Exchange Ward was a very peculiar ward in this respect—that a portion of it belonged entirely to the mercantile classes, and that a portion of Abercrombie Ward belonged entirely to the working classes. His defence for dividing up Exchange Ward was that he took from it the mercantile portion and put it into the mercantile ward of Abercrombie, and that he left the working class portion in the working class Exchange Division. He hoped that was clear to the Committee. The defence for the course he had taken in dividing Lime Street Ward was this—that he took that portion of it which was occupied by well-to-do shopkeepers and put it into the well-to-do division of Abercrombie. Generally speaking, his defence of his proposal was that it equalized the population. The disparity of the population in the two wards, according to the plan of the Boundary Commissioners at the present moment, was very startling. In Exchange Ward there was a population of 72,000, whilst in the Abercrombie Ward there were only 67,557. Although that might not be a great disparity between two London constituencies, he thought it was a very great disparity indeed between the populations of two Liverpool constituencies. If the proposal he made were adopted the result would be this—he did not know that he could give the exact figures; but, roughly speaking, the result would be, that Exchange Ward, instead of being as it was, would have about 68,000, and Abercrombie Ward would have about 70,000—that was to say, there would be a difference of only 2,000, instead of the difference being between 72,000 on the one hand and 67,557 on the other. Now, he thought he might put his scheme in opposition to that of the Boundary Commissioners as justified on three grounds: first, that of equalization of population—because his plan would equalize the population more

nearly than the scheme of the Commissioners; secondly, that it would make the division — geographically — more correct; and, thirdly, that it would keep people of similar pursuits more together —throwing the wealthy merchants of Exchange Ward and Lime Street into the wealthy ward of Abercrombie. He had kept his main reason to the last. If the change he now advocated were made, the Irish voters would be put far more compactly together than they were at present, which, he thought, was very desirable in the case of Liverpool. Subsequently he should make a similar proposal in regard to Manchester, which, he believed, would be desirable in the interests of both the English and Irish inhabitants of that City. In the first place, he thought it most desirable, on the highest grounds, that the Irish population of this country should learn to take an interest in the affairs of the country; and the real way to give them that interest was to let them feel that in this, the highest Court of Appeal in the Realm, they had their own Representatives elected by their own votes—Gentlemen representative of their interests and of their suffrages. It was desirable, for the sake of the English themselves, that the Irish should be, so to speak, segregated into a constituency of their own. Nothing was more confusing, and nothing could be more demoralizing, than to have the Irish vote continually appealed to at English elections. They saw a sort of Dutch auction constantly going on in regard to the Irish vote between the candidates of the different parties. Pledges were made which sometimes were kept and sometimes were broken, and in place of there being a fair-and-square stand-up fight on purely English principles they saw a kind of triangular duel constantly taking place, leading to much confusion and demoralization in the bid for the Irish vote on both sides. He was desirous of seeing that sort of thing put an end to. He was anxious that the Irish people in England should know that they had an interest in the affairs of this House by having their own Representatives, and that the English candidates should be saved from the temptations and penalties to which such gentlemen putting up for the representation of places containing a large number of Irish voters were at the present moment exposed to. He had now said all that he had to say on the matter. He hoped the Committee would excuse him for not having put his Amendment on the Paper; and he confidently appealed to the right hon. Baronet, if he could not accept the proposal now, at least not to discourage his (Mr. T. P. O'Connor's) efforts to accomplish an object which he thought would be equally advantageous both to the Irish and English people of this country.

Amendment proposed,

In page 31, line 42, column 2, add, after "Lime Street Ward," the words "except that portion bounded by Moss Street, London Road, and William Brown Street."—(*Mr. T. P. O'Connor.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that as the hon. Member opposite (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) had told the Committee, he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had already spoken upon the general question now raised. The Amendment, he thought, could only be accepted by the general consent of the Committee. At present the general feeling would be that it would be impossible to fully consider the arrangement until it had been put into print, and had been some time before them. The hon. Member would feel that himself, he was sure. He (Sir Charles W. Dilke) therefore hoped that the hon. Member would not press his Amendment on the present occasion, but would put it on the Paper, so that it might be considered before Report. Though the proposal might not satisfy the feelings of some hon. Members, he himself was favourably disposed towards its principle. He rather approved of the Amendment which stood on the Paper in preference to that the hon. Member now submitted; but, whatever form the Amendment might take, if it were conceived in the spirit of the hon. Member's observations, there might not be any great difficulty in its being favourably entertained by the Committee. For the reasons he had stated, he trusted the hon. Member would allow this, with other proposals, to remain open for consideration on Report.

MR. WADDY said, that there was one observation which arose with regard to the division of these various boroughs viewed relatively to each other. He

would, with the consent of the Committee, make that observation now with a view to its being considered, because, if it were regarded with favour, it was possible that the Government might deem it necessary to alter the Bill itself as a matter of detail on Report. The point was this—these boroughs—Liverpool being one—were at present undivided. By the Bill they were to be separated into divisions, each division being a separate borough. By the law, as it now stood, a man had a vote if he had not a residence, but premises in a borough, and if he had resided not necessarily in the borough or on the premises, but "in the borough, or within seven miles." Now, there was no provision in the Bill that he was aware of which dealt with this question. How were they henceforward to measure the seven miles?

MR. WARTON: I rise to Order. This has nothing to do with the Amendment before the Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Waddy) has misapprehended the Amendment before us. The observations he is now making are not at all germane to this Amendment.

MR. PARNELL said, that although he always objected to leave matters to be decided on a later stage of a Bill, he thought that on the present occasion his hon. Friend (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), whose Amendment was not on the Paper, would do well to leave the matter over for the consideration of the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) until the Report stage. While he would advise his hon. Friend to withdraw, for the present, his Amendment, he (Mr. Parnell) might take this opportunity of expressing his entire concurrence with the views his hon. Friend had put forward. There could be no doubt that the Bill as it stood left the Irish minority in England almost entirely unrepresented. A claim had been made for the separate representation of the English minority in Ireland, and the Committee was aware that the Bill gave that English minority a representation which had been variously estimated at from 23 to 27 Members. But the English minority in Ireland was not at all as numerous as the Irish minority in England and Scotland. It was calculated there was an Irish population, either by descent as regarded the first generation, or by birth, of very close upon 2,000,000 in England, and Wales, and Scotland, and nobody had ever claimed that the English minority in Ireland amounted to more than about 1,250,000; but while a large representation of 23 to 27 Members had been given to that minority in Ireland, they found that under the Bill, as it stood, under no possible circumstances could the Irish minority in England obtain a representation of more than two or three Members. This, therefore, was a matter for the very serious consideration of the Government; and he hoped that they would see their way, between this and Report, to accede to the able arguments of his hon. Friend (Mr. T. P. O'Connor). As regarded Liverpool, at all events, he hoped the Irish Representatives would be met by the Government in a fair spirit.

MR. WHITLEY said, he had listened carefully to the observations of hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway; but he could not share their view—that mere nationality should be represented. He had always looked upon the citizens of Liverpool as a united people, and he had felt that while representing the interests of the other sections, he had also represented the interests of the Irish section. He should regret very much if a line of demarcation were drawn between English and Irish living together in the same city. With regard to the proposals of the Bill, he was bound to say that, as far as Liverpool was concerned, the Commissioners' Report was accepted by all the leading Parties. They gave a great deal of attention to it, and, as far as he knew, all parties were struck with the admirable manner in which the Commissioners discharged their duty. He believed it would be found that all sections of the Liverpool people would be represented by the Bill as it stood. He did not think it possible for the Commissioners to have arrived at a more satisfactory result. He was afraid the hon. Gentleman (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) was wrong as to the alterations of the population. The matter was very carefully considered, and he believed the populations of the Exchange and Abercrombie Wards were correctly stated. He was afraid the proposition of the hon. Gentleman would, instead of equalizing the population,

make a greater difference than there was at present. On the whole, the divisions as proposed by the Commissioners were loyally accepted by the city at large, and any alteration of them would meet with disapproval.

MR. JACOB BRIGHT said, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would seriously consider the proposition of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor). His (Mr. Jacob Bright's) object in rising was to say that, so far as he had learned in Manchester, if the Government found it practicable to adopt the view of the hon. Member for Galway, very little opposition would be offered in the city. If it were practicable so to arrange an electoral district that the main body of the Irish electorate should inhabit that district, it might happen that they would have an Irish Representative in the House. He, for one, should not be sorry if some of our large Irish populations in England did have Irish Representatives; indeed, he agreed with the hon. Gentleman the Member for Galway that it would be better both for the Irish population and the English population that that should be so. He hoped this question would be fairly considered by the Government, and that, if possible, the Amendment would be adopted.

LORD CLAUD HAMILTON said, he entirely disagreed with what had fallen from the hon. Gentleman the Member for Manchester (Mr. Jacob Bright). He cordially endorsed the view of his hon. Colleague (Mr. Whitley) that it was the desire of the people generally to keep the divisions of the city as they had been arranged by the Boundary Commission. There was a great desire among all classes in Liverpool that there should not be a hard-and-fast line of demarcation drawn between the English and the Irish population, as suggested by the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor). It was felt that the enmity which had existed at times between the Irish and the English people in the city was dying out; and efforts were being made in Liverpool, as elsewhere, to promote the most kindly feeling between the two races. He could not help thinking that any attempt to sharply separate the two peoples, such as was contained in the proposal of the hon. Member for Galway, was likely to be mischievous in its results. He trusted, therefore, that both in the interests of public policy, as well as in the interests of the convenience of the people of Liverpool, who cordially approved of the divisions which had been made by the Government, the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would adhere to the scheme, and that he would, after the consideration he had promised to give to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Galway, be able to announce his resolve to make no alteration in the Government proposal.

MR. HEALY said, it was to be regretted that the admirable sentiments of the noble Lord (Lord Claud Hamilton) appeared to be addressed entirely to one country. The noble Lord did not see the logic of his remarks as applied to Ireland, because, while one, the Irish portion of the Bill was under consideration, the Committee constantly heard from the noble Lord and his hon. Friends of the difference between Protestants and Catholics.

LORD CLAUD HAMILTON: Loyalists and Nationalists; I never mentioned Protestants.

MR. HEALY said, that what he wished to point out for the consideration of hon. Gentlemen was that the Catholic population of England numbered 2,000,000, and that it was extremely desirable they should have some representation in the House of Commons. At the present time, there was only one Catholic representing a constituency in Great Britain, and he had only been returned within the last few years. It certainly was not a credit to the generosity or spirit of fair play of the people of England that the fact of a man being a Catholic was sufficient to deprive him of any right to sit in the House of Commons. The Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) was intended to put an end to the present state of things; and he (Mr. Healy) did not think it laid in the mouth of the noble Lord (Lord Claud Hamilton), who was extremely anxious, by means of the most extraordinary jerrymandering, to secure the representation of the minority in Donegal, to object to an alteration of the Exchange Division of Liverpool which would enable the Catholics to obtain a Representative. The noble Lord occu-

pied a very curious position when he objected to the proposal of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Galway. This was not at all a matter between the English and Irish races. The question of education entered into it to a very large extent; and he (Mr. Healy) was surprised that Gentlemen who, like the noble Lord, supported denominational education, should be found denying that Catholics were entitled to some distinct representation. He (Mr. Healy) could not help placing the statesmanlike attitude of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Manchester (Mr. Jacob Bright) in contradistinction with the attitude of the noble Lord. The Amendment was distinctly against the interest of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Manchester. The hon. Gentleman was well known to be in favour of secular education; yet, in a spirit of fair play to all classes, he was willing to accept an Amendment which would give the Irish or Catholic population of Manchester a Member. Hon. Gentlemen above the Gangway on the Opposition side of the House were altogether opposed to the acceptance of any such Amendment. Considering the way in which the 1,000,000 of so-called Loyalists of Ireland had been treated, it was not too much to expect that the 2,000,000 Catholics of England should have some special representation under the Bill. The noble Lord evidently did not seem to agree that what was sauce for the goose was sauce for the gander. The Loyalists of Ireland, who were composed of magistrates, deputy lieutenants, landlords, and other persons of great distinction and quality, were to have ample representation in the House of Commons; but the unfortunate Irish people of England, who, as a rule, belonged to the lower classes, and who from that very fact were entitled to every protection from Parliament, were to be deprived of representation. If the noble Lord would only turn over in his own mind the extraordinary conflict there was in the attitude he took up between England and Ireland, he would see the absurdity of the position he assumed. He (Mr. Healy) was very glad indeed that the hon. Member for Manchester had supported the Amendment; and he trusted that the anxiety of the Government that minorities should find representation in the House would prompt them to accept the proposition. He hoped that, at the next General Election, it would not come home to the Irish in England that the persons opposed to the representation of Catholics were Members of the Tory Party, and that the persons in favour of it were the Members of the Liberal Party. He assured the noble Lord and his Friends that it would be an evil lesson to teach the Irish working classes that it was he and his hon. Friends who were opposed to their obtaining separate representation, whereas it was the Liberals who were anxious that justice should be done them. He feared the speech of the noble Lord would have an unfortunate effect in many districts of the country. Of course, the noble Lord's official Leaders were conveniently absent, and the matter admitted of reconsideration by the Conservative Party. He (Mr. Healy) trusted that both the Liberal and Conservative Parties would see it was undesirable that the conflict on Irish questions, which were totally distinct from English questions, should be introduced into English politics. Candidates of each school of politics found it extremely inconvenient when they heard so much of the undesirability of the Vaccination Acts; how much more undesirable would it be to have the Irish masses raising their war cry and thrusting themselves into English affairs? He trusted the Government would see their way to accept the proposition of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Galway.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he had no reason to be dissatisfied with the reception that had been given to his Amendment, especially by the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke). He joined his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy) in sincerely thanking the hon. Gentleman the Member for Manchester (Mr. Jacob Bright) for his kindly and wise words with regard to this question. On the other hand, he regretted the attitude taken by the noble Lord (Lord Claud Hamilton) and the hon. Gentleman the Member for Liverpool (Mr. Whitley). He was glad, however, to hear the noble Lord say that he was desirous to see the relations between the Irish and English in this country improved and made more kindly. He was glad to learn that the relations between the Irish and

nglish working classes in Liverpool ere kindly, and he hoped they would remain. But he ventured to present the mind of the noble Lord this view the question—that the best way, ter all, of creating and fostering a ndly feeling between the different asses of the population was to give ch class of population an idea that it ad its full share of rights; and he did ot think that a minority numbering 000,000 people, of a distinct nationaty and creed, could be said to have a use of having its full rights as long as ey were practically debarred from representation. He felt that the fact of e Irish in England having their own epresentatives in the House to counsel nd control them would be the best eans in the world of bringing about that ndly relation between the Irish and nglish races which all desired to enourage. He hoped that before the Report age the noble Lord and the hon. Genman (Mr. Whitley) would reconsider eir position, and be able to view the atter a little more favourably. If need e, he would be willing to make some lteration in his Amendment. He might ave based his Amendment on considera-ons altogether apart from nationality. He might have based it on the greater qualization of population, or on the imilarity of pursuits. He felt it deirable, however, to state to the Comittee his view upon the question f nationality. He did not propose, fter the favourable reception his proosal had met with, to divide the Comittee upon it. He would now ask eave to withdraw it, promising that if e got anything like encouragement rom the Conservative side of the House e would re-introduce it on Report.

LORD CLAUD HAMILTON said, he vished to say, before the Amendment vas disposed of, that hon. Members ad somewhat misrepresented what had allen from his hon. Colleague (Mr. Whitley) and himself. He (Lord Claud Hamilton) was under the impression hey were discussing the arrangements vith regard to Liverpool, and these rrangements alone. He did not allude t all to the general arrangements as to he representation of the Irish in Engand, or on the other side of the Channel; e simply directed his remarks to what vas before the Committee—namely, the epresentation of Liverpool. He and his hon. Colleague had been given to understand that the divisions made by the Commissioners gave satisfaction not only to the Liberal and Conservative Parties, but also to the so-called Nationalist Party in the city. His own belief was that the Nationalists of Liverpool were perfectly satisfied with the arrangements; but a few exceedingly astute and clever agents from the headquarters of the organization, which was so admirably represented by the hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) and his hon. Friends, paid a visit to Liverpool, and it was through their agency that these new proposals were made. He was convinced that the arrangements made by the Government were, on the whole, the fairest that could be made, and he sincerely trusted they would be adhered to.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, that his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) had nothing to do with the Irish organization in England or Scotland. He (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) was sorry to say he had the entire responsibility of that organization. The proposals which he now submitted were practically the same proposals as were made by the Nationalists before the Commissioners at the local inquiry. The Nationalists in Liverpool were quite astute enough to manage the matter for themselves. The only thing that the Central Association in London did in the matter was to ask the local Representatives what their proposals were. He now asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. WARTON said, he proposed to insert, after the words "Walton-on-the-Hill," in page 31, column 1, line 11, the words "hereinafter called the starting-point." The starting-point of the district was often referred to; and therefore, for preciseness and general accuracy, it was well that it should be properly specified where it was first mentioned.

Amendment proposed,

In page 31, column 1, line 11, to insert, after "Walton-on-the-Hill," the words "hereinafter called the starting-point."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he saw no objection to the Amendment.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

MR. SAMUEL SMITH said, he proposed, in page 32, column 1, line 1, in the title, to leave out "Abercrombie," and insert "Central." The object of his Amendment was a very simple one; it was to give a more appropriate title to what was really the Central Division of Liverpool. The title "Abercrombie" was a very unhappy one. It had no relevancy to that part of the city. It only applied to a small area called the Abercrombie Ward, and it was not at all suitable to designate the great bulk of the division. As far as he had been able to ascertain, the present title did not give satisfaction to the people; they would like some designation more appropriate and suitable to the most important part of the city. The district contained no less than six wards, and it bore the same relation to Liverpool that the City of London bore to the Metropolis; the bulk of the commerce of Liverpool centred in this division; it contained all the banks of Liverpool, the larger part of the commercial community, and a very large population engaged in business. It also contained, he believed, the greatest rateable value of any district of Liverpool; and, upon the whole, he thought most persons would agree with him it was really the most important division in Liverpool. It certainly was entitled to a designation more suitable and appropriate than the one chosen by the Commissioners. The one he suggested was a very suitable one. He could see no reasonable objection to call it the Central Division, and he hoped it would find acceptance at the hands of the Government. He need not go into much detail; but there was just one consideration which he wished to urge, although it might be called a sentimental one. A valid reason, in his opinion, why the division should be given a commanding designation was that it contained the birth-place of the Prime Minister. He thought that the portion of the city which had the honour of giving birth to the greatest statesman of modern times should be called Central Liverpool. He felt sure the designation he suggested would give general satisfaction to the people of Liverpool.

Amendment proposed,

In page 32, column 1, line 1, in the title, to leave out the word "Abercrombie," in order to insert the word "Central,"—(*Mr. Samuel Smith,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'Abercrombie' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he should have been glad to accept this Amendment; but it had been found, upon inquiry, that it did not command general assent. In the absence of that, he thought it would be unwise to change the name of the division, although the point was one to which he did not attach the same amount of importance as the hon. Member who moved the Amendment.

MR. WHITLEY said, he was bound to confess that he did not view the change proposed as one which would give general satisfaction. If his hon. Colleague had proposed that there should be North, South, East, and West Wards, he should have entertained no objection whatever to the proposal; but he did not think it would give satisfaction to the inhabitants to call the ward the Central Division. It was in this ward that the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government was born; and if his hon. Friend were to propose to distinguish it by the name of the right hon. Gentleman, he should, of course, have no objection to that. This question had been duly considered when the Boundary Commissioners met; and until he had seen the Amendment of his hon. Colleague on the Paper he had no idea that any change would be proposed; and he was obliged to confess that he thought that the alteration in question would be objectionable to the people of the ward.

LORD CLAUD HAMILTON said, he agreed with the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken (Mr. Whitley) that if the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) could see his way to distinguish the other Liverpool divisions by the words "North, South, East, and West" there would be no objection to his calling the Abercrombie Division the Central Division. But he did not otherwise see why they, in Liverpool, should, so to speak, revolve around the hon. Member's central point. Liverpool was, no doubt,

proud of being called the birth-place of the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister; but he had always noticed that, when speaking in different parts of the Kingdom, the right hon. Gentleman did not give any confirmation of the idea that he was born at Liverpool; on the contrary, he referred to himself in Scotland as a Scotsman, and in Wales as a Welshman. That being so, he began to have some doubt as to whether the right hon. Gentleman was born in Liverpool at all. With regard to the Amendment, he repeated that there would be no objection to Abercrombie Division being called the Central Ward if the others were described as "North, South, East, and West."

MR. HEALY said, his attention had been directed to the names of some places in Ireland which were mis-spelt in the Bill. He rose to ask whether the spelling of the names of places would be carefully revised and correctly given in the Act? It was likely that a question of law might turn upon the point as to whether the name of a place was correctly given or not; and he thought that it would, perhaps, be well to give power to one of the Judges to settle any such question in accordance with the general principles of the Act. There were geographical considerations involved here, and it seemed to him a serious thing to pass the Bill without taking power of reference to some tribunal in cases where mistakes were made in the spelling. There were many errors with regard to the spelling of Irish names at once apparent on the face of the Bill which involved power of reference to a tribunal in case of need.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the point raised by the hon. and learned Member for Monaghan was important, and his suggestion should be considered.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH said, he believed that the alteration he proposed, if adopted by the Government, would be acceptable to all parties concerned in the matter. The division in question differed from the other divisions of Liverpool in not having a local designation. All the other divisions had names of old standing which everyone knew, which were accepted by all, and which were perfectly intelligible. The designation "Abercrombie" had no relation whatever with the greater part of the division, and it would be a long time before it was recognized by the inhabitants. He was by no means opposed to the town being divided geographically, and he would be glad if, before the Report, some satisfactory arrangement could be arrived at in the meantime.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Amendment *negatived.*

Verbal Amendments made.

VISCOUNT LEWISHAM said, the series of Amendments which he had placed upon the Paper all depended one upon the other. There was a strong feeling among a considerable section of the inhabitants of Wolverhampton that the scheme of the Commissioners was not a satisfactory one; and at the time when the Commission was held at Wolverhampton considerable opposition was expressed to the proposed arrangement. The Committee would understand that, at the present time, the borough of Wolverhampton consisted of five parishes —Wolverhampton, Willenhall, Sedgley, Bilston, and Wednesfield; and although, at the last Census, the population was not quite up to 165,000, yet, considering that it was still increasing, he thought that the town was fully entitled to a third Member. It was proposed to divide the borough into three divisions—West, East, and South. As to the South Division, he had little or nothing to say, because he believed the arrangement gave satisfaction to everyone concerned, except so far as concerned an Amendment that would become necessary if the proposal was agreed to. In line 33, page 38 of the Bill, in connection with the words "the parish of Bilston, except so much as comprised in Division No. 1 as herein described," it would be necessary to substitute for "Division No. 1," "Division No. 2." It was difficult to see how, with regard to the East and West Divisions, the Commissioners had, in the scheme which they proposed, carried out the instructions issued to them at the commencement of their operations. The proposal of the Commissioners was that the West Division should consist of St. Mark Ward, St. Paul Ward, St. John Ward, St. George Ward, St. Matthew Ward, and so much of the parish of Bilston as is known as Ettingshall New Village. The Eastern Division was to consist of St. Mary Ward, St. James Ward, St. Peter Ward,

and the parishes of Wednesfield and Willenhall. Amongst the points to be considered in the Instructions issued to the Commissioners, the two most important were that they should have regard to the equalization of population, and to the similarity of pursuits in the different districts. The population of the Western Division was 55,167, and that of the Eastern Division 53,742, the difference between them being 1,725. But, while considering this point, they must also take into consideration the fact that the larger number was given to the increasing division of the West, and not to the decreasing division in the East; and, therefore, he thought they would be justified in considering that in the course of another 10 years the difference would be considerably larger than it was at present. Now, the alternative scheme, which he proposed, would give to the Western Division a population of 54,298, and to the Eastern Division, which would include the wards of St. George and St. James, and a portion of the parish of Bilston, a population of 54,199, which would make a difference between the two divisions of 99 only. He thought that, so far as the equalization of population was concerned, his scheme was preferable to that of the Commissioners; but there remained, of course, the more important question as to the pursuits of the inhabitants of the two divisions, and that he thought was worthy of consideration. By the Commissioners' scheme it was proposed to take St. Peter's Ward out of the centre of the town, and to group it with outlying villages with which it had no connection whatever. He did not wish to say one word in depreciation of the inhabitants or their pursuits in the parishes of Willenhall and Wednesfield; because he was aware that they carried on a useful industry which took the form of the manufacture of steel locks and rat-traps. But the pursuits of the inhabitants of St. Peter's Ward were mechanical and professional. His contention was that the important ward of St. Peter's ought not to have been taken out of the Western Division. It contained all the principal municipal buildings; and although that did not carry with it any right with regard to the franchise, yet he thought that some consideration ought to be given to the fact. It appeared to him that it was hardly in accordance with the Instructions issued to the Boundary Commissioners that St. Paul's Ward should be taken out of this division and grouped with the outlying districts named. Again, a comparison of the numbers of high and low rated houses in the respective divisions afforded, in his opinion, a clear proof that the pursuits and occupations of the two districts under discussion were not in any way similar. It was very difficult to understand what had guided the Commissioners in putting forward this scheme; and the only thing he could find that gave any kind of clue to their line of action was the rule laid down by themselves, that in the case of important rural towns the uniform division of the wards should, if possible, be preserved intact. No doubt that was an excellent rule; but he thought that the case of Wolverhampton, now under consideration, was the exception which proved the rule, and he considered that two rules laid down in the Instructions issued to the Commissioners should have more weight than this one self-imposed rule. Again, on geographical grounds he thought the scheme which he proposed was in every way more compact and more suitable, there being a very good natural boundary to the proposed division of two wards formed by the canal. For the reasons he had given, and because he believed that his proposal was far preferable to the scheme of the Commissioners in the three points—equalization of population, similarity of pursuits, and geographical position — he begged to move the Amendment standing in his name.

Amendment proposed,

In page 38, column 1, line 21, after the words "West Division," to insert the words "Saint Peter Ward."—(*Viscount Lewisham.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he was sure the noble Viscount would forgive him if he did not argue this matter upon its merits. His reason for that was that he was speaking in the presence of both of the hon. Members for Wolverhampton, who were more capable of arguing the question on its merits than he was. Without going into the scheme of the noble Viscount he might say that it was one which cut up the wards to a

very considerable extent. It was one of the two schemes brought before the Commissioners by Liberals and Conservatives, both of which schemes they rejected in favour of a scheme of their own to which they adhered. The scheme embodied in the Bill was framed by General Carey, one of the most competent engineers of the Local Government Board, after careful inquiry on the spot, and it was subsequently adopted by Mr. Henley, the Boundary Commissioner. The entire Commission considered the recommendations of Mr. Henley and also adopted the scheme. Now, the authority he had named was so high that, for his part, he should be disposed not to go into the merits of the matter, but to pin his faith to the decision arrived at, which he thought the Committee would adopt.

VISCOUNT LEWISHAM said, he did not wish to impugn the authority of the right hon. Baronet; but he thought the Committee would be glad to know the reasons that guided Mr. Henley and induced him to recommend the scheme adopted by the Commission. He was bound to say that his own alternative scheme appeared to be superior to the other.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the main ground on which Mr. Henley advised the scheme was the general rule that, in boroughs, it was desirable to follow the wards, and which, in the absence of evidence the other way, he thought ought to be adhered to.

VISCOUNT LEWISHAM said, he should have thought that the two rules laid down for the Commissioners would have had precedence over a rule laid down by themselves.

MR. H. H. FOWLER said, if they were to discuss the decisions of the Boundary Commissioners in the case of one borough, they would have to discuss them with regard to every borough and every county. He thought that if the Government had delegated an inquiry of this sort to a body of able men who had discharged their duties to the satisfaction of both political Parties, the decision arrived at by them ought to be accepted. But the noble Viscount opposite (Viscount Lewisham) had given a very defective, if not a very inaccurate, account of the circumstances. He was bound to say that so far as having regard to the pursuits of the inhabitants and population, the Boundary Commissioners had, in his opinion, rigidly followed their Instructions in dividing the borough as appeared in the Schedule. The population of Wolverhampton consisted largely of the artizan class, and it could not be divided as in the case of London or Manchester. That would be seen by hon. Members from the fact that the constituency of Wolverhampton, which before the Reform Bill was passed numbered 4,000, was now 24,000. He had himself pointed out to the Commissioners at Wolverhampton that, with the exception of St. Peter's, to which the noble Viscount had alluded, there was no single ward in the borough in which the majority of houses were not valued under £10 a-year. He did not profess himself to be altogether satisfied with the division of Wolverhampton as adopted by the Commissioners; but a more grotesque piece of jerrymandering than that put forward by the noble Viscount could not be conceived, and if it were laid upon the Table of the House, he believed the noble Viscount would be the first to say that it was impracticable. The schemes put forward by the Conservatives and Liberals had been rejected by the Commissioners in favour of their own. General Carey was in the town two days, and, after making very careful inquiry, he devised a scheme which was carefully considered by Mr. Henley, and then by the Boundary Commissioners, who unanimously approved it. Under the circumstances, he thought the Committee would embark upon a difficult and unwise course if they were to attempt to reverse the decision at which the Commissioners had arrived. He considered it, on the whole, a fair and just decision, and one which carried out the Instructions given to the Commissioners.

MR. TOMLINSON said, he thought the speech of the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. H. H. Fowler) was really one in favour of the proposal of the noble Viscount. He had said that there were two schemes fairly supported, neither of which was adopted by the Commissioners. But the scheme of the Commissioners, which he thought unsatisfactory, was the one before the Committee. If it was not satisfactory to the hon. Gentleman himself, it would be equally unsatisfactory to the Party of

which he was a distinguished Member in that House. Beyond that, it appeared to have nothing upon its own merits to support it. He had the plan of the Commissioners before him, which showed one division as having a very curious shape, with a piece cut out of it apparently for no reason. But if the ward of St. Peter were added, as proposed by the noble Viscount, instead of having an awkward boundary it would have a regular appearance. Therefore, he was favourably impressed by the proposal of the noble Viscount; and he thought that when a question of this kind was before the Committee, it was upon its merits that it should be considered by the Committee. The hon. Gentleman said that if they questioned the decision of the Commissioners, they would have to do the same in the case of every borough in the Kingdom; but he (Mr. H. H. Fowler) had told them himself that Wolverhampton presented special difficulties. Certainly, from the map of the Commissioners, it appeared to him (Mr. Tomlinson) that Wolverhampton was presenting exceptional difficulties in division. That being so, it was an argument, not for accepting *en bloc* the conclusions come to by the Boundary Commissioners, but for endeavouring to apply themselves to the merits of the question brought before them. He was sure it must be a gratification to the Committee to see in his place the right hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. C. P. Villiers), who had been for so long a distinguished Member of the House. That right hon. Gentleman had known Wolverhampton probably for a longer period than anyone else in the House, and it was to be hoped that before the question was disposed of the Committee might have an opportunity of hearing him upon it. On a *primâ facie* view of the case—which was all he (Mr. Tomlinson) had had of it—the scheme proposed by his noble Friend was a much more reasonable one than that of the Boundary Commissioners; and if he went to a division on it, he should, unless some reasons were given tending to show that it would not work, support him.

Mr. WARTON said, he hoped the Committee would have the pleasure of hearing the right hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. C. P. Villiers) on the subject. If he (Mr. Warton) understood rightly, what the junior Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) had said was that the houses which were above £50 rental were not equally distributed over the different wards of the town; and if he (Mr. Warton) rightly understood the noble Viscount's point, it was that he objected to the grouping of St. Peter's Ward with Wednesfield and Ettingshall New Village. It was clear that in St. Peter's there were a large number of houses of over £50 rental, and only 68 of £5; that in Wednesfield there were no houses of over £50, and 916 under £5; and that in Ettingshall there were 1,120 under £5, and only 37 of over £50. [Mr. H. H. Fowler dissented.] The hon. Member opposite shook his head; but he (Mr. Warton) maintained that his statement was accurate. Did the hon. Member deny all the figures, or any of them; and, if the latter, which of them? Did he mean to say that the two statements as to St. Peter's Ward were not correct; that in Wednesfield there were houses of over £50 rental, and not 916 of under £5; and that in Ettingshall there were not 1,120 of under £5, nor 37 of over £50? The shake of the head might apply to only one or two of these propositions. He must ask the hon. Member not to shake his head at all these propositions, but to confine himself to shaking his head at one or two at a time. Here were six propositions, and he trusted the hon. Member would be kind enough to give the Committee some further information, and not drive them into the very painful position of going through a solemn farce. They were now considering the houses in the borough, and it was necessary that they should have proper material before them to guide them. He did not wish to appear discourteous; but he certainly thought that all through the proceedings of this Committee there had been a sort of apathy amongst hon. Members, instead of a real, intelligent apprehension of the matters brought before them. They had all paid compliments to the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke). They all knew his ability, and the able manner in which he had piloted the measure through the House. They were all prepared to do him justice in this respect; in fact, he (Mr. Warton) was afraid they did him too much jus-

tice. He thought they ought not to leave to the right hon. Baronet the settlement of all these difficult points. Hon. Members should respect their own judgment; and if this was the way they were to hurry through the consideration of these matters, the Committee stage on the Bill was nothing less than a gigantic farce. This should be a slow, solemn, intelligent, deliberate, procedure, and they should care for the opinions of no one but themselves. In his opinion the noble Viscount had made out an unanswerable case. This borough of Wolverhampton, for some reason or other he could not understand—with a population of 165,000—had been singled out for three Members, an honour conferred on no other borough of the same size. He could not imagine how this arrangement had been decided upon, unless it had been generally believed at the time it had been entered into that there was some mode of dividing the borough which would warrant it. There was, he thought, some reason in the back ground not yet explained. He did not wish to suggest it; but when they were driven to the authority of the Commissioners, or anyone else, and these matters were not explained as they ought to be, it seemed to him that they had reason to find fault with the course that had been taken. The Committee should show itself in earnest in this matter.

MR. C. P. VILLIERS: I do not wish to waste the time of the Committee, but only desire to say a word or two in support of everything which has been stated by my hon. Colleague (Mr. H. H. Fowler) in favour of the arrangement made in this Bill for redistribution. What my hon. Friend has stated is strictly true—that the division of the borough was not sought by the borough itself, and that he was not particularly in favour of it. The policy of the Bill is to divide the great towns, and to give each several Members, and when it was laid down that Wolverhampton was to be divided the question was considered in the borough. There were, of course, parties interested, for the future, in the result of the division, and they each prepared their plans. These were laid before the Boundary Commissioners when they came down, and it would have been impossible for anyone to have bestowed greater care and attention upon an inquiry than these gentlemen gave to the consideration of the proposals of the one Party and the other. I think I recollect that that was admitted at the time. They rejected the propositions of the two different Parties, and proposed one of their own, which they considered more strictly in conformity with the Instructions they had received; and I am bound to say that I think their plan was accepted by both Parties. At any rate, if it has not been accepted by each Party, the Party I feel the greatest interest in withdrew its opposition, and submitted to the plan of the Commissioners, for the reason that those gentlemen seemed to have conducted the inquiry in such a fair and impartial manner. I remember, myself, being asked about these Commissioners—being questioned as to who they were, and whether they could be trusted. I found them to be gentlemen opposed in opinion to myself, but willing to do their duty in a most fair and impartial manner, and I urged my friends to lay all the facts of their case before them, and to submit to their judgment. That, I believe, has been done. There was another plan laid before the Commissioners; but I believe its rejection was not submitted to with the same patience that was exhibited in the other case. The decision of the Commissioners, however, was entirely free from political or Party opinion. They declared when they came into the town that they would not permit any political motives to influence their decision; they faithfully adhered to that rule, and the borough has submitted respectfully and quietly to their decision, which was arrived at after hearing the evidence adduced and carefully weighing and considering that evidence. So far as I understand the matter, the noble Viscount opposite (Viscount Lewisham) has made a statement, which is not exactly evidence, upon the strength of which he asks the Committee to reverse the decision of the Commissioners. He does not impugn the conduct or motives of these gentlemen, nor does he show any reason for believing that they followed any opinion but their own. I do not ask what the Committee will do. If they accept the judgment of the Commissioners in this case, well and good; but if they do not accept it, they will have no argument in principle when asked to adopt a similar course in many other cases. So far as I know, the

unanimous opinion of the borough—not only of those who support the Commissioners, but of those who have had the decision given against them — is that that decision is fair. I ask what ground is there for disturbing the arrangement? —and, of course, the noble Viscount proposes to disturb the judgment of the Commissioners. I own I know of none. I am not particularly wedded to the system which involves the division of the borough, and I do not particularly approve of the single-Member system; but I do think we should submit to certain rules or judgments when they are laid down on sufficient authority. I repeat that I do not think the noble Viscount has any ground for his proposition.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he wished to say a very few words on this subject. His noble Friend (Viscount Lewisham) had made a very able speech, and had brought out some very important points for their consideration; but he (Sir Stafford Northcote) thought the Committee should bear in mind that one cardinal point in the arrangement on which the Bill was founded was the delegating to the Commissioners, carefully selected without reference to political Party, and very competent men, the task of making local inquiries, and arriving at awards in the matter of the revision of boundaries. He thought it was unanimously agreed that these gentlemen, though they might have made mistakes—for as all men were fallible, so they were fallible also—had yet discharged their duties with most perfect fairness, and most perfect abstinence from anything like political jobbery or improper conduct. It was, therefore, of considerable importance that they should —unless some very strong reason was shown to the contrary—support the decisions to which the Commissioners had arrived. He would remind his noble Friend—no; he could not do that, as the noble Viscount was not in Parliamentary life at the time—but he would tell his noble Friend that on the occasion of a former Reform Bill Boundary Commissioners were appointed, and took a great deal of trouble to carry out the duty confided to them, but that after proposing various boundaries their work was overthrown by the House of Commons. It had always been the subject of remark since that that was a very unfortunate and unfair way of treating the Commissioners. That had not occurred on the present occasion; in fact, there was a general desire to abide by the decision of the Commissioners. If the House had undertaken—which, of course, it might have done — to arrange the boundaries itself, it would have been much more convenient to act by means of Select Committees than by a Committee of the Whole House, for in that way it would have been easier to sift these matters. Instead of that, however, the duty had been relegated to a body of gentlemen who had visited the localities, and fully considered the question of the boundaries on the spot. He thought, then, that unless there was strong reason to think that the Commissioners had not had all the facts brought before them, or that by some unfortunate circumstances they had been in some way or other misled—unless they had evidence of that kind, he thought it would be unwise, and would be laying up for themselves a great deal of trouble in the future discussions of the Bill, if they departed from the recommendations of the Commissioners. The question was not as to the laziness of the Committee, but as to how far the Committee was competent to deal with a matter of this sort in a proper and satisfactory way. His noble Friend must bear in mind that if he were successful in upsetting the decision of the Commissioners, they would find that many other decisions would be challenged, and they, on the Opposition side of the House, would most probably not profit by the re-opening of questions to be decided by the majority that happened to be in the House at the time. Therefore, with an acknowledgment of the ability with which the noble Viscount had brought the question forward, and admitting that he had made some points in a very ingenious manner, he (Sir Stafford Northcote) hoped that the Committee would adhere to the decision of the Commissioners.

VISCOUNT LEWISHAM said, he should not trouble the Committee to go to a division. The Committee would excuse him for having introduced the subject, seeing that they had had the pleasure of listening to the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. C. P. Villiers). He (Viscount Lewisham) should like to say that he had no intention whatever

of uttering a word against the manner in which the Commissioners had done their work, and simply desired to base his case on the two points laid down in the Instructions to those gentlemen—namely, the equalization of population, and the similarity of pursuits. He should like to tell the hon. Gentleman the junior Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) that he certainly should not have quoted the figures he had given if he had not been pretty certain that they were correct. The hon. Gentleman had rather impugned them, but had never said anything to prove them wrong. He (Viscount Lewisham) was certainly fully under the impression that both the facts and figures he had used were absolutely correct, and till he had evidence to the contrary he should continue to do so. If the Committee would allow him he would withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

MR. WEBSTER said, he rose to move the Amendment he had given Notice of, namely—

"Schedule 6, page 39, line 3, leave out from 'Aberdeen' to 'polling district,' in column 2, line 12, both inclusive;"

and, in doing so, he would endeavour to state his grounds for bringing forward the proposal as concisely as he could. At the same time, as the question had enlisted the anxious interest of the City of Aberdeen, he hoped the Committee would extend to him that indulgence which they always granted to a constituency complaining of hard treatment under a Bill. The object of the Amendment was to withdraw Aberdeen from the list of those important cities which had to be divided, and to include it among those having now two Members, and which were allowed to remain undivided, so that each Member represented the whole constituency. Now, he wished to remove a possible misconception at the outset, by asking the Committee to bear one or two points in mind. The proposal he was now making was not made at the expense of any other constituency. It did not affect the number or the distribution of the Members proposed by the Bill. It afforded no precedent for similar demands, for he would show that there was no two-Membered city constituency, in the same position as Aberdeen, which would be able, on a decision in favour of Aberdeen, to set up in consequence the same claim for itself. Further, let him just say that the Amendment involved no political interest for either Party, for he was bound to say that he believed no division and no manipulation of the constituency of Aberdeen would shake its steady political allegiance to the Liberal Party. The grounds, then, upon which he submitted the proposal to the Committee were these—that it was in harmony with the main lines of the Bill as regarded constituencies of the same class and character as Aberdeen. In proof of that, he desired to refer to the words of the Premier (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) himself, which, with the permission of the Committee, he would now read. The right hon. Gentleman, in introducing the Redistribution Bill, said—

"We have arrived at the conclusion that, upon the whole, the best and fairest method of dividing the electoral areas would be to adopt, not absolutely as an uniform, but as a general and prevailing rule, the system of what is known as one-Member districts,"—(3 *Hansard*, [294] 380.)

as to which he made explanations. He then proceeded—

"We propose, however, certain exceptions. The first and most distinguished exception is that of the City of London. . . . Another and more extensive . . . . exception to the rule of one-Member districts is to be found in the case of those towns, not in the Metropolis, but outside, which now exist as Parliamentary boroughs having dual representation, and which is not to be increased or diminished. . . . Towns between 50,000 and 165,000 having, and continuing to have, two Members, we propose not to divide. As I have said, towns below 50,000 are to be diminished to one Member, and towns above 165,000 are to be increased by one Member. Towns between these limits having, and continuing to have, two Members, we propose shall not require to be divided."—(*Ibid.* 381, 382.)

These were the grounds on which the right hon. Gentleman proposed the exception to the general rule in the case of all two-Membered boroughs having and continuing to have two Members. He said—

"There is, undoubtedly, in many towns, a unity of municipal life which, except for some great object, it is not desirable to violate or impair by severance."

He also said—

"I think there are something like over 50 seats which would be affected by this exception," and "I do not say that there may not be any other exceptions which might not be devised

in the course of the discussions on the details of the Bill."—(*Ibid.*)

The right hon. Gentleman again, on the 13th March last, explained and enforced the principle of this exception of large and ancient distinct towns, in the debate on giving Members to the City of London. He said—

"The hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) complained that we were inconsistent in refusing to give four Members to the City of London, while boroughs of small population were retaining their separate representation. I suppose he referred principally to boroughs of 15,000 and upwards. [Mr. GORST: Boroughs having two Members.] But why is that done? It has been done because in those cases where towns have constituted historical communities, with a distinct local and municipal life transmitted through many centuries, it has been thought wise to sanction that principle, and to allow that element of common life, as well as the element of population, to enter into the consideration."—(3 *Hansard*, [295] 1160.)

In the debate on the 17th of March last, on the Amendment of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ritchie) to divide these two-Membered towns, the right hon. Gentleman laid down the same principle. He said—

"We have been desirous of striking a fair balance between two principles, which, no doubt, conflict up to a certain point with the principle of respecting the unity of common municipal life transmitted through many generations."—(*Ibid.* 1456.)

These words contained the policy upon which the Prime Minister had introduced an exception from what was the general, but not uniform, rule of one-Member constituencies, and he (Mr. Webster) appealed to the Committee to support him in his contention that every word in those expressions of the Prime Minister applied to his constituency of Aberdeen in the same way as they did to York, Norwich, or Southampton. There were no fewer than 24 of these two-Membered civic constituencies, with a separate corporate unity and life, to all of which the privilege of remaining undivided was to be continued, so that in truth the exception was so large that it became the rule, and there was absolutely no two-Membered city save that of Aberdeen which was to be severed. The only case which appeared to be of something of the same character as Aberdeen was Swansea, where two Members were to be returned by a divided constituency, and Swansea was the only other borough constituency possessing one Member which was now to have two. A close examination, however, would show that the cases were entirely different, because Swansea was a group of six unconnected and separate boroughs, which had no other connection except that they were artificially included in an electoral arrangement. The case of the constituencies of the Metropolis to which two Members were nominally given by the Bill, and which were artificially created out of the great mass of Metropolitan life, with no historic or other connection except at an election, was not a case in point. Now, he had said that every word the Premier had used applied to the case of Aberdeen. It had been a historical city for seven centuries, associated with the political history, the literature and art of Scotland as probably no other city except Edinburgh had been during that time; it had possessed a municipal goverment of its own, a distinct local and common life with common interests and character, and its people were proud of that unity and history. What was there, he asked, in the case of Norwich, York, and Southampton, which were to remain undivided, which did not equally exist in the case of Aberdeen? His hon. Friend the Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ritchie), in a recent debate, had pointed out that it was impossible to draw any distinction between the case of Dundee and that of Aberdeen, and had asked why should the corporate life and unity of Dundee be preserved, and that of Aberdeen be destroyed? It was impossible to find any satisfactory answer to that question. The only answer then made to it by the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke) was not even plausible, or, at all events, it was not satisfactory. He said, in substance, that the difference was that Dundee had gained no advantage by the Bill, that it had two Members before, and that it had preserved them; whilst Aberdeen had only had one Member before, and now obtained a second under the Bill. That was really no answer at all. It implied that the giving of an additional Member to Aberdeen was a matter of grace and favour, which justified some condition being attached to it; but he denied that it was any matter of favour. The Bill conferred no favour upon his constituency. The giving of an additional Member to Aberdeen, which it should have had long

ago, was no matter of favour to which a consideration should be attached, but was a matter of right and justice demanded by the common interests of the nation, and was bestowed on that principle alone. Aberdeen had 105,000 inhabitants, was the capital of the North-East of Scotland, and was growing in population in a more rapid ratio than any other large town in Scotland, with one exception—namely, Leith. The claim of Aberdeen to a second Member had long been acknowledged. It ought to have had the addition in 1868, when an additional Member was given to Dundee; there was no reason in point of principle why it should not have in 1885 what was given to Dundee in 1868. Aberdeen was within an ace of getting its second Member in 1868, and if the Liberal Party had had its own way it would have got the addition. A Motion had, indeed, then been made to give an additional Member to the city, and it had failed through what might almost be called an accident—because, at that time, it was decided to give seven and not 10 new Members to Scotland. There was no principle in refusing the undoubted right of Aberdeen merely on the ground that the one city had happened to get its additional Member in 1868, whilst the privilege was not bestowed upon the other until 1885. But the ground on which the Prime Minister had put the case to the House was not so narrow as that. He had put it distinctly on the principle he (Mr. Webster) had read—namely,

"In those cases where towns have constituted historical communities, with a distinct local and municipal life transmitted through many centuries, it has been thought wise to sanction that principle, and to allow that element of common life as well as the element of population to enter into the consideration.—(3 *Hansard*, [295] 1160.)

It was impossible to deny that every word of that description applied fully to the case of the city which he (Mr. Webster) had the honour to represent. One word more and he would sit down. Great stress had been laid in every debate on this subject on the question of the wishes of the constituency interested, if those interests did not cross the interests of other constituencies, and were not opposed to the main lines of the Bill. If that feeling was to be consulted, it was impossible to suppose a case where there was a stronger aversion, distaste, and repugnance towards this division than existed in Aberdeen. He had presented a Petition from the magistrates and Town Council of the city, pointing out how adverse the feeling of the community was to the proposed division. A Petition against it had also been presented from a public meeting of Liberals held in Aberdeen—a meeting convened not by circular, but by advertisement. A more united, unanimous, and enthusiastic meeting could hardly be imagined. He had presented Petitions to the same effect from two other Liberal bodies of Aberdeen; and, finally, with regard to the feeling of the working classes, that was expressed in a Petition which the Trades Council, who represented and embodied their wishes, had unanimously signed to the same effect. He asked the Government and the Committee whether it was worth while to thwart the manifest wish of the community of Aberdeen? And, if it had been thought wise to respect that local feeling and perpetuate the principle of unity in all the other cases of two-Member boroughs, was it wise or just to destroy it in the single case of of Aberdeen?

Amendment proposed,

In page 39, to leave out all the words after the word "Scotland," in line 3, to the words "polling district," in column 2, line 12.—(*Mr. Webster.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Aberdeen' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he feared he could not assent to the Amendment of his hon. Friend; and he was also afraid that the statement he had to make would not carry conviction to the mind of his hon. Friend, who had complained, in reference to a previous statement of his (Sir Charles W. Dilke's), that it was no answer to his views. As he had to make exactly the same statement that evening, he could not suppose that his argument would have any weight with his hon. Friend. He felt bound in honour to oppose this Amendment, on the ground, amongst others, that the Government had obtained the support of several hon. Gentlemen opposite, who were in favour of the universal application of the single-Member system, against the Amendment of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr.

Ritchie), who proposed that Dundee and other burghs which were left alone by the Bill should be divided. After that, Aberdeen being the first borough with respect to which the exception asked for applied, the Government could not go back and make any further change. Therefore, without going into the question of population or the arguments which his hon. Friend had put before the Committee, he felt bound to disagree with the proposed Amendment.

DR. FARQUHARSON said, the remarks he was about to make were not offered with the expectation of convincing the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke), but merely as a protest against the decision at which he had arrived, because, after the statement of the right hon. Baronet, it might appear almost unnecessary to continue the discussion. He (Dr. Farquharson) was most anxious to support, as far as he could, the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Aberdeen (Mr. Webster), although he was bound to say that he had put forward his case so ably and fully in the Committee that he had left very little to be said upon the subject by those who followed him. The proposal of his hon. Friend was not, after all, a very drastic one, or one which would in any way disturb the sweet serenity which, during the progress of the Bill, had been observable on the two Front Benches. His hon. Friend had expressed satisfaction that Aberdeen was to have another Member; he had not suggested any re-arrangement of the boundaries or areas; he had merely put forward a claim that the Aberdeen of to-day, with its two Members, might be allowed to remain in the same political position as the Aberdeen of the past, when it had one Member. The additional Member for Aberdeen was, no doubt, deserved, because there was a great unanimity of political life there; the working classes in Aberdeen had a great interest in political affairs, and social difficulties had been so far smoothed down that it had led to all classes in the communitiy working together for the public good. It was in that satisfactory state of things that they feared the harmonious arrangement he referred to would be broken up by the proposal now made in the Bill. He confessed that he shared the apprehensions of his hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) that this process of single-Member constituencies would not improve the political life of the country. It was evident that in some large towns something of the kind must be done; some provisions must be made, and those had worked very well in Scotland. But the case of Aberdeen was different from that of other towns. Aberdeen was the only serious exception to the rule that towns of its character, like Dundee, were to remain as at present, and, although returning two Members, were not to be cut up into two constituencies. In other words, Aberdeen got a position invidious and somewhat mysterious in this matter, because, while other towns were to remain as they were, she alone was, politically speaking, to be cut into two. They all regretted deeply that his hon. Friend who moved this Amendment was not again to take charge of the representation of Aberdeen, when it would in future return two Members, because he was bound to say that the constituency had never been more thoroughly represented than by its present Member, and there was a fear lest it might not always be so well represented — that a Faddist or a Tory might come down to Aberdeen and be elected—an event which an hon. Friend suggested was just possible when the Bill became law. They had been told—and the statement on the part of the Government was, of course, final—that the compact which had been made between the two Parties, and from which very considerable benefit had been reaped, forbade the adoption of the Amendment of his hon. Friend. He admitted that considerable benefit had been gained by the compact; and although it had prevented discussion on the Bill, and it was said that it also prevented any alterations being made, he hoped that was not so. The Prime Minister had indicated that some exceptions might be made, and he had hoped that hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House would have united, in this instance, in order to meet the fully and adequately expressed wishes of the people of Aberdeen, who had at several large and representative meetings—meetings of all classes of the community, including working men of all shades of political opinion—protested against the proposed division of the burgh. Of course, he did not expect on that occa-

sion to convince the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke), and he had simply risen to express his regret at the proposed arrangement, and to enter his protest against it.

MR. DALRYMPLE said, that, as often happened amongst hon. Members opposite, the two hon. Members who supported the Amendment had given entirely different accounts of the same thing. The hon. Member who moved the Amendment (Mr. Webster) said that in no possible circumstances would Aberdeen depart from its allegiance. He did not say its allegiance to what; but he (Mr. Dalrymple) understood what he meant. The hon. Gentleman who had supported him said, if the Amendment were not accepted, and the constituency remained divided, a Faddist or a Tory might hereafter represent the town. He (Mr. Dalrymple) did not contemplate anything so serious. For his own part, he agreed with the hon. Member who moved the Amendment; but he wished to understand from the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) what was meant by saying that he could not yield to the proposal of the hon. Gentleman, because of the support which he had received on a former occasion on that side of the House in reference to the Motion of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ritchie)?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: No; not that only. I said it was a portion of the agreement with the other side.

MR. DALRYMPLE: Part of the agreement between the Heads of Parties?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Yes; and consequently I feel bound to resist the Amendment, unless relieved from the agreement.

MR. DALRYMPLE said, that, of course, when they came across that they knew exactly where they were. That was more serious, perhaps, than a Tory being returned for Aberdeen. He desired to say that he considered the proposal of the hon. Member for Aberdeen (Mr. Webster) an essentially fair one. He confessed that he did not understand what he meant by—

> "A violation of the ancient character of the place, and a violation of the municipal institutions which had continued through so many generations;"

but still he did not see why, if there were exceptions to this rule, Aberdeen should not be one of those exceptions. It seemed to him (Mr. Dalrymple) that it might be so, just as well as the place which the right hon. Gentleman had mentioned. He had received a number of communications upon the subject, and he joined with the hon. Gentleman opposite in remarking that on many occasions the feelings of particular places often rested on very shadowy grounds. But on this occasion he thought that the feeling of an important place like Aberdeen might receive some attention at the hands of the Government; and unless they were actually to understand that this would lead to a conflict between the Heads of the two Parties, he thought Her Majesty's Government might give the matter a little further consideration. If the hon. Gentleman obtained no satisfaction from Her Majesty's Government, and in view of the feeling at Aberdeen being so strong against the Government proposal, he would make the suggestion that Aberdeen should resign one Member, and he could point to more than one place in Scotland on which the surplus resulting from the hon. Gentleman's liberality might be bestowed.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN said, he had been interested in the Motion of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ritchie), which had been withdrawn on the distinct understanding that the Government would consider special cases. The Prime Minister further said that when they came to deal with the details of the Bill, the Government would be prepared to give and take in matters of local interest. That was a distinct understanding. His hon. Colleague (Mr. John Morley) and himself were both in their place to support the Motion of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets; but they had withdrawn their support, because they understood that special cases would receive consideration. He now made this proposal to the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke)—not to divide Aberdeen, but to divide Newcastle, which need not interfere with any other arrangement.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that, in the absence of general consent on the part of the Committee, he felt himself bound to adhere to the position which he occupied with regard to this Amendment.

MR. GREGORY said, he understood that one of the principles of the Bill was that boroughs like Aberdeen should be divided. He thought that nothing had been advanced in the case of Aberdeen which would not apply also to a large number of constituencies throughout the country. It was alleged that its large population entitled this borough to additional representation some years ago. The same thing might be said of Leeds, Sheffield, and other boroughs in the Kingdom; and if they once admitted the principle in the case of Aberdeen that because it had an increasing population, it should have another Member, the question would be raised that no borough ought to be divided, and that each borough ought to be presented by a certain number of Members. As he understood it, one of the leading features of the Bill would be put an end to, and the whole question re-opened. He thought, however, that they ought rather to insist that the principle on which the Bill was to a great extent founded should be carried out.

MR. BUCHANAN said, he thought the Committee were still a little in the dark with regard to the answer given by the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Aberdeen (Mr. Webster). He was bound to say that he did not take the reply of the right hon. Baronet on the first occasion of his speaking in quite the same sense as that in which he subsequently referred to the splitting up of new constituencies such as Aberdeen as being within the contract between the two Front Benches. He thought, therefore they might receive a further statement from him for the satisfaction of the Committee; and he was also of opinion that it would tend to clear up the matter under consideration if the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Devon (Sir Stafford Northcote) would give his opinion as to whether the case of Aberdeen came or did not come within the terms of the contract between the Leaders of the two Parties. He would also like to know whether, when the Prime Minister, on the Amendment of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ritchie), said that the retention of the dual vote on the 23 seats was "a fair compromise between two principles" he meant to include in that compromise the case of Aberdeen, which now for the first time obtained dual representation? He remembered also that the right hon. Baronet had said on the Amendment referred to, that he agreed to what was stated—namely, that the case of these boroughs returning two Members by a dual vote was a compromise, but that if there was local feeling and a consensus on both sides of the House opposed to it, he was quite willing to agree to an alteration. The present case of Aberdeen surely satisfied all these conditions. Local feeling was entirely on one side. And if the hon. Baronet considered that he was not specifically bound by the terms of the compact, it seemed reasonable that, in view of the strong feeling testified to by his hon. Friends in favour of the Amendment, the Government might adopt it.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, as the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. Buchanan) had referred to him, he would like to say a few words on this question. It had always been, in the discussion of the Franchise Bill and the Redistribution Bill, a question of considerable interest as to whether any attempt should be made, in view of the new power to be introduced to the electorate, to provide for the representation of minorities. When they came to discuss the principle on which the Redistribution Bill should be founded, the proposal which they made in that matter was that there should not be anything in the nature of direct representation of minorities, except in the way of division, as far as possible, of all constituencies into single-Member districts; and it appeared to them that this would, on the whole, give that sort of representation to minorities which would be adequate to the occasion, and which would afford a prospect of durability. That was, therefore, the principle on which the whole scheme of the Bill was understood to be founded. There were certain boroughs, 25 in number, each represented by two Members, with regard to which no change was proposed; and it was a matter of compromise that those 25 boroughs should be left as they were, and no change made with respect to them. In other words, they would return their two Members each *en bloc*, as before, instead of being divided; but where there

was such a change, the principle of division into two or more constituencies was to hold good, and each constituency would return a single Member. Aberdeen was one of those cases in which an addition was to be made to its representation, and, that being so, it was necessary that there should be a division into districts. That principle was distinctly part of the foundation of the Bill—it was not an accidental provision, it was part of the basis on which it rested, and in that way it ought to be represented. Of course, there was nothing in the Bill which might not, with the general consent of the House, be changed; but no reason had been shown sufficient to justify the alteration now proposed in the case of Aberdeen. He therefore replied to the arguments of hon. Gentlemen on the other side—that all the evidence which he had seen on the subject tended to convince him that the right principle to maintain, here and "elsewhere," was to keep the two divisions separate, each division returning a single Member. However, he was not disposed to stand in the way of the consideration of the Amendment.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON said, he greatly regretted the decision of the Government in this matter. He had never known a case in which the political feeling of a constituency was so unanimous as it was upon this question. The right hon. Baronet the Leader of the Opposition (Sir Stafford Northcote) and the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had both treated this matter as one of principle; they had made no attempt to look at the merits of the case. He thought sufficient grounds had been shown for re-opening the case of Aberdeen, and making the alteration which his hon. Friend proposed. If his hon. Friend (Mr. Webster) divided the Committee, he should certainly support him.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR said, he regretted very much to hear what had fallen from the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Charles W. Dilke), and he thought it was also to be regretted that any compact should have been made which prevented the voice of the people being heard on a question of this kind. He fully realized it was no use contesting the matter any further.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, the case of Aberdeen was really an isolated one. It was practically the only urban constituency whose representation was to be increased to two Members, and which it was proposed to divide into two parts. He could understand it if this were the result of a general rule agreed to by both sides of the House. He thought the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Stafford Northcote) and the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke) should reconsider the question as to whether it was absolutely necessary to insist upon this rule being applied to an individual case, when the local feeling concerned was so strongly opposed to it. He thought the Leaders on both sides might agree to concede what was asked by the hon. Member for Aberdeen.

MR. BIGGAR said, that as Aberdeen was going to get two Members instead of one, the inhabitants ought to be exceedingly thankful for this redistribution scheme. The town was to be in two divisions, one of which was Liberal, and the other seemed to contain a small majority of Tories, who would have the power of returning a Member to Parliament, so that, from the point of view of both Parties in the place, it would be fairly represented. He thought that hon. Gentlemen opposite ought to be satisfied with having stated the case, and not put the Committee to the trouble of a division.

MR. TOMLINSON said, he fully sympathized with the view taken by hon. Members from the North of Scotland who had argued against the division of this borough, because he knew that there would be in his own constituency a strong feeling against division, and that would, doubtless, be so in all cases where it was proposed to divide boroughs which had been incorporated from ancient times for local management. Therefore, he repeated that he personally sympathized with hon. Gentlemen opposite. Still, he could not but feel that two-Member constituencies were in a minority, and, in all probability, a diminishing minority. He did not think the time far distant when these constituencies would be broken up; and therefore he, for one, did not think it desirable to increase the number of them. He believed it would be found that the convenience of managing

a single Member would preponderate over other considerations. For those reasons, notwithstanding his sympathy with hon. Members opposite in this matter, he could not support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Aberdeen.

MR. DICK-PEDDIE said, the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke) having said that he could not agree to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Aberdeen (Mr. Webster), the only hope of those who supported him lay in an appeal to the right hon. Baronet the Leader of the Opposition. But he also had declined to concede the point. He (Mr. Dick-Peddie) again urged on the right hon. Baronet that the feeling in favour of the Amendment of his hon. Friend was unanimous, which he thought constituted a good reason why, in the present case, an exception should be made. Fortunately, there was an appeal from the Front Benches to the country at large, and he hoped it would be seen that this matter was not one to be settled by a compact between those Benches, but by the House.

MR. WEBSTER said, he was profoundly dissatisfied with the decision to which the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had come. ["Oh, oh!"] How could he be otherwise than dissatisfied? There had been no reason assigned for the exception made in the case of Aberdeen. They had nothing but the *sic volo, sic jubeo* of the two Front Benches. What, he asked, had become of the promise of the Prime Minister, and what were the exceptions to which he looked forward as possible in the case of other two-Member constituencies which might remain undivided?

Question put.

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 57; Noes 26: Majority 31.—(Div. List, No. 93.)

Amendment *negatived.*

Verbal Amendments made.

On the Motion of Sir CHARLES W. DILKE, the following Amendment made:—In page 41, line 24, after "Limestone Road," insert "and continued in a straight line to the centre of York Road."

MR. SEXTON said, he rose to move the first of the Amendments which stood in his name upon the Paper, and which were contingent on Amendments that had been negatived or withdrawn. By the first of these Amendments he had proposed to give five Members to Dublin City; and by the second to alter and extend the boundaries of the borough. The Government had stated that they could not assent to any proposal to give five Members to the City of Dublin, and the reason they assigned for this refusal was that if they were to allow Dublin to return five Members, that would necessitate an increase of the boundaries proposed for the borough; and they had also refused to extend the boundaries of the borough on the ground that if the boundaries were extended it would be necessary to increase the number of Members to five. Consequently, Dublin was in this position—that it was not to have five Members, because the boundaries would thereby have to be extended; and it was not to have its boundaries extended, because that would necessitate its having five Members. He did not think that this would be considered a very satisfactory method of argument. But coming to the Amendment he was about to propose, he would say at once that he did not seek to disturb the number of Members named in the Bill, nor to alter the proposed Parliamentary boundary——

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he was sorry to interrupt the hon. Member; but he saw by the Paper that the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) had put down two Amendments that took precedence of the Amendments of the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton). To the Amendments of the hon. and learned Member for Bridport it was his intention to agree; and, therefore, he would call upon the hon. Gentleman to move them.

On the Motion of Mr. WARTON, the following Amendments made:—In page 42, line 3, leave out "and," and in same line, after "contents," insert the word "boundaries."

MR. SEXTON said, the hon. and learned Member for Bridport had not displayed his usual acuteness in bringing forward his Amendments at the proper moment; but he (Mr. Sexton) was not sorry for the interruption of the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W.

Dilke), as he hoped he might draw some encouragement from it. Only a short time ago the right hon. Gentleman had accepted a number of Amendments in order to save the time of the Committee, and when he again intervened, for the purpose of enabling the hon. and learned Member for Bridport to make good his Amendments, he (Mr. Sexton) was disposed to hope the right hon. Baronet was in a conciliatory mood, and would be inclined either to accept the Amendments about to be moved, or offer some compromise that would save the time of the Committee, and produce a feeling of satisfaction in the City of Dublin, where the proposed revision of the Parliamentary boundaries, founded on the Report of the Commissioners, had provoked the widest discontent. As he had already stated, the Amendment he now proposed accepted the allocation of four Members to the City of Dublin, and also accepted the general boundary line laid down in the Bill as that of the future borough; but it proposed to alter the divisions the Commissioners had recommended as those for which the four Members should be elected. And not only did he propose to alter the divisions contained in the Schedule, but likewise to alter their names. The Commissioners proposed to call the several divisions of the city by the points of the compass—namely, the North-West Dublin Division, the North-East Dublin Division, the South-West Dublin Division, and the South-East Dublin Division. Now, not only were these names cumbrous, but they were inaccurate, and did not, with any satisfactory amount of exactitude, define the divisions it was proposed to make. What he proposed to do was to adopt the principle that had been already, to some extent, adopted in the case of other cities, and to call the four divisions of Dublin after historical sites or areas, at the same time preserving the points of the compass in the city, instead of confusing them by calling them North-East, South-West, and so on. With that view, therefore, he proposed to name the different divisions of the city—the Four Courts Division, the Rotunda Division, the St. Patrick's Division, and the College Green Division. The name of the first, or Four Courts Division, would be that of the historic seat of justiciary in Ireland; that of the second, or Rotunda Division, would give prominence to a building of great historic repute; that of College Green, or the third division, was equally well known for its historical associations; while that of the fourth division, St. Patrick's, was not only the name of the ancient Cathedral of Dublin, but it was also that of the patron Saint of the country. He believed that two of the divisions of London were to be called after St. George, who was the patron Saint of England. The plan which he proposed came before the Committee recommended by the fact that it was the one proposed by the Corporation of Dublin. That body had taken great pains to inquire into the merits of the present question. They had conferred, in the first instance, with the Assistant Commissioner; they had also been before the Boundary Commissioners; they had spent a good deal of time and money over the matter, and they had produced a pamphlet which dealt very clearly and, at the same time, very carefully with the whole question. Moreover, he had the boldness to assert that the plan he now offered for the acceptance of the Committee was one which, in every particular, much more closely followed the Instructions issued to the Commissioners by the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) than did the plan agreed upon by the Boundary Commissioners themselves. Let him (Mr. Sexton) bring to the recollection of the Committee what those Instructions were. The first Instruction was that the Commissioners should, as far as possible, approximately equalize the populations of the different divisions. This was the dominant rule prescribed for the direction of the Commissioners; and such being the case, he hoped to be able to show the Committee that the plan suggested by the Corporation was far more in accordance with this primary Instruction than that which the Commissioners had agreed upon. The population of the City of Dublin was 273,000, and of these something like 6,000 were paupers or inmates of the workhouses; so that, deducting those in receipt of parochial relief, there was a net population of 267,000, which, for the four divisions into which the borough was to be divided, would give an average of 66,800 for each division. Now, one of the divisions proposed by the Corporation would contain a population of 66,900; while another would have a

population of 66,800; so that they not only approximated to equalization, but to all intents and purposes actually hit the ideal unit of the borough from the point of view taken by the Instructions issued to the Commissioners. Of the two other divisions suggested by the Corporation, one would have a population of 66,200, and the other a population of 68,300; so that two of the divisions thus proposed almost exactly hit the rule laid down in the Commissioners' Instructions, while the greatest difference between any two of the four divisions was considerably under 3,000. He would now ask the Committee to consider what was the case under the scheme presented by the Commissioners. In one division there would be a population of 61,700; in another the population would number 69,100; in a third the number would be 64,700; while the fourth would contain a population of 67,000. Thus it would be seen that, while the greatest difference between any two of the divisions suggested by the Corporation was considerably under 3,000, there was, between two of the divisions proposed by the Commissioners, a difference of nearly 4,400; so that, according to the Instructions issued to the Commissioners, as laid down by the right hon. Baronet, there was nearly double the disparity between the divisions suggested by the Commissioners and those proposed by the Corporation of Dublin. Therefore, he submitted that, in moving the Amendment he was about to propose, he was entitled to the support of the right hon. Gentleman. But, in addition to the Instruction as to the equalization of populations in the divisions fixed by the Commissioners, they were also instructed to have regard to compactness of area. Now, that was a question of maps, and if the Committee would take the trouble to look at the map of Dublin, as showing the Commissioners' boundaries, and compare it with the map he had in his hand, showing the divisions suggested by the Corporation, it would be seen—and the point was one he would not argue at any great length—that the four divisions proposed by the Corporation were much more regular in outline and more compact in area than those proposed by the Commissioners. The first division proposed by the Corporation took the whole of the city at both sides of the Liffy north of the Four Courts, and divided it by an almost straight line. Two of the other divisions suggested by the same authority took the city and divided it to the north and south of the Liffey, while the fourth division took the central wards on the south side of the Liffy, and made them into one division; and he had to add that not only was that division drawn out with regular boundaries, and formed into a compact area, but it followed the Instructions given to the Commissioners by the Government to a much closer degree than the division suggested by the Commissioners, whose divisions were certainly of a less satisfactory character than those of the Corporation, as being less on an equality in point of population and much more straggling in the lines of their boundaries. And not only was this the case, but the Corporation plan possessed this additional recommendation—it would preserve every ward of the city intact. The City of Dublin had 15 wards, and not one of these was broken into by the plan submitted by the Corporation; while by the plan of the Commissioners no less than three of the wards would be broken into. On this question of preserving the integrity of wards, he would remind the Committee of what was stated in the Report made by the Boundary Commissioners. They said, with respect to boroughs, it appeared to them that the best area to be taken as the basis of division would be the wards formed for local elections under the Municipal Corporations Act, and this was the conclusion they had come to after they had inspected every city and borough in the country. The Commissioners also stated, as the result of the inquiries they had instituted, that there was a strong desire in every borough that in forming the divisions of the boroughs the wards should, if possible, be preserved intact; and in deference to this feeling the Commissioners had allowed a larger disparity in the populations of several of the divisions than they would otherwise have recommended. Thus it would be seen that the Commissioners were so determined to preserve the boundaries of the municipal wards for Parliamentary purposes, that even where, in order to do this, they were compelled to make unequal divisions of the population, they preferred the latter alternative to that of breaking up the

Mr. Sexton

integrity of the wards. How was it that the Commissioners accounted for this extraordinary procedure? They stated that they had given to their plans the greatest amount of compactness they could obtain consistently with the equalization of the population, and a due observation of the pursuits of the people. Now, he (Mr. Sexton) had already shown the Committee that the plan submitted by the Dublin Corporation gave a greater equality of population to the different divisions of the borough than that prepared by the Commissioners; and with regard to the further argument of the Commissioners, that they had been obliged to depart from the principle of compactness because they wished to observe the pursuits of the people, he could say, from his knowledge of the City of Dublin, after a residence in it of 16 years, that it was not a city to which the principle of having regard to the pursuits of the people could be made to apply in such a manner as to overturn the principle of compactness of area. Dublin was a city in which the pursuits of the people were few. The population of Dublin was composed of the professional and official class, the merchant and trading class, which included a large number of shopkeepers, and the working or labouring class. The professional and official class was so few in number that no sort of arrangement could make a Parliamentary division of them; while the trading and labouring classes were so intermixed throughout the city that it would be absurd to suppose that any particular areas could be carved out of the city with anything like due regard to regularity or uniformity of pursuits. There might be uniformity among the residents in Fitz-William Square, Merrion Square, and a couple of streets besides; but outside the limits of these two squares and two streets, the pursuits of the people were so mixed and so heterogeneous that it would be impossible to map out any particular area that would represent any special peculiarity of occupation or mode of life. Therefore, he made bold to assert that it was the duty of the Commissioners not to have followed an untenable principle by endeavouring, in the case of Dublin, to achieve a segregation of the people by mapping out special areas according to uniformity of pursuits. The Commissioners stated that they had given some effect to the idea of observing the pursuits of the people by acting on the principle of combining the people carrying on kindred nautical pursuits on the opposite banks of the River Liffey navigable below the bridge. That was certainly about the most absurd statement that could possibly be made with regard to the City of Dublin. There was only one portion of it that was true, and that was that the River Liffey was navigable below the bridge; there was nothing else in it that was accurate or which possessed an element of truth. If the Commission had been composed of foreigners who had never seen Dublin before, and who had not gone into the unfashionable parts of the city, he could have understood their making such a statement; but the Commission was composed of gentlemen who must have been well aware that there was not a shadow of foundation for the assertion that the population of the two shores of the river below the bridge were engaged in kindred pursuits. He would remind the Committee that the population on the Southern Quay below the O'Connell Bridge consisted mainly of shopkeepers and small traders, the remainder of the residents being of the artizan class; but what was the character of the population on the other side of the river? That was a non-residential district, there being very few residents on the quays to the north of the Liffey below the O'Connell Bridge. The buildings there were chiefly occupied as shipping offices, Custom House offices, and stores, together with the offices and wharves appertaining to the different Railway and Steamship Companies trading to Dublin. The people who occupied these places on the northern bank of the river were only engaged in their offices there during the day, and in the evening retired to their residences outside the city; and there was no possible comparison in point of pursuit between these persons and those resident on the southern bank, consisting, as he had already stated, of small traders, shopkeepers, and artizans. Moreover, on the northern side of the Liffey there was not a particle of anything answering to the description of nautical pursuits. He would, therefore, ask the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir

Charles W. Dilke) how he intended to deal with this part of the case? There was not one iota of proof in support of the statement of the Commissioners that there was a similarity of pursuits between the people on the north and south sides of the Liffey below the O'Connell Bridge. He (Mr. Sexton) maintained that the true reason for the extraordinary conformation of this South-Eastern Division of the borough was to be found in the explanation furnished by Lord Salisbury, when he had stated that the fate of the Irish Tory Party would depend on the spirit in which the Boundary Commissioners performed their functions. In the plan at first put forward by the Commissioners, those gentlemen were satisfied with cutting off from the South-Eastern Division all those parts that were occupied by the poorer class of people who might be supposed to be in political sympathy with the popular Party led by the hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell); but it subsequently occurred to them that they had not with sufficient completeness jerrymandered the division; and consequently, in their final plan, they not only cut off the poorer people from the division and threw them across the river into another division, but they also put into the South-East Division Trinity College, with its 400 residential Tory voters; and they actually went away from the locality south of the River Liffey and took the fishing village of Ringsend and the marine villages of Irishtown and Beggar's Bush, and plunged them into a political area with which they could have no conceivable connection. In point of fact, the conformation of the South-East Division of the City of Dublin was one of the most laborious, one of the most obvious, and one of the most discreditable examples of jerrymandering that appeared on the whole surface of the record of the Boundary Commission. There was one other point to which he wished to draw the attention of the Committee. He had already referred to the Report in which the English Commissioners laid it down that the ward boundaries ought to be followed as far as possible in the divisions of the boroughs, and in which they also said they had found there was a strong desire in every borough that the ward boundaries should be observed. Now, if there was one city in Ireland in which the ward boundaries were distinct and adapted to form the boundaries of Parliamentary divisions, it was the City of Dublin. They were the units of the Municipal and Poor Law elections, and also for the jury panels, and were well known in connection with all the proceedings in the Courts, besides being familiar to all who were engaged in the elections and the preparation of the list of voters. The Commissioners, however, appeared to have adhered so little to their obvious duty that, in their first scheme, they actually broke up four out of the 15 wards, and in one case they had actually adopted the old Protestant parishes of the city as the boundaries of a division. He believed that not one person out of a hundred in the City of Dublin, whether Protestant or Catholic, was able to follow the boundary lines of the existing Protestant parishes. Those boundaries had become so antiquated and obsolete that they had disappeared from the face of the map, and the result was that in their first scheme the Boundary Commissioners had actually proposed divisions which ran through the rooms of certain houses. Of course they were unable to maintain so manifest an absurdity, and in their second scheme they had withdrawn the lines which ran through different houses; but they had adhered—and he strongly protested against such adherence—to the divisions by which they broke up the municipal wards. Why, he asked, had they disregarded the Circular of the 22nd of December, by which they were directed to have regard to the boundaries of the municipal wards; and what was their reason for acting contrary to the opinions of the English Commissioners that the municipal boundaries of wards should, as far as possible, be preserved intact? What they were doing for Dublin was not only to arrange unreasonable boundaries, but to create a permanent source of worry, perplexity, and trouble in each of the city wards, where the number of electors in each averaged 12,000. There was no real necessity for breaking up the ward boundaries, all of which were well known, and the result would be that, if the plan of the Commissioners were adhered to, there would be a great increase in the number of voters' lists that would have to be prepared every year, a con-

siderable augmentation of expense and trouble would be imposed on the various public bodies in the preparation of those lists, and a large addition made to the difficulty and worry thrown on the Revision Courts. And what was the object of it all? It was simply that by a purely arbitrary arrangement of boundaries certain portions of the City of Dublin might be so cut off as to shut out from their legitimate political action those persons who would be likely to sympathize with the views of the Party led by the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). One result of such a plan would doubtless be to produce a feeling of cohesion among that Party in Dublin that would go far towards defeating the scheme. He had looked through the Reports of the Commissioners who had been engaged in arranging the divisions of the British boroughs, and he would make bold to say that the only cases in which they had ever broken up the boundary of a ward were instances in which they were compelled to do so in order to produce equality of population. Was the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) prepared to dispute this statement? If so, he would refer the right hon. Gentleman to the case of the London boroughs, and that of Islington and Mile End Old Town. Not only had the Commissioners in those cases respected the existing wards, but the Commissioners stated that the divisions they recommended were based on the boundaries of the municipal wards, and in every case where they had felt obliged to break up a ward, they stated that they were compelled to do so because, if they had not taken that course, the division of the population would have been very unequal. There was no case in Dublin for breaking up the boundary on the alleged ground of difference of pursuits. There was no case to warrant the right hon. Baronet in departing from the principle followed with regard to England and Scotland. He would again challenge the right hon. Gentleman to produce a single case in either of those countries where the wards of a borough had been broken up unless for the purpose of producing equality in point of population. The plan now put before the Committee would equalize the population and give compact areas and regular boundaries. It was as perfect in regard to the pursuits of the population as the plan of the Commissioners; it would retain the boundaries of the municipal wards of Dublin which had been familiar to the people for many years, and it would enable a general revision to take place with a minimum of expense and loss of time. He maintained that the right hon. Baronet was bound either to accept this plan, which would make the Bill more workable than that of the Commissioners, or to cast discredit on his own Instructions.

Amendment proposed,

In Schedule 6, Part 3, leave out from "Borough," in line 1, to end of the Schedule inclusive, and insert,—

Borough of Dublin.

Four Members. Four Divisions.

No. 1.—The Four Courts Division.

Arran Quay Ward.
Town Quay Ward.
Usher's Quay Ward.

No. 2.—The Rotunda Division.

Mountjoy Ward.
North Dock Ward.
North City Ward.
Rotunda Ward.

No. 3.—The Saint Patrick's Division.

Fitzwilliam Ward.
Mansion House Ward.
Merchants' Quay Ward.
Wood Quay Ward.

No. 4.—The College Green Division.

South City Ward.
Royal Exchange Ward.
Trinity Ward.
South Dock Ward.
Township of Pembroke.

So much of the parishes of Booterstown and Monkstown, in the Union of Rathdown, as is comprised within the present boundary of the Parliamentary borough.—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would put aside the question of the names of the divisions for the present; but he was bound to say that when he had considered the Amendment and the scheme of the Corporation of Dublin earlier in the day, and had considered the line of argument in the spirit of the hon. Gentleman's third Amendment, he had assumed that the hon. Gentleman would move his Amendments in the form in which they had been placed on the Paper. He had expected that the names would be considered either as they stood in the Bill, or in the form in which the

hon. Member had placed them on the Paper.

MR. SEXTON said, he thought the right hon. Baronet was labouring under some misapprehension in this matter. The third Amendment contained the proposed new names.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that no doubt the fact was as the hon. Member had stated, and that if he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had made a mistake it was his own fault. He was not now prepared to discuss the names, being unable, on the spur of the moment, to say whether or not it would be best to take them in the form suggested by the hon. Member. It would not be unreasonable to ask the Committee to take the names on Report; and if they were allowed to remain as they were he would carefully consider them, and, if possible, meet the hon. Gentleman's view with regard to them. Therefore, he put the question of names aside for the present. As to the boundaries, the scheme of the Corporation, which was rejected by the Commissioners, had been very carefully considered by them before they took that step. The same thing happened with regard to Belfast—it had unfortunately happened that in the case of both the great cities of Ireland the schemes prepared by the Corporations had been rejected by the Commissioners. The Commissioners had, under the circumstances, felt themselves bound to bring forward schemes of their own; and, knowing the Commissioners as he did, the very fact that they had done this convinced him that they must have had good reason for rejecting the Corporation proposals. The hon. Member said he knew cases where similar departures from the scheme of the Commissioners to that he now proposed had taken place; but the only argument the hon. Member had put forward in favour of his scheme was that it would avoid breaking up any of the wards. The hon. Member had challenged him to show any case in England in which the wards had been broken up, except for the purpose of equalizing the population. There were a great many cases in England in which the Commissioners found themselves obliged to break up the wards. He found, on referring to the case of Leeds, that the Commissioners intersected wards in that borough in consequence of the great difference in the character of the population in different parts of the same ward. It had been claimed that, so far as regarded substantial equality of population, the balance would be in favour of the Corporation scheme; but omitting inmates of workhouses, asylums, and prisons, and military barracks, the highest population of a division under the Commissioners' scheme was 67,416, and the lowest 62,287. In the Corporation scheme the highest was 67,287, and the lowest 62,152. The greatest differences in population of the divisions under the Commissioners' scheme was, therefore, 5,129, and under the Corporation scheme 5,135; so that there was, practically, no advantage in one over the other. He did not lay any great stress upon attaining absolute equality of population; but merely pointed out the facts of the case. The question of the merits or demerits of the schemes was one it was almost impossible to satisfactorily discuss in the House of Commons, and he felt the difficulty of making such cases clear. It was a question of authority against authority, and it would be impossible for hon. Members to make up their minds upon it unless they either studied the subject for themselves, or accepted one authority or the other. He was willing to admit that the scheme of the Corporation had its merits as well as its demerits; but the chief objection to it was that it made no attempt to group persons or pursuits. It withdrew two wards—namely, Fitzwilliam Ward and Mansion House Ward, which, by the admission of the hon. Member, were important, residential, and professional.

MR. SEXTON: No; they are unimportant, and of small area.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Well, a portion of them was important. These wealthy districts were taken out of the South-Eastern Division, which was largely residential, by the Corporation scheme, and united with some of the poorest parts of the city. It also withdrew some of the riverside population; but the Commissioners' scheme brought together that class, and also the residential and professional population. Those were the two objects it accomplished. The Commissioners stated that the main objection to the provisional scheme had been that it intersected four of the municipal wards, one of them being divided into four parts; and a further objection was that in some instances obsolete parochial boundaries had been

adopted. But one of those objections had been entirely removed, and the other partially, for now only three wards were intersected. A question had been raised, not only in regard to Ireland, but in reference to other places—for instance, in the case of Aldershot—as to the necessity, in estimating the numbers, to leave out of the population classes of persons who could not exercise the franchise. On applying that principle to the present case, it was found that there were outside those classes from whom voters would be drawn five or six classes of persons, including paupers, soldiers, and inmates of asylums and prisons. As he had said, omitting these classes, the highest population under the Commissioners' scheme would be in the North-Eastern Division, where the number would be 67,416, and the lowest—namely, 62,287, in the South-Western Division. He had stated the greatest differences in population of the divisions under the Commissioners' and the Corporation schemes, showing that they were almost exactly the same, but just turning the scale as against the Corporation scheme. He did not attach so much importance as some did—perhaps not so much as the Commissioners did—to the question of the exact equalization of population. He cared little about it, and attached no importance to the argument, believing it without force either way. No doubt the strong point in favour of the scheme of the Corporation was that it did not cut the wards; but, on the whole, he thought the Commissioners had made out a fair case for cutting them, as was proposed. While he should be prepared to do all he could to meet the desire of the hon. Member (Mr. Sexton) on Report as to the names he could not accept his proposal to alter the boundaries.

MR. HEALY said, he looked upon this discussion as flogging a dead horse, although the Irish Members owed it as a duty to their constituents to bring the matter forward. The right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Charles W. Dilke) was in a more unfortunate position even than the Irish Members, because over and over again he had used arguments which it was evident he had not the smallest confidence in, because they were all referable to the compact, and had no reference whatsoever to the Amendments or the arguments which had been addressed to the Committee in support of them. This showed the unfortunate position in which the Committee was placed. Of course, it was not the fault of the right hon. Baronet; but he (Mr. Healy) could only extend to him the same commiseration which they themselves were entitled to. There was one point in regard to which he thought the Corporation of Dublin were entitled to some sympathy from the right hon. Baronet, for he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) put aside the question of the splitting up of wards as a very light matter. [Several Irish MEMBERS: No, no!] At any rate, the merit of not cutting up the wards was not the strongest argument in favour of the scheme of the Corporation. It would prove economical. Did the right hon. Gentleman know that its adoption would save the Corporation of Dublin hundreds a-year—did he understand that by this bogus jerrymandering scheme, which would do no one any good, that the Corporation would have to incur an additional expenditure for the preparation of the lists of voters? He was reminded by the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) that already it had to pay an extra charge in regard to Pembroke and a portion of Blackrock in a most unjust manner. Did the right hon. Baronet propose to relieve the Dublin Corporation of the additional expense which this division of the wards would throw upon them out of Imperial sources? He (Mr. Healy) was sure he did not. The Corporation was not to be relieved of the extra expense which this jerrymandering proposal, which they had had nothing to do with and which they had protested against so strongly, would entail on the ratepayers. They had never yet had any experience or experiment in regard to this single-Member system, and still less had they had any experiment of the breaking up of wards for these purposes. Therefore, he (Mr. Healy) could not form the remotest conception of what would be the state of disorder into which the lists would be thrown when they came up for revision next October. He was appalled at the prospect. No one knew what would be done or what to do. There were to be the Trinity Ward, the Rotunda Ward, the South Dock Ward in the different constituencies. The collectors who would have to deal with

them would belong to the Collector General's Office. Now, the Collector General's Office was unpopular to a frightful extent. Every single individual in it was an Orangeman and a Freemason. There was not a single Catholic in it. He was happy to say he had been instrumental in getting the former Collector General, Mr. John Byrne, sent about his business, and other hon. Members had also been successful in disturbing other officials of the Office. Well, it would be to these gentlemen, so unpopular in their antecedents, to whom would be confided the preparation of the lists. What would happen? Why, they would make mistakes, and would call them accidental—would say they could not help it. In Ireland they were not used to this system of splitting up wards. The collectors when they had made mistakes would say—"Why did Parliament throw on us this Herculean task, for which we are not equipped, and in regard to which we have made no experiment?" And if they were complained of they would say—"The blame must rest upon the shoulders of Parliament and the Legislature." There would be no remedy whatever against these men. Look at the character of some of them—of the late Collector of Rathmines, the Clerk of the South Dublin Union, for instance, who, in 150 cases, had put on the rate-books the names of persons who had never lived for an instant of their lives in the places for which they obtained votes, and who had no more right to vote for those places than had the Emperor of Russia. They were simply bogus, straw voters who did not exist. This roguery had been detected, and yet the Government—the Local Government Board—had condoned it. Questions, however, were put in the House, he (Mr. Healy) having interested himself in securing the dismissal of one collector, and the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) having taken a similar interest in another on altogether different grounds. If that was the state of things under the old £12 occupation franchise, what would it be under the new franchise? People who had in the past been tolerably well able to protect themselves would, under this system of split wards, be for some time powerless under this Orange-Freemason machinery. They would have these people disfranchished, not in files, but in battalions. He did not mean to say that they would be struck off the lists; but they would never be put on, and the Irish Members would next year be coming to the House with their fingers in their mouths complaining of the ruffianly conduct of the officials under this Bill. The Government would be laughing in their sleeves, saying, after the elections were over—"We will give you a remedy—we will dismiss these people." That was the system the Government were pursuing. The Irish Members thoroughly understood it. The right hon. Baronet said these questions involved considerations which could not be discussed with advantage in the House, and that the Commissioners were aware of all the local circumstances and arguments. What satisfaction was that to the Irish Members? The Irish Members understood the question. The right hon. Baronet did not. The Irish Members knew the motives which had existed in the minds of the people who made this proposal—they were familiar with the whole thing from garret to basement. They knew the arguments in support of the Commissioners' scheme were as frivolous as they were mechanical, and that they were not based on the good sense of the right hon. Baronet. It was most unfortunate that they seemed to be able to make no appeal whatever to the good sense or logical faculties of the Committee. He had known the time when the House, bad as it was, would listen to an argument addressed to it, and when the Treasury Bench could be got to accept an Amendment. In the present case, however, there was no chance of anything of the kind. They had their minds made up; they were armoured in triple brass from Arlington Street. The Irish Members knew it was no use coming down to the House to ventilate their grievances in regard to this Bill; but he would suggest to hon. Members on the Irish Benches, and to hon. Members in other parts of the House who had grievances under this Bill, the desirability of combining against the Government. Do not let them remain in such a complete state of disorganization. On one occasion it had been said by an hon. Member that if certain little insects were unanimous they might pull a person out of bed. So in the case of hon. Members

who had grievances in connection with this measure. If they would all unite, each would be able to carry his point; but, as it was, they scattered themselves, enabling the Government to meet each discontented section separately, and defeat it easily. [*Laughter.*] He observed that the hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen (Mr. Webster) was smiling. He (Mr. Healy) had voted for his Amendment a short time ago, but he would not ask the hon. Member to vote for the present proposal; but he desired to impress it upon the mind of the Committee that the Government by this system he had described were able to beat down all opposition to the measure. If they went to units in the House, they would find that almost everyone had some objection to the measure. But it was unnecessary for him to dwell on this matter, and he would only say that the right hon. Baronet had used one argument which was peculiar. He had said it was most unfortunate that in the only two cases in Ireland in which the Corporation had put forward schemes the Commissioners had not acted upon them—that was to say, in the cases of Belfast and Dublin. The right hon. Gentleman had said that in all the other cases the Commissioners would have been most anxious to have accepted the views of the Corporations; but these two were the only places affected by the Bill where the Local Authorities could put forward schemes. It was by arguments of that kind that they were attempted to be met; and really, in his judgment, the degradation of Parliament had never sunk lower than it had done under this Redistribution Bill. They were going through a farce which took all the life and heart out of debate. It might be asked, why did the Nationalist Members go through with it? They did it for this reason—they did not believe that the Bill would lead to any finality whatever, and they were anxious not to allow it to go by default, so that it might be said, when a new Bill was introduced to deal with the subject, that they had had nothing to say upon the old one. He would make this suggestion to the Government—that they should make this scheme provisional so far as it affected Dublin. They should pass it for, say, four or five years, and then, if it was found that the Tories kept their one Member, well and good; but, if not, let the old position be restored. That was a fair-and-square proposal. Let them pass the Bill as it stood, and the Nationalists would put up with it for the present; but it should be provided that in the year 1890 this scheme should stop and the matter should come up for review, and the public should be made certain that the arrangement was not to continue *in sæcula sæculorum*. The Nationalist Party in Dublin ought not to be paralyzed 10, 20, or 30 years hence, because of the freaks and vagaries of the Boundary Commissioners in 1884-5. If the Nationalists proved, as they would do at the General Election, that they could carry every one of these four divisions, then the wards ought not to be split up, but should be left as they stood at present. Those wards were the units of the Municipal Poor Law, and for Grand Jury, rating, and every other purpose connected with civic life. They ought, then, to be preserved for Parliamentary purposes also. Why was it proposed to destroy them by this Bill? It was for selfish, improper, and disgraceful objects—to give Party advantages which they would not otherwise have to the Tories of Dublin. Those Gentlemen had already two seats for the University, and it was now proposed to give them three. They had two seats out of six already; it was now proposed to give them three out of six. Could anybody say that the Tories formed half the population of Dublin? What was the aim and object of the Bill? The Tories would have a third of the representation of Dublin already, by means of the two Members for Trinity College. It was now sought by this Bill to give them one-half; and the Nationalists were asked to submit tamely to this proposal. The splitting up of the wards was a rank absurdity. They were told that the riverside population should be kept in one division; but that was simply ludicrous, as anyone who knew Dublin and remembered Mountjoy Square would admit, for that square was situated in the same area which contained this alleged riverside population. It was proposed to put all the riverside population into one area; but why were Mountjoy Square and other places of that kind to be thrown in with this quay-side population? Anyone who knew anything about the selfish scheme of the Commissioners knew that it was condemned and damned on the face of

it; and the inquiry which took place on the subject—an inquiry which he attended professionally—was little better than a farce. The whole of the Commissioners appeared to have made up their minds beforehand; and that was proved by the fact that when the next morning arrived, without any debate or discussion, the Emergency Association handed in their plan, and it was at once accepted. Everybody regarded the latter scheme at the time as a joke and a farce; and that was the way in which the people of Ireland were treated by the Government who appointed these Commissioners. The people had never yet been able to trust a single official appointed under these circumstances; and he must say that this business would have much more serious consequences than its simple relation to the Bill, for it had sown the seeds of distrust in regard to everything connected with Committees of Inquiry and Royal Commissions. The people had now come to know that such things were a mere sham — that the Government only appointed people of a certain kidney to carry out schemes in the interests of the Tory and landlord class. So long as the Bill existed in its present form—so long as the divisions of the City and County of Dublin were continued in the manner now proposed —so long would they be monuments of the shameful way in which Lord Spencer, acting on the advice and stimulated by the wishes of the Freemason and Orange class, had ordered the Commissioners to carry out a plan which would give the Tories an extra vote in addition to the two they already possessed for Dublin University.

Mr. PARNELL said, he had thought that they would have had some better defence on the part of the Government than the very perfunctory one offered by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke). The case which had been made out with regard to the jerrymandering of the South-Eastern Division of the City of Dublin was a very complete one. Two wards in that division had been split for the purpose of obtaining if possible—though it was a vain and useless attempt—representation for a very small section of the population in that district. That section was composed of land agents, Government officials, landowners, and so forth, nearly every one of whom had votes in other constituencies throughout the country; so that it was, practically, an attempt on the part of the Government to give to a number of men who resided for a portion of the year in the City of Dublin—a number of fagot-voters in other parts of Ireland—a special representation of their own, carried out of the City by means of the most extraordinary system of jerrymandering, of a kind of which the right hon. Baronet had only been able to find one instance in connection with all the borough constituencies of England. The right hon. Baronet had told them that, in casually going over the whole of the borough constituencies in England, he had been able to find one example where wards had been divided—the example of Leeds—to the same extent as they had been divided in the South-Eastern district of Dublin. But they knew very well that the right Baronet had produced the only example that he was able to produce out of all the borough constituencies of England. He (Mr. Parnell) did not wish to venture upon an estimate of the number; but they must, at least, be 200. The right hon. Baronet had only been able to give them one example where the wards had been split, as they had been split in the case of Dublin—that was to say, he had only been able to give them an example amounting to ½ per cent upon the whole number of cases. But what was the case in Ireland? There were only two borough constituencies in Ireland which were affected by the redistribution scheme in the sense of being divided, and in which it was possible for the Commissioners to jerrymander in this way; by cutting the wards. In one of those two cases they had cut the wards—that was to say, 50 per cent of the Irish borough constituencies affected by the Bill had been jerrymandered by the cutting of the wards; whereas in the case of England only ½ per cent had been so jerrymandered. The right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) admitted that this was a very strong proceeding, because the only argument he had offered against the force of the opposition to it had been this single example of Leeds. Before he left this part of the question he (Mr. Parnell) must allude to the principle which was steadfastly and

constantly maintained and kept before their eyes by the English Commissioners in reference to this matter of keeping the wards intact. In their Report they declared that with regard to boroughs it had appeared to them that they were not susceptible to division either by parishes or by aggregates of parishes, and that the best areas to be taken were those of the wards formed for local elections under the Municipal Corporations Act. Further on, they stated that there was a strong desire in every borough that in forming the divisions the wards should, if possible, be preserved intact; and they added that in several divisions they had allowed, in deference to this feeling, a disproportionate boundary to that which they would otherwise have recommended. The English Commissioners had therefore adopted a converse course to that which had been followed in Ireland, for they had allowed a disproportion to exist in several divisions—even a regrettable disproportion—rather than cut the wards. But in the case of Dublin they had produced a disproportion in the population, in order that they might cut the wards. The volume containing the Report with regard to England was full of examples. Of the borough of Marylebone, for instance, the Commissioners said in their special Report that the divisions as proposed by them were based entirely upon the wards into which the borough was divided under the Act, for it was apparent that the disproportion could only be obviated by a very inconvenient division of the wards. Again, in the case of the borough of Paddington, it was stated that the divisions as proposed by the Commissioners consisted entirely of the wards into which the borough was divided under the 'Metropolis Management Act. In the case of Shoreditch, they stated that the divisions as proposed consisted entirely of wards, and that there was a disparity of population between the two divisions which could only be remedied by dividing some of the wards. The wards, however, were not divided. These were cases which he had collected at random, and they showed the converse action taken by the English Commissioners to that taken by the Irish Commissioners, and that in the English boroughs the Commissioners had distinctly refrained from dividing the wards, although they might have remedied the disparity of population in the various divisions if they had divided the wards. The volume containing the Report of the English Commissioners was studded with cases where they had avoided dividing the wards, and where they had specially and consistently held in their mind's eye the principle and duty of refraining from cutting the wards. He wished now to refer to an argument of the Irish Commissioners which had been repeated by the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board. The right hon. Baronet had no special local knowledge whatever of the City of Dublin, or of the way in which its population was distributed; but the Commissioners knew very well that they were jerrymandering this South-Eastern Division. They knew very well that the result would come before a tribunal which had no special knowledge—no knowledge whatever, in fact—of the local circumstances, but which was absolutely ignorant of the city. And he declared that the audacity of the Irish Commissioners in making such an assertion to that House as that which had been repeated by the right hon. Baronet that night in defence of the Government plan was of the most unblushing character. The Commissioners stated that they had regard to the character and pursuits of the population when they crossed the river, and that they kept the riverside population on both sides of the river in the same division. But what was the case with regard to this riverside population? It was only to be found on one side of the river. A residential riverside population had no existence on the north side of the river. The north side of the Liffey was composed of manufacturing establishments, large wharves, the Custom House, the railway stations, steamship depôts, and all those great buildings which were only occupied in the day time, and which were used as part of the necessary adjuncts to quays and wharves where the trade of the City was received. The north side was not an inhabited side. It had about the same relation to the south side of the river that the City of London had to Westminster. The City of London possessed a day population, but not a night population; and the English Commissioners might just as reasonably have grouped together the City of London and

Westminster on the ground that the pursuits of the population were the same, and might just as reasonably and consistently have presented to Parliament a Report recommending the justice of such grouping as the Irish Commissioners had acted in recommending Parliament to adopt their grouping for Dublin on the ground that the riverside population on the north of the Liffey was the same as the riverside population on the south. The fact was that the two sides of the river had no characteristic in common. The real object was to cut away from this South-Eastern District, which the Commissioners, he believed unavailingly, had attempted to keep as a preserve to the landlord and official class in Ireland—to cut away the large riverside population which undoubtedly did exist on the south side of the Liffey, and to throw it into the North-Eastern Division, where there would have been no riverside population at all if it had not been for this extraordinary example of boundary manufacturing on the part of the Commissioners. It was difficult to convey to English Members an adequate notion of the extraordinary steps which had been taken by the Irish Commissioners to serve their own Party. The original plans were not so bad; but those original plans were undoubtedly arranged in England; and it was not until the work was handed over to the permanent Government officials in Ireland that this jerrymandering came into play. This, of course, was the first example that he and his Friends had been able to unfold in detail to the House of Commons; but it would, unhappily, be their duty to trace the operations of the Commissioners in the Northern counties, where they would be able to show that the same precedent had been followed and the same unusual exertions made for the purpose of giving the official and the landowning class in Ireland a representation to which they were not entitled. The City of Dublin had had a history which entitled it to better treatment at the hands of the Government. Originally the "City of the Pale," up to the end of the last century no Nationalists—none but the Garrison Party—were allowed to own property or carry on trade in the city. It was the preserve of the Orange and Garrison Party in Ireland. He was happy, however, to say that the vitality and industry of the Celtic race had now enabled them to take possession of the whole of Dublin, and that, with the exception of this one little ward, in which such unusual methods had been resorted to for the purpose of maintaining the power of the Ascendancy Party, there was no part of it which could be looked to for any help in the system of English misgovernment in Ireland. He doubted whether even the attempt which the Boundary Commissioners had made—the strenuous and barefaced attempt—to jerrymander would be of any avail. The Catholics of Ireland had taken possession of Dublin; they had peopled it, and filled it with their works and their industry in a way which had even been admired by an illustrious visitor on a recent occasion. He (Mr. Parnell) felt confident that, notwithstanding the way in which the Government had played into the hands of the agents of misrule by this Boundary Commission, and even should the House refuse to lend any assistance to redress the inequality and injustice which had been committed, the attempt would not bear the fruit which was hoped for; but the majority of the people would be able at the forthcoming General Election to assert their principles, and to return their Representatives for every division of the city.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that hon. Members below the Gangway had addressed themselves to this case with ability, fluency, and some strength of language; and the gist of their case was that the Commissioners had endeavoured to jerrymander the wards of Dublin with a view to the return of Members of their own class. But, almost in the same breath, those hon. Members had declared that there was no prospect whatever that that measure would be successful.

MR. HEALY: That is not your fault.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) had been very strong upon the point.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: I never opened my lips.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the hon. and learned Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy) declared before the Commissioners at Dublin that he was there in the interests of the Nationalists, and that, in reference to this matter, it

made very little matter whether the proposed divisions were adopted or not, as they could carry the whole city.

Mr. HEALY: Hear, hear!

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, it was clear, then, that the hon. and learned Member, while complaining of the jerrymandering of the wards, with a view to return one Member of a particular political complexion, was still of opinion that the process would not be successful. That appeared to him (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) to show a very imperfect knowledge of what the Boundary Commissioners were doing. If they were influenced by the motive attributed to them, and were unblushingly trying to jerrymander, surely they might have jerrymandered to some better purpose.

Mr. HEALY: They did all they could. They did their worst.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE went on to say that he had understood the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) to declare that the population of Dublin was such that the principle in reliance upon which the Commissioners had acted would not work. The hon. Member appeared to think that there was only one single case in all the English borough constituencies where the Commissioners had divided the wards.

Mr. PARNELL: I said to the same extent.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, there were many cases in England where the boundaries of the wards had been cut.

Mr. SEXTON: I said that in England, where they divided the wards, they did so in order to produce equality of population, and that in some cases they put up with inequality of population rather than divide the wards.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, there were many cases in which the Commissioners had sub-divided wards. His right hon. Friend the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had mentioned the case of Leeds. He (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) might mention the case of Birmingham; because in Birmingham, as well as in Leeds, regard had been had to the equalization of the population, and also to the pursuits of the population. He had no doubt there were other cases of the same kind. He maintained that the scheme of the Corporation did not carry out the principle which had been laid down by the Government with respect to the pursuits of the population. The scheme of the Commissioners divided the riverside population and the residential population, whereas the Corporation plan mixed up the two populations. What was really the principle involved in the two competing schemes? On the one hand, the Commissioners had followed the directions of the Government, and had endeavoured to take into consideration the pursuits of the population as well as the question of the boundaries of wards; while, on the other hand, the scheme of the Corporation mixed up the two populations, although they were quite distinct from one another. The real point was, whether the Corporation scheme or the Commissioners' scheme had most regard to the pursuits of the population; and, in the opinion of the Government, the Corporation scheme was deficient in that particular. No doubt, it would be desirable not to interfere with the boundaries of wards; but the Commissioners were bound by their Instructions to take into account every principle which was laid down, and one of the chief of those principles was that they should have regard to the pursuits of the population. Personally, he did not believe that any political interest was involved in this matter. He quite agreed with hon. Gentlemen opposite that the Nationalists would have a great advantage in all the four divisions of the city. He heard from every source that there was little hope of any other Party getting even one of the four seats. Those considerations, however, did not enter into the minds of the Commissioners; they were bound to have regard to the pursuits of the population, and they faithfully carried out their instructions.

Mr. GRAY said, it was not a sufficient argument against their contention and their accusation that the Commissioners had attempted jerrymandering for the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) to say that even if the Commissioners had made the attempt they had not succeeded. They blamed the Commissioners for making the attempt; and if the right hon. Gentleman considered that they had not been successful in the attempt, he (Mr. Gray) asked him not to visit the Commissioners with any great amount of censure; because, undoubtedly, they had done their best to bring about the

return of a Conservative for the city. If there were not a sufficient number of Nationalists found in any one division of Dublin—no matter how the divisions were manipulated—to return a Conservative, it was not the fault of the Commissioners. The right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General had acknowledged that the Corporation scheme had one very strong point; but he entirely failed to show that the scheme which had been adopted in substitution for it had any strong point at all. The right hon. Gentleman said that this necessarily was a matter of conflict of authority. Now, he (Mr. Gray) invited the Committee to consider what authority was in evidence before them on this subject. They had a number of Irish Representatives, who ought to know something about the subject, making definite assertions upon the one side. There was not one single Member from Ireland who ventured to stand up and make an assertion upon the other side of the question. No person who knew anything whatever of Dublin—no person who had ever passed through Dublin—would be caught by the specious argument about the river population. Everyone knew, as had been asserted in the able speech of his hon. Friend (Mr. Sexton), and, later on, by the hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Irish Party (Mr. Parnell), that there was no river population on the north side of the city. Everyone acquainted with Dublin knew full well that the north side of the river was occupied by great warehouses and large offices, and that there was no residential population there at all. Of course, to English Members who knew nothing of the circumstances, and who might imagine that the navigable river in Dublin corresponded to some navigable river in England with which they might be personally acquainted, it might appear a very plausible and reasonable argument to speak of the riverside population on the north side of the river; but to Irishmen such an argument had no meaning whatever. Irishmen knew that the riverside population of Dublin was all upon one side of the city. Every person in Dublin knew thoroughly well that when the Commissioners' scheme was propounded it was a mere device to go as far as they could, quite irrespective of reason and common sense, to divide the city so as to secure one seat for what they called the Anti-Ireland Party. The Press, and, indeed, everyone in Dublin, discussed the subject from a political aspect. No one in Dublin ever spoke of the riverside population; indeed, any person who did so would be laughed at. Conservatives justified it on the ground that it was an attempt to give the so-called Loyalist Party in the city a Representative. It was contended that their wealth and intelligence, and their former services to the English Government, and their loyal proclivities, entitled them to a Representative. He really did not think that the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) himself would venture to stand up and say that political considerations had not entered into the division of the city. His hon. Friend the Member for Sligo had left very little to be said on the subject. He (Mr. Gray) felt it was natural for a subject of this kind to be discussed, although the conclusion was, no doubt, foregone. He could not help regretting that the subject should be discussed under circumstances such as the present. For a considerable time the Opposition Benches had been very sparsely tenanted; now they were absolutely tenantless. Although the conclusion might be foregone, and the contention of the Irish Members hopeless, it was none the less their duty to put the facts before the Committee, and to protest against the manipulation of the constituency. There was not the slightest doubt that the Commissioners, instead of dividing the population with regard to their pursuits, had endeavoured to divide them with regard to their politics. It was notorious that the Commissioners had attempted to do this, and they had certainly gone as far as they possibly could in that direction. He (Mr. Gray) was not quite so sanguine as some of his hon. Friends that the Commissioners might not succeed in giving an artificial representation to the Tory Party in the South-Eastern Division of the city. Their intention was made plain by their original scheme, for in that scheme they set aside all natural divisions, and went so far as to divide houses and rooms so as to give the Tories a chance. He protested against the enormous inconvenience and trouble and heavy expense which would be permanently placed on the city in consequence of this most preposterous scheme. The

ward was a unit in Dublin, more essentially and more completely, probably, than it was in any other part of the United Kingdom. The electoral lists were made out by the Collectors General of Rates; and it would be a source of great inconvenience, as well as great expense to the city, to depart from the natural division and adopt the artificial one proposed by the Commissioners. He supposed there was no use in he and his hon. Friends doing anything more than protesting. Again, he drew attention to the fact that the right hon. Baronet stated that questions of this kind—questions of detail—must necessarily depend upon the weight of authority. Now, if the Committee voted on this Amendment according to their convictions, and according to the arguments which had been adduced, and not in fulfilment of the compact which had been arrived at by the Leaders of the two great Parties in the House, he asked upon which side success would lie? On the one side they had hon. Members asserting that the present division was an artificial one, a most unnatural one, a most inconvenient one, and a most unreasonable one; and on the other side they had only got two Gentlemen who, from their official position, were driven to defend the scheme—Gentlemen who had said a few perfunctory words on the subject, scarcely dealing at all with the arguments which had been adduced against the scheme. There was not a single Irish Member—no, not even the Members for the City of Dublin itself—found ready to come forward and say one word in favour of the scheme of the Commissioners. The right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had been able to ferret out another case in England, in addition to that of Leeds, in which wards had been sub-divided. Now, he (Mr. Gray) had looked at the case of Birmingham, and he found that all that the Commissioners had done was to divide one ward. That was a manifestly exceptional case, and he supposed it was justified on the ground of the pursuits of the people. Everyone who knew Birmingham knew that large masses of the population followed particular trades, or trades very much allied one to the other; but a person knowing anything about Dublin would not say that that was the case there. Indeed, no one having any acquaintance with the city had said so for a moment; but two Government officials had read out some observations with which they were supplied by the Commissioners, who, of course, were bound to defend their indefensible conduct. He supposed the Committee would deem it to be their duty, in accordance with some secret agreement arrived at, to adhere to the scheme. He (Mr. Gray) and his hon. Friends, however, deemed it their duty to protest against what had been done.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD pointed out that in Manchester the Commissioners had divided two wards, and in Salford one ward, distinctly with a view to the equalization of the population. It was admitted by the Government that in this case the division of wards had been made in order to separate the pursuits of the population. He (Mr. Arthur Arnold) distinctly disagreed with that suggestion. He thought the pursuits of a population was not a matter which should have been regarded; and he should certainly vote in favour of the scheme of the Corporation of Dublin, as a protest against separation on the ground of the pursuits of the population.

Mr. SEXTON said, he would only ask the Committee to divide upon that part of the Amendment which related to the division of the city. With regard to the question of the nomenclature of the divisions, he would, in conformity with the desire of the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke), suspend that part of his Amendment until Report.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman would consider the matter himself.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed,

In page 42, line 4, to leave out the words "The North West Dublin Division," in order to insert the words "The Four Courts Division,"—(*Mr. Sexton,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'The North West Dublin Division' stand part of the Schedule."

Mr. CALLAN said, that it had been alleged that the city had been divided in this peculiar fashion in order to bring the riverside population together. Looking casually at the map, however, he

found there was only one bridge connecting the riverside population on the East side of Dublin with the district South of the Liffey. Looking to the North-West and South-West of Dublin, where no amount of jerrymandering could affect anybody, he found that the boundary was the river, although there were seven bridges connecting the riverside population. On the East side, where a political object could be obtained by a little bit of judicious jerrymandering, and where there was only one bridge across the river, the two sides had been grouped together. In his (Mr. Callan's) opinion, it was a piece of effrontery, and an insult to the intelligence of the Committee, to defend the scheme of the Commissioners on the ground that it was desired to keep the riverside population together.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 47; Noes 16: Majority 31.—(Div. List, No. 94.)

Question, "That Schedule 6, as amended, stand part of the Bill," put, and *agreed to.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Monday* next.

SUPPLY.—REPORT.

Resolutions [9th April] *reported.*

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

First Resolution *agreed to.*

Second Resolution read a second time.

MR. DICK-PEDDIE said, he had no intention of offering opposition to the Vote; but he desired to put a question, which, perhaps, the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General could answer. One thing was very remarkable in the plans for the new buildings—the inordinate portion of space which was to be occupied by passages and staircases. He had no objection to the plans; so far as a hurried examination of the competing designs enabled him to judge, that selected seemed to be the best of those submitted; but he wished to know what was the addition to the cost of the building caused by the great proportion of space allotted to staircases and passages? The unusual proportion of space allotted to staircases and passages was the result of the principle of arrangement adopted by the architect—namely, that of having rooms on only one side of the corridor. Could the right hon. Gentleman give, upon paper, a statement showing the area on the first floor of the building occupied by walls and partitions, the area occupied by staircases and passages, and the area occupied by rooms?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he thought there would be no difficulty in giving such a Return, and he would communicate with the Office of Works. Comparing the plans with the Home Office and the Colonial Office, the advantage of the proposed arrangement as to light and convenience would be apparent.

Resolution *agreed to.*

Remaining Resolutions *agreed to.*

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (EXPENSES OF CONFERENCES) BILL.

(*Mr. Leake, Mr. Algernon Egerton, Mr. Agnew, Mr. Arthur Arnold.*)

[BILL 88.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Leake.*)

MR. HEALY said, he observed in the Bill that though Ireland was not formally excluded, yet, practically, that would be so. He offered no opposition to the Bill; indeed, he would be glad to see it pass; but he did not see why legislation for the two countries should vary. If Irish Members brought in a similar Bill for Ireland, it would surely be "blocked," or else thrown out in the House of Lords; could not the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Leake) devise some means of extending the provisions of the Bill to both countries? If the Government did not object, he hoped English Members would be generous enough to allow Ireland to be included. The Bill was to remove certain doubts as to the legality of expenses incurred by local authorities, and it was not stated anywhere that the Act should not apply to Ireland; but in the Interpretation Clause the expression was used, that certain words should have the same effect as those used in the Public Health Act of 1875. Now, that Act did not

apply to Ireland—the Irish Act was passed in 1878. But there was no reason in the world why Ireland should not have the benefit of the Bill; and, therefore, to obtain some reply from the Government, he begged to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. Healy.*)

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he was afraid he was hardly in a position to express any opinion on the subject; it was a question for the Local Government Board in either country; and the Bill had received the sanction of the Local Government Board for England; but, not being conversant with the matter, he could not say if Ireland should be included. He would undertake to say the point should be carefully considered.

MR. PARNELL said, he would suggest to the hon. Gentleman who had charge of the Bill (Mr. Leake) that he should consider the matter between this and the Report stage of the Bill, agreeing to a nominal Amendment in Committee, so as to insure that there should be a Report stage. Of course, if the Bill passed through Committee without Amendment, there would be no Report stage. Meanwhile the matter might be examined, and he judged the Government would not object.

MR. WARTON said, in reference to the last observations from the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), that it was his intention to move an Amendment which the hon. Member in charge of the Bill was inclined to accept.

MR. LEAKE said, he had not the least objection that the Bill should extend to Ireland, and therefore he accepted the suggestion of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). If the Bill were now allowed to go through Committee, then, on the Report, probably the reference to Ireland might be introduced.

MR. HEALY said, in asking leave to withdraw his Motion, he would ask the hon. Member (Mr. Leake) to be content with getting the Bill into Committee, and then to report Progress. He would thus advance the Bill a stage. For his own part, he thought it would be a little too soft to allow the Bill to go through Committee; he knew too much of the Irish Government to trust them so far.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Short title).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Healy.*)

MR. WARTON said, perhaps the hon. and learned Member would allow the Bill to proceed to his (Mr. Warton's) Amendment.

MR. HEALY said, he had no objection.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Expenses of local authorities may be allowed).

MR. WARTON said, the Amendment he had to propose would come in line 13, after the word "Board," in the second line of the clause, to insert the words "on their behalf." The words of the clause were rather wide, and the phrase he proposed was often employed in such cases.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 13, after the word "Board," to insert the words "on their behalf."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. HEALY said, this was exactly the point where an Amendment to apply the Act to Ireland would come in; after "Board," the reference to the Local Government Board (Ireland) would come in. He would, therefore, move to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Healy.*)

MR. WARTON said, in the latter part of the clause might be introduced the words "Public Health Act (Ireland), 1878," and also in the Interpretation Clause, to the effect that the words "Local Government Board" should mean in England or in Ireland. To

accept the present Amendment would not limit the Committee at all.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Thursday* next.

House adjourned at a quarter after One o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 13*th April*, 1885.

MINUTES.]—*Took the Oath for the First Time*—The Lord Bishop of London.

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Tramways (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 2) * (65); Local Government Provisional Orders * (66); Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) * (67).

Second Reading — Burgh Police and Health (Scotland) * (57), *discharged;* Criminal Law Amendment (58); Solicitors (Ireland) * (53); Army (Annual) * (62).

Withdrawn—County Justices * (55).

HOUSE OF LORDS—THE LATE EARL CAIRNS.—OBSERVATIONS.

EARL GRANVILLE: Your Lordships will not, I am sure, think it presumptuous in me if I ask your permission to say one word with regard to the great blow which has been inflicted upon this House by the death of Earl Cairns. I could have wished to bear testimony myself to his worth as a man, to his greatness as a lawyer, to his eminence as a politician; but I prefer to use words of more authority. I hold in my hand a letter from the Lord Chancellor, which, after a touching allusion to the great calamity which he himself has sustained, goes on thus:—

"I should like you to say that I am among those who feel this loss deeply both upon public and private grounds; and if I were not myself suffering under the severest affliction, I should desire, from my place in the House, to endeavour to pay that tribute to the late Earl's great qualities and great virtues which nearly 40 years of constant intercourse on terms of friendship never interrupted would perhaps have qualified me to pay."

I feel, my Lords, that these are words which all your Lordships will endorse, and it seems to me that in these sad circumstances it is singularly pathetic and strikingly indicative of the character of the two men—this simple tribute from Lord Selborne to his Friend and great rival who has passed away.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, the noble Earl, in the exercise of his position of Leader of this House, has paid in a fitting and graceful manner a tribute to the qualities and virtues of the statesman and lawyer whom we have lost. All that he says from a public and general point of view, we, who have lost, not only a great public example, a great ornament to the Assembly to which we belong, but a friend, a counsellor, and a comrade of many years' standing, re-echo—we re-echo his words and the words of the Lord Chancellor with a peculiar feeling of the acuteness of the bereavement, if I may use the word, which has happened to us. Lord Cairns had an eminence not very often granted to a single man—he was equally great as a lawyer, as a statesman, and as a legislator. In all these three capacities his memory will live in the minds of his fellow-countrymen, and will leave its mark on history. To us the loss is very severe indeed. No one but those who have sat in Council and worked with him can thoroughly appreciate the inestimable value of his calm, judicial mind, even on the most burning questions of politics, and the wonderful grasp with which he perceived at once all the bearings of the most complicated facts, and all the lucidity with which he marshalled the arguments and considerations to which it was necessary to give attention, and which fell from his mouth, as it seemed, at once naturally and without effort into their proper place, and made all that seemed before obscure and difficult as simple and clear as daylight. The loss of such a counsellor at such a time is the heaviest burden and blow that could be inflicted upon a political Party. On behalf of that Party I thank the noble Earl for the touching language he has used with respect to Lord Cairns. His death leaves a void not easily supplied in the debates and proceedings of this House, and which can never be replaced in the services which it was in his power to render to the Friends with whom he acted for so many years.

LORD COLERIDGE: My Lords, I desire to add my testimony to that of the noble Earl and noble Marquess as to the public loss which everyone on

both sides of this House will admit has been sustained by the death of Lord Cairns. To his great public gifts ample justice, and no more than ample justice, has been done by the language of the noble Earl and noble Marquess who respectively lead those great political Parties into which this country is divided. But for his own domestic bereavement, we should have heard from the lips of the Lord Chancellor in this House, with an eloquence all his own, whose knowledge was equalled by few and surpassed by none, what the Profession of the Law had lost, and we should have heard it from a man who, while at the Bar, was Lord Cairns's constant rival and also his constant friend. To the language which we have heard from the noble Earl and noble Marquess, and to that which has been read from the Lord Chancellor, no words of mine can add. But as one who in this and the other House of Parliament has watched his career, who in the course of years has been occasionally engaged with him or against him in the practice of the Law, and who has listened to him with infinite intellectual pleasure on many occasions, I wish to say a few words, though I can add nothing to the universal feeling which has found expression here and "elsewhere" as to his great and commanding qualities. It is perfectly true, as the noble Marquess has said, that he had a mind powerful enough to throw light and order into the most intricate and complicated facts, while he could unweave the subtlest web of argument; and yet he never wasted time or words, but grasped more firmly than most men the subjects with which he had to deal. He could make them more intelligible and clear than others, and at times he rose to an eloquence severe, but always elevated and striking. But it is in another aspect that I would wish to say a few words of my departed Friend. As one who, though not much younger in years, but still junior and inferior to him in the great Profession to which we belonged, always opposed to him in politics, and having very little with him in common except a love of letters and an ardent desire to maintain and advance the great Profession of the Law, I may be allowed to say that in Lord Cairns was always to be found a powerful yet generous antagonist and foe. Whenever he hit a blow he could not help hitting hard, but it was always hitting fairly. He never used language which envenoms debate, but never strengthens argument. The proud and lofty nature of Lord Cairns recoiled from stooping to such things. There is another matter in which I am able to bear the highest possible testimony to the character and integrity of Lord Cairns. It chanced from circumstances with which I need not trouble your Lordships that when I was Chief Justice of the Common Pleas Lord Cairns often consulted me as to judicial appointments which he had to fill, and which had been usually filled by members of the Common Law Bar, with whom in the nature of things he could not himself have had much personal acquaintance. I do not for a moment suggest that he always took my advice. Lord Cairns was too great a man, he had too independent a mind, not to rely in the last resort upon his own judgment. He used the judgment of other men as materials to form his own. But this I may say, as those who knew him best must know, that he was always guided by the severest integrity, and always animated by a single-minded desire to do his duty as he understood it. It might be said that by those on both sides who disposed of judicial appointments politics have for many years been disregarded; but anyone acquainted with public affairs must know that it is not an easy thing to resist the importunities of men who perhaps from the nature of the case are not aware of the great public mischief that is done by incompetent persons acting in a judicial position. I may venture to say that Lord Cairns paid marked disregard to the importunity of such men, and would not appoint anyone whom he did not believe to be fully competent. In one case I suggested to him to fill a judicial position one whose competence no one who knew him would venture to deny, and he declined to appoint him. I may speak of the case now without risk of doing any harm. I suggested that the late Mr. Benjamin should be appointed to the Bench—a man whom I was anxious to have seen among the Judges of England, and who to my knowledge would have felt himself honoured by being placed among them. But Lord Cairns refused to consider his claims, and he refused on grounds which I can-

not help admitting were at the time urgent and forcible, and would by most men be held to be conclusive. I am sure that in not appointing that eminent person Lord Cairns acted against his own wishes and on the purest and most patriotic motives. There is one other matter to which I will allude. I have seen it stated—where in other respects ample justice was done him—that Lord Cairns was cold and ungenial in manner, and that he had very little or no sense of humour. That was not my experience. I do not pretend to the honour of his intimacy; but I can say from what I knew of him that I always found him most cheerful and amusing, and there were few men who had a keener sense of humour. His literary and classical acquirements I often had occasion to admire, as also the extent and accuracy of his reading and the correctness of his literary judgment. Lord Cairns, I dare say, was a man who did not readily give his heart. He certainly seemed of a somewhat reserved manner; but when he gave his heart at all he gave it thoroughly. Twice it has come under my own observation that he had a serious difference with a man inferior to himself in every respect, and on both those occasions it was Lord Cairns who first came forward with a frank admission of mistake, and with an earnest desire to continue the friendship, which was not only touching and honourable, but which showed that he was as good and as generous as he was great and commanding. As long as I live I shall be proud to think that I could call my Friend the great man we have lost.

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

(*The Earl of Dalhousie.*)

(NO. 58.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF DALHOUSIE, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, that on two previous occasions their Lordships' House had passed a similar measure, though not without considerable discussion. The Government were anxious in a matter of this kind not to legislate in advance of public opinion, for nothing was so certain to do harm to the cause which the Bill was intended to promote as to aim at legislation which did not carry with it the cordial and hearty support of the outside public. If the Bill aimed at making that criminal which public opinion did not consider to be criminal—if it were to regard immorality as crime and treat it as such, it would at once raise enemies. Again, if it were oppressive in its mode of action, if it gave large inquisitorial powers to the police, or if it made the police censors of public morals, it would probably create a reaction in the public mind, and an opportunity would thus be lost of dealing effectively with the existing state of things in both Houses of Parliament. The Bill differed from its predecessors inasmuch as it did not go so far. The desire of the Government had been to lighten the measure by the excision of doubtful and debatable matter. For instance, the age to which protection was extended, and to which consent could not be pleaded in defence, was reduced from 16 to 15 years. The first four clauses were in exactly the same form as when the Bill of last year left this House. In Clauses 5 and 6 the age to which protection was extended was reduced by one year, and this change was made in the hope of securing unanimity in the passing of the Bill. He was aware that this change would be viewed with some disfavour by those who had given warm and hearty support to the Bills of former years. The Government had not made the change without considerable hesitation and reluctance; but they had done so in the belief that the change was a wise and prudent one, and one that should be adopted rather than run the risk of exciting hostile feeling by a too drastic and sweeping measure. He trusted, therefore, that their Lordships would allow the Bill to be read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Dalhousie.*)

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN said, he thought their Lordships had some cause to complain of the conduct of the Government in respect to this very extraordinary measure. This was the third year in which they had been called upon to pass the Bill, and during those three years no effort had been made to pass it through the other House of Parliament. Last year he expressed the opinion that the Government had no inten-

tion of passing it into law, and the result justified his prediction. He still held the same opinion, because it was perfectly notorious that in the present state of Business in the other House there was not the smallest chance of the measure being carried into law this year. He could not help thinking that it was not consistent with the dignity of the House that Her Majesty's Government should make this House a kind of theatre to exhibit a solemn farce year after year. He quite agreed that, to a certain extent, the Bill showed a marked improvement upon the measure of last year. The clause giving powers for a search warrant to be issued in order that the police might discover whether certain persons' houses were being conducted in a disorderly manner had been omitted, and the public were no longer to be excluded from Courts of Justice where cases to which the Bill applied were being tried. This was a great improvement. With regard to the age of consent, he believed that any alteration of the existing law was quite uncalled for. The alteration was based on no principle whatever, and the clause was opposed to the judgment of the highest legal authorities. The present Lord Chief Justice, when he was Attorney General to Mr. Gladstone's Government, refused his assent to the proposal to raise the age of consent from 12 to 14, because the law of European nations fixed the age of consent at 12 for women, and 14 for men. The framers of the Bill evidently felt that it would open the door to wholesale extortion, and hence it was made a defence to a charge that the accused had reasonable ground to believe that a girl was over age. But how was it to be proved that he had such reasonable ground of belief? The danger to be guarded against was not so much that of wrongful conviction as that of unfounded charge, and the consciousness of this danger was manifest in a strange proviso, which assumed that a man might or might not be treated as guilty of an offence at the time of arrest by the police; and, with strange inconsistency, a police officer was named as the only person whose unsupported evidence should not secure a conviction. Both an offence and the attempt to commit it were visited with the same severe penalty. If we wished to clear the streets of mere girls, which was all we could hope to do, we could best do it by extending the operation of the Contagious Diseases Act, instead of illegally repealing it, for it was abundantly testified that, under the operation of the Act, girls of tender age had been prevented from following evil courses. When certain houses became a nuisance prosecution could be carried to conviction, and until they became a nuisance the wiser course was to ignore them. If by any miracle the Bill should pass this Session in its present form, it would create a maximum of danger with a minimum of safety.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday* the 28*th instant.*

CENTRAL ASIA — RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—RUSSIAN ATTACK ON THE AFGHANS AT PENJDEH—THE NEGOTIATIONS.—QUESTION.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Before the House adjourns I wish, not to put any Question to the noble Earl which he would have any difficulty in answering, but to ask him, Whether there is any information which he can give with respect to the state of the negotiations with Russia, and also whether he can give us any information as to the strange rumours which are prevalent as to the state of things which have taken place on the scene of the negotiations in Afghanistan? The stories are, as I understand some people say, that the Russians are advancing along the Murghab, while others say that the Russians are in Herat. I wish to extract such information as the noble Earl may be able to give.

EARL GRANVILLE: I have nothing to add to what Mr. Gladstone said so well last week. I may, however, say that we have received particulars from M. de Staal of the statement made by General Komaroff as to the causes of the lamentable conflict which has taken place, and the inquiry is proceeding. But I have no reason whatever to believe in the truth of the rumours to which the noble Marquess has referred.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I understand from the noble Earl that he has not received from the Russian Government any explanation as from them-

selves of the circumstances in question?

EARL GRANVILLE: I have received from the Russian Ambassador, not an explanation from the Russian Government, but the statement made to them by General Komaroff, which has also appeared in the public journals of to-day.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Is the noble Earl expecting any further information?

EARL GRANVILLE: We are in communication on the subject.

TRAMWAYS (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER (NO. 2.) BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order of the Lord Lieutenant and Privy Council in Ireland relating to the Cork, Coachford, and Blarney Light Railway—Was *presented* by The Lord FITZGERALD; read 1ª; and *referred* to the Examiners. (No. 65.)

House adjourned at half past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 13th April, 1885.

MINUTES.]—PRIVATE BILLS (*by Order*) — *Second Reading*—North British Railway; Worcester and Broom Railway (No. 1).*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Committee*—Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) (*re-comm.*) [49]—R.P. [*Twelfth Night*].

Report—Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 2)* [107]; Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 3)* [108]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Orders* [100].

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

NORTH BRITISH RAILWAY BILL

(*by Order.*)

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir Charles Forster.*)

MR. WADDY, in moving, as an Amendment, that the Bill be read a second time that day six months, said, he did so for reasons which he hoped would receive the support of every disinterested Member of the House. He had no objection to the Bill so far as it was a Railway Bill, and he had nothing to say against it. His objection was simply with regard to a particular provision of the Bill. The measure provided that the North British Railway Company should become hotel proprietors on a somewhat extensive scale; and if there ever was a case in which such a provision was objectionable it was in the case now under the consideration of the House. It was not an attempt to obtain powers such as were obtained openly in a great many instances, but it was put forward in a very ingenious manner. Many years ago this Railway Company became possessed of certain property for railway purposes. That property had been used in various ways and under various pretexts, and, having had the property so used, the Company now came before Parliament and asked it to sanction that which was done improperly and irregularly a good many years ago. The Company now proposed to open the property they had obtained for the purposes of an hotel. There was not the slightest need for such an hotel, and the Company were simply poaching on the ordinary business of hotel proprietors which had been carried on in the immediate neighbourhood for many years, and which anybody who knew Edinburgh would say had been carried on there successfully and well. One great ground of complaint against the Railway Company was that when they entered into this or any other business, they did not enter into it, as everybody knew, under fair and equal conditions. The hotel proprietors of Edinburgh had no opportunity of opposing the Bill, because it was settled that they had no *locus standi* before the Select Committee to which the measure would be referred, and they were unable, therefore, to put the House in possession of the real state of the facts. The amount of money already spent in the supply of hotel accommodation to Edinburgh and the immediate neighbourhood was very large; and, apart from the breach of faith in the present case, he could not help thinking it was time that something should be done to put a stop to attempts on the part of Railway Companies to undertake businesses for which they were not fitted, and which they had no right to under-

take. It might be a desirable thing to establish hotels when there was a lack of enterprize on the part of other people, and the requirements of the public demanded such accommodation. In such cases it was desirable and right that Railway Companies should undertake the duty, and establish such hotels; but there could be no excuse of that kind in this instance. Everybody knew what took place in regard to Glasgow, where a similar kind of business was carried on by the Railway Company. The passengers were besieged by the guards of the North British Railway Company, who were converted into hotel "touts," and telegrams were despatched to procure beforehand the accommodation required. When the hotel proprietors of Glasgow desired to do the same thing, they were told that they must not send their touts down to the station, because it would be an interference with the business of the Railway Company. That might be so; but the practice did not appear to involve any interference when it was undertaken on behalf of the Company's own hotel, because the moment the train got into the station the passengers were again besieged by touts from the Company's own hotel. The genuine hotel proprietors were consequently subjected to an unfair competition. So long as the business was carried on in a fair manner there might have been no objection; but, unfortunately, it was not conducted fairly, and therefore he begged to move that the Bill be read a second time on that day six months.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(*Mr. Waddy.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. ORR-EWING said, this was one of those important Bills which were known by the name of omnibus Bills, and it proposed to do a great many things besides authorizing the North British Railway Company to enlarge and improve the premises which were at the present moment held by them as an hotel. The hotel in question was an old one, and had been used as an hotel for many years for the convenience and accommodation of passengers by the railway. It had been the property of the North British Railway Company since the year 1865; but the hotel premises were at present unlet, and the object of the 24th clause of the present Bill was to enable the Company to enlarge, remodel, and improve their hotel and other property fronting Prince's Street in Edinburgh, so that they might be able to let it as an hotel. The Railway Company had no intention of occupying the hotel themselves; nor, in fact would they have any right to do so, because the Railway Company were not entitled to carry on the business of hotel-keepers. They found themselves obliged, however, to obtain power under a special Act of Parliament to enable them, among other things, to use their capital in this way. All they wanted, in connection with this property, which had now been in their possession for nearly 20 years, was that they should raise money for the purpose of improving it, so that they might be in a position to let it. The hon. and learned Member for the City of Edinburgh (Mr. Waddy), who had moved the rejection of the Bill, said that the hotel-keepers of Edinburgh had no other method of opposing the measure, or of objecting to any portion of it, except by moving the rejection of the whole of it; and he had told the House that if they had petitioned to be heard against it, it would have been declared that they had no *locus standi*. But the fact of the matter was that they never thought of opposing the Bill until one enterprizing hotel-keeper, who had a large interest in the hotels of Edinburgh, purchased, in the month of February, £300 worth of Stock in order to give him a position to oppose the Bill in public meetings of the Railway Company, and also before the House. If there was any doubt upon the matter whether it was desirable that the Railway Company should obtain this power, it was not a question for the House, but for a Select Committee to consider upstairs. The House could not know anything about the facts of the case, and they had been put in a very prejudiced way by the hon. and learned Member for Edinburgh. The proper place in which the opponents should submit their views was before the Committee upstairs, who would decide whether the North British Railway Company were entitled to raise money for this purpose or not. It would be monstrous to throw

out an important Bill like this upon an insignificant question of this nature. It would, he thought, be an unfortunate abuse of the privileges of that House if a Bill of this kind were to be rejected merely because a mere fragment of it was complained of.

MR. BUCHANAN wished to say a word in support of the Amendment of his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Waddy). The hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Orr-Ewing) said that it was a strong argument in favour of allowing the Bill to be considered, that it was an omnibus Bill, and that it would be unfair because they objected to a part of it to attempt to reject the whole Bill. But he (Mr. Buchanan) understood that it had been held that the Petitioners who opposed the Bill would have no *locus standi* before the Select Committee.

MR. ORR-EWING said, they had presented no Petition.

MR. BUCHANAN said, he understood that unless they obtained the concession they asked for at this stage of the Bill they would find it impossible to obtain it at any other stage. That, he thought, was a strong argument in favour of the proposal of his hon. and learned Friend. As a matter of fact, these premises were originally obtained not for hotel purposes at all, but in order to enlarge the station accommodation of the Railway Company; and the present proposal only showed how ready the Company were to make use of powers granted for one purpose for another and an entirely different purpose. He felt bound to support the proposal of his hon. and learned Friend.

MR. LEWIS begged to move that this debate be now adjourned for the reason that they were not at that moment favoured with the presence of the hon. Gentleman the Chairman of Ways and Means, and he thought it was important that hon. Members who knew nothing about the matter should have the advantage of the advice and assistance of the right hon. Gentleman. It was certainly strange to hear a strong Protectionist argument from the other side of the House; but when private interests were affected they often saw the cloven-foot of Protection peeping out. The hon. Members for Edinburgh appeared there as the champions and supporters of all the existing hotel-keepers in that City, and they denounced as unrighteous that the Railway Company should have the opportunity of setting up a rival establishment. He thought the proposal of the hon. and learned Member was hardly one that the House was likely to accept. It seemed that his objection was confined to a portion only of one clause in the Bill, and yet he asked the House to throw out the whole measure. If the Amendment were accepted, it appeared to him (Mr. Lewis) that it would reduce the business of Private Bills in that House to perfect chaos, and everything that was really of importance in a Private Bill would hereafter stand a chance of being wrecked. [Sir ARTHUR OTWAY here entered the House.] He now saw the hon. Baronet the Chairman of Ways and Means in his place, and he would not, therefore, press the Motion for the adjournment of the debate; but it was perfectly obvious that the House could not allow a division to take place without having the advantage of the advice of the hon. Gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member withdraw the Motion?

MR. LEWIS: Yes.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR said, he knew nothing himself of the merits of this Bill; but he understood that it was an omnibus Bill, which had been introduced to obtain powers for various purposes, and that, amongst other powers, it proposed to enable the North British Railway Company to raise money for enlarging the building for their proposed hotel in Edinburgh. Now, he thought that the hotels attached to railways were very valuable as far as the convenience of the public were concerned, but only in places where hotels were deficient; but this was not the case in Edinburgh, where hotels were many and good, and therefore the additional hotel was not required; and if objections were raised to the proposal in this instance, he considered that it was only right that the question should be fairly argued before a Committee upstairs. If the hon. Member for Dumbarton (Mr. Orr-Ewing) was correct in the statements he had made, he did not think the objection to the second reading of the Bill should be pressed; but as the Chairman of Ways and Means was there, he would probably inform the House whether the powers asked for were such as ought to be given to the Railway Company.

SIR ARTHUR OTWAY said, he had not paid much attention to this matter, nor had he had the advantage of hearing what had been stated in the House upon it. He merely rose, therefore, for the purpose of saying that the opposition of certain hotel-keepers of Edinburgh to one of the provisions of the Bill was scarcely sufficient to justify the House in refusing to read the Bill a second time. Even if it were true that the hotel-keepers had no *locus standi* before the Committee in a matter of this kind, he had no doubt that the Committee to whom the Bill would be referred would have their attention directed to the discussion which had now taken place, and would deem it desirable to consider the matter and decide accordingly. But he must confirm the remark of the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis) that it was the interest of the House of Commons to preserve some principle in arriving at their decisions in regard to the second reading of Private Bills; and if upon a clause of this sort they were to refuse to read a Bill a second time, he could not help thinking that a considerable amount of injustice might be done. Notice having been taken of the complaint of the hotel-keepers of Edinburgh, he thought the House might safely leave the matter in the hands of the Select Committee, and he hoped the second reading of the Bill would now be passed.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY would advise his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Edinburgh (Mr. Waddy) to rest satisfied with the statement of the Chairman of Ways and Means. He had done all that was necessary, he (Mr. J. W. Barclay) thought, to insure that the attention of the Select Committee should be directed to the question he had raised. He did not think his hon. and learned Friend could expect the House to vote against the second reading, because it was a Bill which contained various other important provisions. He felt, therefore, that his hon. and learned Friend would be best consulting the interests of those on whose behalf he was acting if he were now to withdraw his opposition to the Bill on the assurance which had been given by the Chairman of Ways and Means—that the question would be considered by the Select Committee.

MR. ONSLOW said, he had intended to vote with the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite, and he could not say that he agreed with the remarks of the hon. Member for Dumbarton (Mr. Orr-Ewing). He did not think that this was a very small question. He thought that sufficient hotel accommodation already existed in Edinburgh, as was shown by the Petitions which had been presented to that House, and it was monstrous that private interests should be invaded by a powerful Railway Company. But as the Petitioners were to have a *locus standi* before the Committee, or, at all events, their views were to be considered, upon such an assurance he would advise his hon. and learned Friend opposite not to press the Motion to a division.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. and learned Member withdraw the Amendment?

MR. WADDY said, he would not press the matter further; but he desired to say a few words in answer to the observations of the hon. Member for Dumbarton.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. and learned Member is not entitled to address the House again.

MR. WADDY said, that, under those circumstances, he would not consent to withdraw the Amendment.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed.*

QUESTIONS.

—o—

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—CLAIM FOR MALICIOUS BURNING—TRIAL AT WICKLOW ASSIZES.

MR. W. J. CORBET asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he will inquire into the circumstances of a claim made by Mr. Gun Cunningham for alleged malicious burning of a house; whether the facts put before the Grand Jury at the late Assizes at Wicklow showed that two emergency men, named Willoughby and Morgan, left the house in the morning of the 13th July, 1884, locked up, and when they returned it was burned down; whether it was sworn by Mr. Keely, P.L.G. for the district, who gave evidence on behalf

of the cesspayers, that his attention was called to the fire that morning by a man named John Doyle, when he saw it was raging round the chimney, and could not have been caused from the outside unless the person setting it on fire had a long pole or a ladder; whether Mr. Keely's evidence was fully corroborated by John Doyle; whether Willoughby swore that Morgan disappeared after the fire, and was not available at the inquiry; whether the bailiff on the property, Michael Murray, swore he knew nothing of outrages in the district, and was not prepared to say the burning was malicious; whether, as a matter of fact, the district has all along been free from outrage of any kind; whether Mr. G. P. Brenan, one of the Grand Jurors, left his seat at the Grand Jury table to give evidence in support of the claim; whether his evidence was only an expression of opinion that the house was burned maliciously "through the negligence of the two emergency men;" whether Mr. Brenan is land agent to Mr. Gun Cunningham; and, whether he can indicate how the cesspayers can be relieved from a claim made under such circumstances and passed by a Grand Jury, one of whose members was in Mr. Brenan's position of agent and witness interested in getting the presentment passed?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have seen reports of this matter, which is not one in which the Government could interfere. If the cesspayers are dissatisfied with the decision of the Grand Jury, I believe it is open to them to appeal to the Judge.

MR. W. J. CORBET: Will the right hon. Gentleman give any expression of opinion as regards the action of the particular Grand Juror referred to?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I should be going beyond my function to give any opinion on the subject.

POST OFFICE CLOTHING CONTRACTS.

MR. W. J. CORBET asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether the Post Office clothing contract is under the control of the War Department; and, if so, whether there is a clause in form of tender providing that all clothing shall be made up at the contractor's factory only, and that no work whatever shall be done at the homes of the work-people under a penalty of £700; whether he is aware that the firm who have just obtained the contract have sub-let it to a "sweater" at the East end of London, and what steps he will cause to be taken in the matter; and, whether the size roll was withheld from certain manufacturers, and what was the reason for withholding it?

MR. BRAND: The Post Office clothing contract is under the control of the War Office; but there is no such clause in the form of tender as that indicated in the Question. The firm who have obtained the contract have arranged with another War Office contractor to assist them in carrying it out. The size roll was not withheld from any manufacturer who applied for it.

NAVY—(SHIPS) BUILDING AND REPAIRS.

MR. RYLANDS asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, What measures have been adopted, or are intended to be adopted, to carry out the recommendations contained in the Report of the Admiralty Committee on the Building and Repair of Ships?

SIR THOMAS BRASSEY: Papers showing the action which has been taken are about to be presented to Parliament.

THE PRINCE AND PRINCESS OF WALES—THE ROYAL VISIT TO IRELAND—OFFENSIVE SPEECHES.

MR. LEWIS asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to a speech, reported in the morning journals of the 8th instant to have been made in Dublin on the 7th, by Mr. W. O'Brien, M.P., in which he is reported to have said (inter alia):—

> "He could not read with patience all the fuss which was being made about the visit of the Prince of Wales to Ireland. They would never have parley with these English rulers until they had driven them and beaten them out of the Country;"

whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to take any notice of this appeal to physical force against the English Government on the part of a recognised leader of the so-called Nationalist party in Ireland and a Member of this House; and, whether, in view of repeated similar appeals being made to the Irish people, the Government will forthwith announce its decision as to the

renewal of the Crimes Act in the present Session?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have seen the speech referred to, and other similar speeches on the same subject. The Government would very promptly deal with anything like a serious appeal to physical force; but the particular passage quoted by the hon. Gentleman reads to me more like an expression of impatience or disappointment than a call to arms. I do not see that there is any connection between the subject of the Royal visit and the question of renewing the Crimes Act, as to which I have nothing to add to the answers already given.

MR. HEALY: As to this appeal to physical force, I would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether his attention has been called to a speech made by the noble Lord the Member for Liverpool (Lord Claud Hamilton), in which he said that if the Government did not drive "the horde of ruffians, Members of the House," south of the Boyne, he would take the law into his own hands and do so?

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—MR. FLEURY, DISTRICT INSPECTOR OF LISBURN.

MR. CALLAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether Mr. Fleury, District Inspector of Lisburn, is in the habit of appearing on duty at Belfast Quarter Sessions dressed in plain clothes, instead of in his uniform, as directed by the Constabulary Code of Regulations (section 1316); whether he has done so at the last Annual Licensing Sessions held on 1st of November last, when he attended and opposed the application of a widow named Margaret Robinson for a transfer of a licence from her deceased husband; whether he also, on the 20th January last (to which date the application had been adjourned), appeared dressed in a similar manner; whether, in consequence of his being so dressed, when, on stating his opposition, the Chairman asked him who he was, to which he replied that he was the District Inspector; and, whether, on both occasions, he sat beside the Temperance League solicitor, giving him instructions in the opposition to the granting of the transfer; and, if so, whether he was authorised to retain, or instruct, or give information to said solicitor; and, if so, by whom so authorised?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: District Inspector Fleury is not in the habit of attending Quarter Sessions in plain clothes; but he was so dressed on the two occasions referred to, when the application in question, which had been previously repeatedly refused, came on. The Inspector General thinks that as the District Inspector knew he was liable to be called upon, although not then actually conducting the opposition, he should have been in uniform, and has so informed him. The District Inspector gave some information to the solicitor for the opposition, but he did not retain him professionally.

CHARGES AGAINST IRISH OFFICIALS—CASE OF JAMES ELLIS FRENCH—COLONEL BRUCE.

MR. CALLAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, in view of the statement made by the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, when Chief Secretary, in this House on the 17th of June 1884, on the Motion for a—

"Select Committee to inquire into the conduct of the Government with regard to the criminal charges against James Ellis French, County Inspector and Detective Director, and others,"

to the effect—

"I think something may be said of the duty of those who are aware of these horrible crimes, or who think they are aware that these horrible crimes have been committed. These crimes are criminal matters deserving of criminal punishment, and when any person has evidence that such crimes have been committed, he should proceed against the persons who have committed them in the way the Law enjoins, that is, to lay information before a magistrate, whether the offenders be Government officials or not,"

Whether it is a fact that Colonel Bruce, the Inspector General of the Royal Irish Constabulary, held an inquiry in the Castle, Dublin, into certain of the charges against his colleague, James Ellis French, with the result that the said James Ellis French was officially informed by Colonel Bruce that he should "not return to his office till called upon to do so," in other words, that he was suspended from duty; whether the evidence taken at that inquiry was laid before the Law Officers of the Crown for advice and direction, or its nature and effect, and suspension of J. E. French, communicated to His Ex-

cellency the Lord Lieutenant or the Chief Secretary; whether Mr. John Mallon, the Chief Superintendent of the Detective Department of the Metropolitan Police, was instructed to prosecute further inquiry into the said charges; whether it is a fact that, at the inquiry so held by Colonel Bruce, District Inspector Maguire, of Limerick, was examined as to French's conduct towards his brother; whether District Inspector Bell, Athenry, in the course of his evidence at said inquiry made a statement with reference to charges made by his clerk against James E. French of solicitation to commit a felony; and, if so, whether Colonel Bruce took any and what steps to secure the evidence of the said police clerk; and, whether Colonel Bruce, instead of directing the prosecution of further inquiry into the matters disclosed at said inquiry, arising from which J. E. French was suspended from duty, on the contrary warned the District Inspectors so examined to suppress all mention of the matter, and not to divulge the fact that such an inquiry had been held?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: There are no grounds for any of the insinuations against the conduct of Colonel Bruce implied in this Question. I can only repeat that from first to last Colonel Bruce laid before the Government the result of the inquiries which he made, that the steps which he took were taken with the cognizance and approval of the Government, and that the Government assume the entire responsibility for the conduct of the case.

MR. CALLAN: Will the Chief Secretary answer this Question—Whether Mr. John Mallon, the Chief Superintendent of the Detective Department of the Metropolitan Police, was instructed to prosecute further into the said charges? Yes or no?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: If the hon. Member will repeat his Question on some future day I will reply to it.

MR. CALLAN: I have given 10 days' Notice of it, and I have once postponed it on the request conveyed to me by the right hon. Gentleman's Private Secretary.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I certainly am much obliged to the hon. Gentleman for putting it off. This is a very particular point in a very long Question, and I have not in my possession accurate information upon it—

MR. CALLAN: Why have you not?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have given general information in order to save the time of the House.

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS (IRELAND).

MR. LALOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If Government officials in Ireland who may have the appointment of their own assistants, who have no judicial functions, require such assistants to repudiate their legitimate political opinions, as exemplified by the action of Mr. White, county surveyor for Queen's County, in requiring his deputy, Mr. Harrison, to publicly disassociate himself from any connection with the Irish National League; and, if this be so, does the same practice prevail in England in reference to members of political societies, and in reference to the societies of Freemasons and Orangemen in Ireland?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: County Surveyors are the officers of the Grand Juries. With regard to officers under the immediate control of the Government, the practice is to require that they shall not take public or prominent part in any political matters.

MR. SEXTON: Are not County Surveyors appointed by the Executive?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: They may be appointed by the Executive, but they are the servants of the Grand Juries.

ARMY—DRESS OF THE ARMY—THE HIGHLAND FEATHER BONNET.

GENERAL ALEXANDER asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is true that the Seaforth Highlanders, now stationed at Windsor, mount the Castle Guard in forage caps; and, if so, who is responsible for so irregular a practice?

MR. BRAND: The facts are as stated. Pending the settlement of the question of the retention of the feather bonnet, no provision was made in the Estimates of last year for its issue. Meanwhile, this regiment has, at its own request, been permitted to wear Glengarry caps instead of helmets in full dress. It having, however, been decided to retain the feather bonnet,

money has been included in this year's Estimates for the service, and the officer commanding the regiment has been authorized to make the necessary arrangements for its issue to the men.

COLONIAL DEFENCES—THE COLONIAL NAVAL FORCES.

MR. GORST asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether he will state the amount of Naval force kept on foot by the various self-governing Colonies; and, whether there would be any objection to insert the names of the ships of the Colonial Navies, and their officers, in the official Navy List, as the names of the regiments of the Colonial Forces, and their officers, are inserted in the official Army List?

SIR THOMAS BRASSEY: The Naval Forces of the Colonies not being under the control of the Admiralty, we have not sufficiently accurate reports of their strength to enable me to reply in detail to the Question of my hon. Friend. I may say, however, that the Colony of Victoria possesses an ironclad, the *Cerberus;* and several of the Australian Colonies have commenced to provide themselves with efficient cruisers, gunboats, and torpedo-boats, and to organize a Naval Reserve. The Admiralty are fully prepared to insert the names of the ships of the Colonial Navies and their officers in the *Navy List* as soon as the Navy of any Colony is sufficiently organized.

THE ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACT—LEGISLATION.

MR. E. STANHOPE asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether he proposes to introduce a Bill this year to amend the Electric Lighting Act?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: No, it is not my intention.

THE EGYPTIAN LOAN—MESSRS. ROTHSCHILD.

MR. W. H. SMITH asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether Messrs. Rothschild have made or have agreed to make any loan or to continue any advance to the Egyptian Government; whether Her Majesty's Government have joined in any request to the Messrs. Rothschild that such loan or advance should be made or continued; and, on what terms and for what period the arrangement has been made?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (MR. CHILDERS): Yes, Sir; Messrs. Rothschild are aware that we regard ourselves pledged to the Bill now before Parliament, and with this knowledge have supplied the temporary necessities of the Egyptian Government. I have no knowledge of the details of the transaction, which have been settled between Messrs. Rothschild and the Egyptian Government.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL OF SAINT JOSEPH, DUNDALK.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Is it a fact that, on the 4th September last, Messrs. R. Cuming and John Monow, magistrates for county Cavan, committed to the Industrial School of Saint Joseph, at Dundalk, a girl named Elizabeth Reilly; whether the grand jury of Cavan have refused to contribute for the girl's support; and, whether, if the facts are as stated, the grand jury of county Cavan can be forced to pay the amount to which they are entitled; and, if not, are there any other means by which they can get paid?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is optional with Grand Juries to contribute towards the maintenance of children in industrial schools, and there is no power to enforce payment.

MR. BIGGAR: Are the managers bound to take the children on the order of the magistrates?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am not sure whether that is the law.

POST OFFICE (CONTRACTS)—THE IRISH MAILS.

COLONEL NOLAN asked the Postmaster General, If he would state what sum the Government have offered the Great Midland and Western Railway of Ireland to carry the mails at an accelerated rate, and also what sum the Midland demands; and, if the difference would be left to the decision of arbitrators?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: In reply to the hon. Member, I may state, as the negotiations are now concluded, that the Midland Great Western offered an accelerated service on their Galway and Sligo branches for a payment of £9,000

a-year. The Post Office had offered a payment of £6,000. As the revenue available for this service is under £5,000, I am quite unable to increase my offer, or to refer the matter to arbitration.

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION (SUB-COMMISSIONERS)—MR. GREER.

MR. TOTTENHAM asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is true that Mr. Greer has again been nominated Chairman of the Sub-Commission for the county of Down; whether he was, on a former occasion, transferred from the county of Down to another district, owing to the fact of his having been a practising solicitor in the said county; whether his late partner (Mr. Mullan), in whose firm he (Mr. Greer) still retains an interest, acts professionally before the county of Down Sub-Commission; and, whether the reasons which caused his transfer on a former occasion do not still exist?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am informed Mr. Greer will act as Chairman of the next Sub-Commission for County Down. He has no interest in the business of his late partner. He was on a former occasion transferred from the County Down, but the reason was not stated, and the Land Commissioners do not think it desirable to make public their reasons for appointing Assistant Commissioners to different districts.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE ACT, 1884—REGISTRATION OF PARLIAMENTARY ELECTORS (IRELAND).

MR. HEALY asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the effect of the extension to Ireland of the enactment conferring the franchise on the occupier of a portion of a dwelling-house when such portion is used as a separate dwelling, even though it may not be separately rated, and to the danger that such provision may in Ireland be rendered nugatory by the difference between the English and Irish Law relating to claims to be rated; whether it is the fact that, owing to the provisions of the 30 and 31 Vic. c. 102, s. 3, subs. 3, it is still necessary for an occupier in such cases to be rated, and that in England he can have himself rated by simply lodging a claim to be rated, whereas in Ireland, owing to the decision in the case of Brangan v. Shaw, a claim to be rated under such circumstances would be quite useless, the Board of Guardians, on whom such claim must be served, having no power to rate the claimant when there is no separate valuation of the portion of the premises occupied by him; whether the result of this state of things is that, notwithstanding the express provision of the Act of Parliament, a separate valuation will be still required in all cases, the necessary steps to have the premises separately valued involving the loss of at least a year, during which the occupier is deprived of the franchise; and, whether it is proposed to provide a remedy for this state of things in the proposed Registration Act for Ireland?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. WALKER): The subject referred to in this Question was some time since very carefully considered, and the result of the opinions arrived at was that the difficulty suggested could not arise having regard to the provisions of the Representation of the People Act, 1884, and the enactments thereby incorporated and extended to Ireland. I do not think that separate rating is now necessary in England in the case put.

INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS (IRELAND) ACT—FEMALE SCHOOLS.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Irish Government have considered an application made to them by the Catholic Bishop of Achonry, for a certificate to enable his Lordship to establish at Ballaghaderreen, county Mayo, an industrial school for female children, under the 13th section of the Act; whether it is the fact that no school for female children under the 13th section has yet been established in Ireland; whether, with regard to the one industrial school established in Ireland under the 13th section for boys, namely, the Kilmore Probationary School, the last detailed Report of the Inspector certifies that the boys in that institution are "very docile and attentive to all their duties," and are "exceptionally well conducted, honest, and truthful;" whether the Inspector, Sir John Lentargue, in his Annual Report for 1883, refers the decrease in the

number of young boys admitted to reformatories to the working of the Kilmore School—

"The value of which institution is now becoming known, and is fully appreciated by those who understand the subject of penal repression;"

whether the Government have noted the opinion of the Inspector that the extension of the system adopted at Kilmore would be productive both of greater economy and of better moral results to the children; and, whether, having regard to the fact that the estimate for the current year makes provision for 361 additional children in Irish Industrial Schools, at a cost of £4,693, the Government will issue the certificate applied for by the Catholic Bishop of Achonry?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: There is already at Ballinasloe an industrial school available for the reception of 50 female juvenile offenders committed under the 13th section of the Act from all Ireland; and as I found on inquiry at the end of last year that there were only two inmates of that class in the school, I did not think a case had been made out for the issue of a certificate for another school of that character.

MR. SEXTON: Would the right hon. Gentleman consider the establishment of an ordinary industrial school?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said, that question must stand over until next week, as their present powers were exhausted.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—CHARGE OF ASSAULT AGAINST GEORGE BARKER (GRANGE PETTY SESSIONS).

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, in a case heard on the 20th ultimo, at Grange (county Sligo) Petty Sessions, before Henry Turner, resident magistrate, Charles Gore Jones, and Jeremiah Eccles, justices, George Barker, gamekeeper, was charged by the Constabulary with having been drunk while in possession of loaded firearms; discharged a revolver on the public road; and assaulting Constable M'Mahon whilst the constable was endeavouring to arrest him; whether the several charges were maintained on oath by three constables and four other witnesses; whether Barker brought a cross-charge of assault against two of the constables; whether this cross-charge was dismissed; whether the magistrates dismissed the charges of drunkenness and discharging the revolver made against Barker, and found him guilty of the assault upon Constable M'Mahon, for which they fined him two pounds; whether the magistrates were unanimous as to the findings and the amount of the fine; whether the Attorney General has caused any steps to be taken to procure further adjudication upon the case; whether copies of reports, informations, and notes of evidence in the case will be laid upon the Table; and, whether the licence to have and carry arms, granted to Barker, will be revoked?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The facts are substantially as stated. The magistrates, I understand, were influenced in their decision—which was unanimous—by the previous good character borne by Barker, as testified by the police, and they considered the penalty inflicted was sufficient to cover all the charges that were borne out by the evidence. They regarded the discharge of the revolver as accidental, and do not think a case exists for revoking the licence. There were no notes taken of the evidence, and it does not seem necessary to lay any Papers on the Table.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—NORTH DUBLIN BOARD OF GUARDIANS.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the Irish Local Government Board have withdrawn, or resolved to withdraw, their veto against the resolution of the North Dublin Board of Guardians, appointing the Hibernian Bank their treasurer?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Local Government Board are still in communication with the Guardians on the subject, and are awaiting a reply to a letter which they sent to them last week.

MR. SEXTON said, he hoped that a decision would be come to before the Vote for the Local Government Board came on for consideration.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said, it would be come to, he hoped, during the coming week.

FISHERIES (IRELAND) — ENCROACHMENT OF FRENCH FISHERMEN.

MR. KENNY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the attention of the Irish Government has been called to the continued encroachments of French fishing luggers on the south-west coast of Ireland, and especially on the coast of Clare, within the three-mile limit, as established by the Sea Fisheries Act, 1883, which carries into effect the International Convention concerning fisheries in the North and British Seas; is it a fact that, on or about the 24th of March last, a boat belonging to one of the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries was stolen off the beach at Kilcredane, and that the local coastguardsmen believe it was done by French fishermen, who came on shore and used it for the purpose of getting back to their lugger; and, if the Irish Government will at once send a gunboat or cruiser to those parts of Ireland to enforce the Convention and protect the interests of the Irish fishermen?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No complaint on this subject has recently reached the Irish Government. I understand one of the Inspectors of Fisheries has received a letter stating that encroachments have been made this year on the coast of Clare; but no case has been made out to necessitate or justify the sending of a gunboat or cruiser to that part of Ireland. The Coastguard reported the disappearance of a canoe, which was nominally the property of one of the Inspectors, and they have since reported that it has been found on the opposite shore.

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND) — THE DETECTIVE DEPARTMENT—MR. JENKINSON.

MR. KENNY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If Mr. Jenkinson, of the Detective Department, in addition to the pay which he receives as a public servant is an Indian pensioner; if so, what is the amount of the pension he receives, and for what length of service he is pensioned?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Mr. Jenkinson is in receipt of a pension of about £950 a-year, after 25 years' service in India. I should explain that pensions of this kind are regarded as annuities—they having been regularly subscribed for by the officers out of their pay—and are not subject to the rules ordinarily affecting the pensions of persons who obtain re-employment in the Public Service.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—LIGONEIL PETTY SESSIONS, CO. ANTRIM.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, since the formation of the Petty Sessions District of Ligoneil, has the Petty Sessions always been held in the Court House, Belfast; and, if so, is the holding of such Petty Sessions out of the Petty Sessions District according to law; and, if, since the public are inconvenienced under the existing arrangement, he will take means of having the Petty Sessions abolished, and the district revert to its former position?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I believe some question has arisen as to the legality of holding Ligoneil Petty Sessions in the Belfast Court House, which is not in the district; but as a case is now pending in which the point is specifically raised, I do not think it would be proper for me to express any opinion on the matter at the present time.

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND) — THE CATHOLIC CHAPEL, HILLSBOROUGH, CO. DOWN.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Is he aware that the windows of the Catholic chapel, in Hillsboro', county Down, have been repeatedly maliciously broken; whether any arrests have been made in consequence; and, whether any and what precautions have been taken to prevent such outrages in future?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is not true that the windows of this chapel have been repeatedly maliciously broken, and there is no cause for any special interference.

EGYPT (FINANCE, &c.) — EGYPTIAN PREFERENCE AND UNIFIED DEBTS.

MR. M'COAN asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the tax established by Article 12 of the Khedivial decree on the amount of the coupons of

the Preference and Unified debts will be deducted from the coupons becoming payable on the 15th of April and the 1st of May; or, whether the deduction will only take place after the several Foreign Legislatures concerned have ratified the guarantee?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): Yes, Sir; arrangements have been made for the deduction of the tax from the coupons about to fall due.

HIGHWAYS (IRELAND)—PAYMENT OF ROAD CONTRACTORS, CO. GALWAY.

COLONEL NOLAN asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, If it is legal for the Galway county surveyor to stop the payments of road contractors for two or three half years in succession, still leaving these roads in the hands of the same contractors?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not think there is anything illegal in the abstract in the County Surveyor taking the course mentioned in the Question.

ARMY LIST—OFFICERS OF COLONIAL FORCES.

MR. GORST asked the Secretary of State for War, Why, in the Official Army List, the names of Officers of Colonial Forces have not been corrected in the case of Canada since November 1883; of the Cape of Good Hope since December 1883; of New South Wales since January 1884; of New Zealand since February 1884; of Queensland since March 1884; of South Australia since December 1883; of Tasmania since December 1883; and of Victoria since January 1883; and, whether the War Office could obtain and publish more recent information respecting the Colonial Military Forces?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: It is considered sufficient to correct yearly the lists of officers in the Colonial Forces, and the edition of the official quarterly *Army List* in which the corrected lists appear is in most cases that for April. In the *Army List* now printing the lists of Colonial officers for most of the Colonies will be corrected to December, 1884; but the Governments of Canada, Queensland, and Victoria have not yet sent in their corrections.

GIBRALTAR—THE POST OFFICE.

CAPTAIN AYLMER asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the Post Office at Gibraltar is under the Imperial Government; and, if so, why it has not been placed on the same footing as in other Colonies where the Post Offices are administered by and for account of the Colonial Governments; whether the business of the Post Office at Gibraltar is conducted, and has for years been conducted, by Natives; and, whether the revenue derived from this Post Office is applied to Imperial purposes instead of in aid of Gibraltar finances, which are known to be heavily weighted as compared with those of other Colonies?

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY: The statements in the hon. Member's Question are substantially correct. There has been a great deal of Correspondence on the subject, and it has not yet been completed. Until it is finished I am not in a position to answer the Question.

LOCAL TAXATION — MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

SIR BALDWYN LEIGHTON asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he will make his promised statement as to relief of local taxation before or at the time of the Budget; and, whether, at the same time, he will consider the exemption of personalty from the equivalent of the Land Tax, as well as rates contrary to the intention of the statutes imposing the same, as also the assessment of reality under Schedule A, and houses for House Duty and Property Tax on the gross, without any equitable deduction as allowed for other property?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): In reply to the hon. Baronet I have to say, on behalf of my right hon. Friend and myself, that we cannot now undertake to make any statement as to local taxation in connection with this year's Budget. When the question of local taxation comes before Parliament on any proposal of the Government, they will, of course, have considered the incidence of the land tax as well as of other taxes or rates on real property. The latter part of the hon. Baronet's Question has been twice raised recently by my right hon. Friend the Member for the City (Mr.

Hubbard), and I have nothing to add now to what I said on those occasions.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, when the Government considers the matter, they will compare the incidence of local taxation in Ireland with that of local taxation in England?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): Yes, Sir. If we make any proposal as to Irish local taxation, of course it will be compared with the incidence of such taxation in England.

LAW AND JUSTICE — THE OFFICE OF SHERIFF.

SIR BALDWYN LEIGHTON asked the First Lord of the Treasury, If he can state the number of persons requesting to be excused serving the office of Sheriff at the last appointment; and, whether, in view of charging part of the cost of public prosecution on the owners of one description of property, the Government will consider the propriety of either making the office optional, like the office of Mayor, or else of paying the cost out of the "Crown's Nominee Account," as would appear to be the original intention?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): In reply to the first Question of the hon. Baronet, which my right hon. Friend has asked me to answer, I have to say that 33 persons out of 147 nominees at the last appointment requested to be excused serving the office of Sheriff. Of these, 13 founded their request on the ground of insufficient income. I cannot at the present time undertake on behalf of the Government to consider proposals either to make the office optional or to pay its expenses from any public fund.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—THE REVISED CODE, 1885.

MR. R. H. PAGET said, he wished to make an appeal to the Prime Minister in regard to the Business of that evening. He observed that the first Notice of Motion on the Paper referred to an important question dealing with the Elementary Education Revised Code, 1885. There were no fewer than four Motions on that question. The last day before which this Statute became law expired on Thursday next, and unless a discussion upon it took place that evening, he was afraid it would be impossible to find another opportunity. He hoped the Prime Minister would arrange that whatever Business was before the House would be suspended at 11 o'clock in order that the discussion might be taken.

MR. GLADSTONE said, he thought there was a good deal of force in what had been said by the hon. Member; but he was afraid sufficient attention had not been given to the difficulty in which the Government stood. If the Government had absolute control of the Business of the evening, they would have asked the House at half-past 11 o'clock, when he hoped and expected they would be in Committee on the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill, to report Progress and allow his hon. Friend the Member for Oxford University to bring forward his Motion. But there were no fewer than six Private Bills, over which the Government had no control whatever; and unless these were got rid of, he could not see how it would be possible for the Government to facilitate the discussion.

TRADE AND COMMERCE — CHINESE DUTIES ON TEA — THE "LI-KIN DUES."

MR. HOPWOOD asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is the fact, as currently stated, that the Chinese Government has imposed an additional tax of three and a-half taels per cent., or other amount, on tea, under the name of "Li-kin dues?"

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Her Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Pekin telegraphs that no such dues have been imposed.

EGYPT—SEIZURE OF THE "BOSPHORE EGYPTIEN."

MR. O'DONNELL asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the French Government has protested against the suppression of *The Bosphore Egyptien;* and, whether that newspaper will be allowed to re-appear?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: No official representations have been made to Her Majesty's Government on the subject; but they are aware that the French Government regard the act

of the Egyptian Government as illegal. In reply to the second portion of the hon. Member's Question, we have no information as to the future.

VENEZUELA — REVOLUTIONARY EXPEDITION AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT.

MR. KENNY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If it has come to his knowledge that certain persons in this Country have, for some time past, been conspiring to equip an expedition to overthrow the Government of the United States of Venezuela; and, if one of the persons concerned has recently been an accredited Minister Plenipotentiary to the Court of Saint James; and, if so, whether Her Majesty's Government propose to take steps to expel from England persons plotting against a friendly Government, as has recently been done in a somewhat similar case by the Government of France?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, the Question had nothing whatever to do with the Home Office.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: No such information has reached the Foreign Office; but care will be taken to prevent any proceedings in violation of the terms of the Foreign Enlistment Act.

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—RUSSIAN ATTACK ON THE AFGHANS AT PENJDEH—THE NEGOTIATIONS.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the First Lord of the Treasury, If Her Majesty's Government have demanded of the Russian Government the withdrawal of General Komaroff from his command an account of his attack upon the troops of the Amir of Afghanistan, our ally, and the evacuation of the Afghan positions occupied by the Russian forces in consequence of that attack?

MR. O'KELLY asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether it is true that the Afghan Forces, before the battle of Penjdeh, crossed the River Kushk, and threw up entrenchments at a point on the river between the position occupied by the main Russian Force and its advanced post at Puli-Khisti, thus menacing the Russian Forces in debateable territory?

MR. GLADSTONE: I am sorry to say that I am not able to give an answer to the Question of the hon. Member for Eye (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett), nor am I able to give an answer to the Question of the hon. Member for Roscommon (Mr. O'Kelly). The fact is this—that a deplorable incident has taken place of the gravest importance at a distance involving communications with a foreign capital. It has been our duty, of course, to institute, without a moment's delay, the best inquiry we can. That inquiry is going forward, and I hope for a full and complete elucidation of the facts; but pending that proceeding I think there would be no advantage whatever in my referring to any particular portion of this question, as is suggested by the Question of the hon. Member for Roscommon, and still less in announcing, in answer to the hon. Member for Eye, the general conclusions at which the Government have arrived. It would be most injurious to the public interests that we should enter on any such course. The hon. and learned Member for Plymouth (Mr. E. Clarke) desires to know whether the Correspondence between the British and the Russian Governments will soon be laid on the Table. I have no doubt that Parliament will in due time be seised of that Correspondence. But unquestionably the moment for such a proceeding on our part has not yet arrived, and no good, I think, would arise from it. I rather gather probably that the right hon. Gentleman opposite has intended to ask me Questions on the same subject and to the same effect as those which he put on previous days. Indeed, one I anticipated would be a repetition of a Question that he himself, no doubt, felt to be of great importance, and which he put to me before, but which I was not able to answer at the time. The right hon. Gentleman asked me, I think, twice as to the communications which we had received from the Viceroy of India. I understand the right hon. Gentleman to mean with respect to other communications that might have passed between the Viceroy and the Ameer of Afghanistan, with regard to whom we must all feel that the greatest consideration is due to him under the circumstances. We have now had what I may call a full report of the detailed communications that have been held by Lord Dufferin with the Ameer, especially, of course, in relation to the recent conflict, of which the Ameer is

fully aware, and also to the other questions now at issue. I am sure that the right hon. Gentleman will not expect me to enter into any details at this time; but I can comprise the whole of them in saying that the communications of Lord Dufferin with the Ameer have been both full and entirely satisfactory. Probably the right hon. Gentleman might likewise wish to know—and the House would wish to know—what the Government have to say on the subject of a paragraph which, I believe, appeared in yesterday's papers, purporting to be the report of General Komaroff in answer to the Russian Government, and containing what I presume is the justification of his proceedings. With regard to that report, I only have to say that it has been at once referred to Sir Peter Lumsden. The reports thus far—speaking of that matter exclusively—from the respective officers of the Russian and the British Governments have differed in substance and in effect, and an inquiry is proceeding which we shall do everything in our power to render thorough and complete.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I should like to know, if the right hon. Gentleman could tell us, within what limits of time the Government can communicate with Sir Peter Lumsden, and also what communications they have received from him with regard to these proceedings; and, further, whether the Government have now received all the communications they expect from the Russian Government, or whether they are still awaiting further answers?

MR. GLADSTONE: About the time I would rather that my noble Friend the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs answered. I do not know whether he can give an exact reply; but I think he can reply more exactly than I can at the present moment. But one thing I will say—that the right hon. Gentleman, no doubt, is aware that the communication on this important event at Pul-i-Khisti was abnormally delayed through the accidental breaking of the telegraph wire on this side of Meshed, and that, therefore, was no test of the regular time for communication with Sir Peter Lumsden. With regard to the second part of the right hon. Gentleman's Question, I should undoubtedly anticipate a further communication from the Russian Government, because I do not think there has yet been time for us to have received in full the answers to the material parts of the representations originally made to the Russian Government on the part of Her Majesty's Government.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: The right hon. Gentleman will understand that, although there have been various communications, we have not yet had a full account of them, and we do not know from Her Majesty's Government their view of what has taken place. I therefore asked whether they were expecting further information both from Sir Peter Lumsden and from the Russian Government. It was not so much a question exactly of days and hours, but whether they were in direct communication with Sir Peter Lumsden, and expected soon to receive his version of what had taken place, and when we might reasonably expect to receive a communication from Her Majesty's Government of their view as to what has actually happened?

MR. GLADSTONE: If it were a mere question of obtaining a reply on undisputed facts, it would be possible for us to indicate the time when we should be able to give a full answer. But, as I have already said, the reports of the officers of the Russian and the British Governments are, in some respects, at variance both in substance and in general effect, and it would be rash on my part to undertake at the present moment to fix a day by which I hoped that those differences would be cleared up.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the Government have received any confirmation of the statement in *The Standard* of this morning from it Correspondent with Sir Peter Lumsden's Commission that the Russian Forces are advancing southwards along the line of the Murghab River? I also wish to know with reference to the statements which have appeared in the Russian organ in this country, which seriously impugn the character and conduct of Captain Yate and members of the English Commission, whether the Government have any reason to discredit the account sent to this country from Captain Yate, or to believe that he was in any way the cause of the recent deplorable conflict?

MR. GLADSTONE: I stated on Thursday the substance of the communications we have received from the British officers, and that we thought it our duty to give credence to them. As to the report referred to by the hon. Member for Eye, we have not received intelligence to the effect described by the hon. Member; but a report of that character has reached us.

MR. E. STANHOPE: Have Her Majesty's Government received any information from the British Ambassador at St. Petersburg as to the statement which has been widely circulated that the Russian Government has already distributed rewards and decorations to their officers commanding the Force on the frontier of Afghanistan?

MR. GLADSTONE: No; we have received no intelligence to that effect.

MR. ONSLOW: I beg to ask, whether, without detriment to the Public Service, all the Correspondence previous to Sir Peter Lumsden's leaving this country could be produced; and whether the Government have considered the propriety of prosecuting without delay the construction of the railway between Quetta and Candahar?

MR. GLADSTONE: As to the first Question, I cannot give a pledge; but if the hon. Member will put it down, I will inquire how the matter stands. As to the railway, also, I cannot make any statement without Notice of the Question.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether he would state the time taken to communicate with Sir Peter Lumsden; also, where that officer is now located; and whether the statement which appeared in the newspapers from General Komaroff has been officially communicated to Her Majesty's Government by the Russian Government as to the official explanation of the action of Russia?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I informed the House the other day that the telegraph wire was unfortunately broken near Meshed. Communications with Sir Peter Lumsden took from three to four days; but since that the time has been considerably longer. Messages from Gulran, where Sir Peter Lumsden was till quite recently, apparently take about seven days. The message which the Prime Minister quoted the other day in making his statement was despatched some time on the 1st, and arrived at the Foreign Office late on the evening of the 7th. As a considerable part of the distance has to be accomplished by messengers, the time must vary according to the speed of the particular means employed. Sir Peter Lumsden has now left Gulran, and is at a place further south called Tirpul.

MR. O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether, if it takes something like a week to communicate with Sir Peter Lumsden, it is the case that there is easy communication between the Government of St. Petersburg and the Russian advanced posts — namely, 24 hours at the outside, by ordinary Russian courier post; and whether a message from St. Petersburg to General Komaroff has not habitually taken less than 24 hours?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I do not think it is within my power to give an opinion on the details of the communication between St. Petersburg and General Komaroff. The Prime Minister stated the other day the facts so far as they are known to us. It does not appear to be certain up to what exact point the Russian telegraph is complete, nor as to what exact point the field telegraph has been laid down. Undoubtedly there is a telegraph to Askabad, and, of course, if it were completed to Merv, it would be nearer the point where General Komaroff is. But it is not a matter on which the Foreign Office is exactly informed.

BARON HENRY DE WORMS: Has the telegraph wire by which communications were forwarded to Sir Peter Lumsden been mended?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I have no doubt that every effort has been made to do so; but I have no information of its having been restored.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT inquired whether General Komaroff's explanation of the attack on the Afghans had been officially communicated to Her Majesty's Government as the Russian official reply to Her Majesty's Government from the Russian Government, or whether it was merely a report?

MR. GLADSTONE: I told the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition that we expected further information.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Then it is not their reply?

MR. GLADSTONE: No.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Are we to understand—[*Cries of* "Oh, oh!"] I am sorry to press the right hon. Gentleman; but the Question is one of vital importance, as to whether General Komaroff's explanation of the attack on the Afghans has been simply transmitted to Her Majesty's Government by the Russian Government as their General's report, or whether it is also the Russian official explanation of what occurred?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: What the Prime Minister said was that it had been communicated, but that further explanations were expected.

MR. GRAY: The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister was asked a Question a moment ago as to a statement in *The Standard* with respect to the advance of the Russians. He replied, as I understood, that he had not received any official intimation of that advance, but had received a rumour to that effect. Can he see his way to explain this, and say whether the rumour was from an official source?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I think the hon. Member had better put that Question on the Paper. [*Cries of* "Oh, oh!"] I have no objection to repeat what fell from the Prime Minister, which was that no intelligence—that was the word—had been received, but that a rumour had been received. That is to say, intelligence from a source which would make it certain has not been received. Undoubtedly a rumour stating this belief has been received.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am responsible for asking my noble Friend that Notice should be given of this Question. I stated that we had no intelligence, but that a rumour had reached us. That appeared to be satisfactory to the right hon. Gentleman who put the Question; but, as the hon. Member now appears to require nicer information than I can give from memory, I requested my noble Friend to ask that Notice should be given. I must confess that I lament, both in the interests of the present and of the future, that the Questions which of all others are most evidently within the competence and discretion of the Executive Government to answer or not are so frequently put without Notice, and that the request for Notice should be received with derision.

MR. GRAY: A number of Questions have been put to the right hon. Gentleman without Notice, and I imagined that I had an equal right with any Englishman.

MR. HEALY: But you are not an Englishman.

MR. GRAY: I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether I was in Order? I did not intend to interfere in any improper way.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have not found the smallest fault with the hon. Member, nor had I the slightest intention of doing so. The hon. Member, so far as I know, is always courteous in his proceedings.

EGYPT (FINANCE, &c.)—DEDUCTIONS FROM THE COUPONS.

MR. M'COAN asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Khedive would sign or had signed the decree under which the deductions from the coupons had been made before the various foreign Parliaments concerned had agreed to the Convention?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): I am not in a position to answer that Question except in general terms. The Question asked by the hon. Member earlier in the Sitting was whether the deduction was to be made from the coupons? The details are not received in my Department; but I have made inquiries at the Foreign Office, and I have ascertained that the necessary decree for this purpose has been issued by the Khedive, and is accepted by the *Caisse*.

ADMIRALTY RETIREMENT.

MR. STUART-WORTLEY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is true that an Admiralty Memorandum of May 1882 greatly restricted the then-existing discretion of that Department to dispense with the rule of compulsory retirement at sixty years of age of all ranks with forty years of service; whether the effect of such Memorandum is to increase the non-effective charge for the Admiralty staff, and to lose to the Country the services of officials of valuable experience and faculties as yet unimpaired by age; and, whether this Memorandum has received the consent either of Parliament or the Treasury?

Mr. HIBBERT: My hon. and learned Friend has been misinformed as to the effect of the Memorandum to which he refers. So far from restricting, it enlarged the discretion of the Admiralty in dispensing with compulsory retirement at the regular age and service; and it therefore tends to diminish, not to increase, the non-effective charge. The provisions of the Memorandum do not require the consent of Parliament or the Treasury, being within the competence of the heads of a Department.

EGYPT (THE EXPEDITION UP THE NILE)—SIR CHARLES WILSON'S VOYAGE FROM METEMNEH TO KHARTOUM.

Mr. CALLAN asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is true, as stated in the Press, that—

"Guku, the Greek to whom General Gordon entrusted his diaries, and who accompanied Nousri Pasha (just arrived here), complains bitterly of Sir Charles Wilson's unnecessary five days' delay at Metemneh before starting for Khartoum. He states that he daily urged Sir Charles, but in vain, not to lose a moment, as every hour was of inestimable importance. Guku, who accompanied Sir Charles Wilson's expedition to Khartoum, declares that if it had started at once upon reaching Metemneh it would have arrived in time to save General Gordon;"

and, if so, whether Sir Charles Wilson has offered or has been asked for a satisfactory explanation of the cause of his delay at Metemneh; and, if so, what is the nature of the explanation of the Officer in question?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: I have no knowledge of the Greek Guku, or of his statement; but I may, perhaps, say that as Sir Charles Wilson's despatch did not enter fully into his reasons for not starting for Khartoum earlier than he did, I asked some time since for a further statement. I do not understand why five days' delay is assumed. The steamers only arrived on the 21st, and Sir Charles Wilson left on the morning of the 24th, leaving two days to be accounted for. Some of the steamers went to Shendy on the 22nd, and Lord Charles Beresford only reported those selected to proceed to Khartoum as repaired and ready to start at 3 P.M. on that day. The 23rd, Sir Charles Wilson, in the despatch I have referred to, reports, was occupied in changing crews and making arrangements for the start. This is all I can say till the further accounts arrive.

ARMY—NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS' PENSIONS.

Mr. STEWART MACLIVER asked the Secretary of State for War, If his attention has been called to the working of Article 1,033 of the Royal Warrant, 1884, by which three classes of Non-Commissioned Officers, after completing twenty-one years' service, may lose three pence per day pension, owing to the triennial mode of reckoning periods to the very letter; and, whether he could either substitute annual periods, or allow Non-Commissioned Officers to remain serving with the colours beyond the twenty-one years required to complete the triennial period?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: The scale of pensions referred to, which has been in operation for nearly four years, was decided on after the fullest consideration; and I am not prepared to make any alteration in it in the direction suggested by the hon. Member.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

ARMY AND MILITIA RESERVE FORCES.

CONSIDERATION OF HER MAJESTY'S MESSAGE.

Her Majesty's Most Gracious Message *considered.*

Message again read.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: The formal Resolution which I have to move, that Her Majesty's Gracious Message be considered, will only make it necessary for me to make a short statement to the House. I had hoped, when at my request the consideration of Her Majesty's Message was postponed, that to-day I should have been able to make a full statement of the measures proposed to be taken in consequence of the Proclamation which Her Majesty has been advised to issue. Since that date, however, as the House is aware, events of very considerable importance have occurred—events which have, to a certain extent, qualified the views of the Indian Government as to the amount, character, and time of the reinforcements they desire to be sent or to be prepared, either immediately or within a short period. We are in constant communication with the Government of

India, but we are not yet in full possession of their views on these points; and it would not be possible for me to enter into any detailed statement of the measures which we propose to take under the Proclamation. I do not, therefore, think that it would be convenient to make a partial statement on the subject. I think I may also add that it would probably not be desirable at the present time that the measures recommended by the Government of India, and proposed to be adopted by the Government, should be fully stated until there is an absolute necessity for such statements, and until we are in a position to take action upon them. An opportunity for making such a statement possibly will not long be delayed. It has already been announced that the Budget Statement is to be made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer on Thursday week; and it has been promised that the Vote of Credit which the operations in the Soudan will make necessary, and which will also be necessary with relation to the preparations being made in regard to India, will be in the hands of the House before that date. That Vote of Credit will, I believe, also be laid on the Table on Monday or Tuesday next. An opportunity will be taken of making a statement in connection with it. That probably will be the most convenient time for making a more general explanation of the intentions of the Government and the measures proposed to be taken than on the occasion of the present formal Motion. I have examined the recent precedents on the subject, and I find that the course we shall take is entirely in accordance with them. The Reserves were called out on the advice of the late Government in 1878. The right hon. Gentleman opposite, in moving the Address, made no statement whatever as to the measures proposed to be taken under it. It is true that the right hon. Gentleman did on that occasion make a statement of the policy of the Government, which, in their opinion, made necessary the calling out of the Reserves; but the circumstances were, I think, different. In the opinion of the Government of that day explanations of that kind were required, in order to prevent misconception as to the object with which the Reserves were to be called out. On the present occasion no one, I think, will doubt that the state of affairs is such as to make it obviously desirable that the military resources of the country should be somewhat increased, in view of any eventuality that may occur. On the second occasion, in 1882, the Motion which I am now making was made as a purely formal one, without any statement whatever, and the measures to be taken by the Government were stated and discussed upon the Vote of Credit, which is the course I am now recommending the House to take. Therefore, I trust the House will agree with the course proposed, which is in accordance with precedent, and which will, I think, be most convenient, and will enable the Government to make a fuller statement than they are now able to make, and as full a statement as the circumstances of the case will admit of, at no very distant day. The only further statement it is desirable I should make is, that as it is probable it will be necessary to call out a very considerable portion of the Reserves, the present intention of the War Department is to call out those Reserves regimentally, and not by classes of years. That course possesses very great military advantages. The objection to it is that it bears with a certain amount of inequality upon the Reserve, even pressing somewhat hardly upon the older classes of the Reserve. If it were a question of calling out only a very small portion of the Reserves it would probably be desirable to call them out by classes corresponding to the particular years. But when there is a probability that the services of a large proportion of the Reserves may be necessary there is great military advantage, which I shall be able to explain more in detail on a future occasion, in calling them out regimentally. Under these circumstances, I trust that, inasmuch as the present Vote is of a perfectly formal character, and does not pledge the House to any opinion of policy whatever, and as an opportunity will shortly be given for making a fuller statement of the measures the Government propose to take, the House will be content to take this matter formally, and to postpone any fuller discussion until a more convenient occasion. In conclusion, I beg to move the Resolution which stands in my name.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, thanking Her Majesty for Her Most Gracious Message communicating to this House that Her Majesty was about to cause Her

Reserve Force, and Her Militia Reserve Force, or such part thereof, as Her Majesty shall, from time to time, think necessary, to be called out for permanent Service." — (*The Marquess of Hartington.*)

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I agree with the noble Lord that, under the circumstances, there is reason for postponing a full discussion of this question; but I think he is hardly justified in apparently assuming that when we are informed so important a step as the calling out of the Reserves is to be taken we should not call upon Her Majesty's Government to state the policy which renders such a step necessary. Although we were perfectly prepared to hear that the Government would require a large force, and that it would be necessary to have recourse to this method of increasing those Forces, we ought to have had—especially having regard to the Egyptian Force—some statement of a more full and detailed character, which would show us the policy of Her Majesty's Government with regard to the employment of our troops. There is much that we require to know, and it would have been quite reasonable to have taken this opportunity of affording a full discussion on the subject. The noble Lord has, however, pointed out that we may expect, in the course of the next week, the presentation of a Vote of Credit, and when that is presented we shall have a full opportunity of discussion. Under those circumstances, I do not myself intend opening up questions which naturally suggest themselves at the present moment, but rather reserve them till that opportunity shall arise. I understand there is no doubt we shall have the Vote of Credit before the Budget, that we shall have an opportunity of discussing it before the Budget, and that that opportunity will occur in the beginning of next week. That being so, I will not offer any opposition to the Motion, or ask for further explanations.

MR. GLADSTONE: In reference to what has fallen from the right hon. Baronet there is one slight explanation which I wish to make. The right hon. Baronet says, and says truly, that next week, before the Budget, it will be our duty to present to the House the Vote upon which the whole policy of Her Majesty's Government will appear, and which, of course, will have to be duly explained and defended. The only explanation I wish to make is this—I do not assume that the actual moment when the Vote is laid upon the Table will be the moment when the House would wish to discuss it at large. I should think it more probable that the House would wish to take some early day for the discussion; and it would, undoubtedly, be the duty of Her Majesty's Government to promote and facilitate that object by all the means in their power. The Budget will be brought forward on Thursday next week. The Government have assumed that the actual debate on the Vote of Credit would follow the Budget; but should there be any strong or decisive opinion to the effect that it should have precedence, there would be nothing to prevent the raising of that question, and the Government, of course, would give it full and respectful consideration. Whether the discussion is taken before or after the Budget, I hardly think that the House would wish to go fully into the matter at the very moment when my noble Friend states the effect of the Vote of Credit to the House.

COLONEL NOLAN asked the Judge Advocate General whether there had been any alteration in the law which enabled Her Majesty's Government to call out the Reserves regimentally instead of by classes? The system adopted afforded great opportunities for favouritism and undue pressure on the part of the permanent officials at the War Office, and would enable the greater number to be called from Ireland. If the men were called out in classes the whole Kingdom would be necessarily treated alike.

CAPTAIN AYLMER said, he hoped, when the further statement came to be made, the noble Lord the Secretary of State for War would be able to assure them that the stores and armaments supplied to the men would be sufficient and efficient. It was understood that there were a great many arms in the Ordnance Department of the War Office which were not actually efficient; and had they not a recent example of swords being supplied to Cavalry one-half of which were unfit for service? He asked the noble Lord to satisfy the country that the armaments were sufficient and of proper quality. He was assured also by officers of great military experience that the number of officers

and non-commissioned officers at the depôts were wholly insufficient to cope with the great impending influx of recruits and Reserve men. He hoped, therefore, the noble Lord would be able to make a statement on that point as well as with regard to the arms.

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN) said, that as the Secretary of State for War could not speak again, he might, perhaps, be allowed to answer the question of the hon. and gallant Member for Galway (Colonel Nolan). The hon. and gallant Member laboured under a mistake. The recent Army (Annual) Bill did not give Her Majesty any such powers in regard to the calling out of the Reserves; in fact, it dealt with an entirely different subject—the prolongation of Army service. Her Majesty had already power under the Army Act, 1881, and the Reserve Forces Act, 1882, to call out the Reserves as she thought proper, and under this power they were now acting. At the proper time the reasons why the present course had been adopted would, no doubt, be stated.

EARL PERCY asked whether it was in contemplation to call out the Militia Reserves?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: It is probable that every regiment of Militia will be embodied whose two battalions of the Line are abroad.

EARL PERCY asked whether all the Militia Reserves would be called out?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, this was not at present contemplated.

MR. LABOUCHERE, in rising to move, as an Amendment to the Address, to add the following words:—

"And at the same time expressing a hope that the available Forces of Her Majesty will be speedily strengthened by the prompt withdrawal of the troops from the Soudan,"

said, this was a matter which exercised the minds and consciences, he believed, of the majority of the intelligent people of this country. Large meetings had been held in the Metropolis, and demands loud and strong had been made that the Radical Members of the House should bring pressure to bear on Her Majesty's Government to withdraw the troops. How was it they came to send this Expedition to the Soudan? They got into it when General Gordon was shut up in Khartoum; but it was distinctly understood then that there was to be no occupation of the Soudan. Then came the unfortunate news of the death of General Gordon; and Lord Wolseley, on applying for instructions, was told to advance. The Lord Privy Seal (the Earl of Rosebery) in his recent speech went through the usual reasons for that advance, and it struck him that the Lord Privy Seal gave these reasons rather contemptuously. The Lord Privy Seal stated, however, that in the then public feeling of the country the Government could do nothing else but tell Lord Wolseley to advance. But public opinion had very much changed since then. There was then a very great deal of excitement and passion. The newspapers wrote advocating revenge. The newspapers were supposed to represent public opinion. But that was not his view. He thought if they wanted to know what was not the public opinion of the country they ought to go to the London newspapers. He believed if the Government remained in power they would not go to Khartoum. But accidents might happen, and if Gentlemen opposite came into power they would go to Khartoum, and they would annex it to Egypt. ["Oh!"] That was the policy of Lord Salisbury. [An hon. MEMBER: Quote.] What was the present position? Lord Wolseley's troops had retreated nearly to Wady Halfa. There were military operations going on in the neighbourhood of Suakin. They seemed mainly to consist of advancing one day and slaughtering, coming back the next, then another advance and another slaughter, then another withdrawal. The Lord Privy Seal had told them when the railway between Suakin and Berber was made, it was to be handed over to a Company, something like the North Borneo Company. He did not suppose that this was any part of the business of this country, even if the Arabs were in favour of the railway; but they were opposed to it, and they were ready to sacrifice their lives that this railroad should be stopped. The fact seemed to be that the Government did not like to wipe off a bad debt; they made a mistake when they went to Egypt, but now, after wasting many English lives, and destroying the lives of countless Arabs, they did not like to retire, and thereby admit they were in the wrong all along. The Government wanted this miserable little railway to

Captain Aylmer

show against the large sacrifice they had made in the Soudan. The latest news was that Osman Digna was retiring; but Osman Digna had a habit of coming back, and then the whole thing began over again. We had spent a very large amount of money in Egypt, and we had not much to show for it. We were now going to keep a garrison in that country at an expense of some £400,000 or £500,000 per annum; and what were we to gain by it? We were also committed to the policy of defending Egypt from all foreign aggression. But why, in addition to all this, should we incur a further expense in the Soudan—why should we throw good money after bad? By remaining in the Soudan we should gain nothing for ourselves, and we should certainly gain nothing for the Soudanese. The only proper course for us to pursue, therefore, was to withdraw our troops from that country as soon as possible. A large number of people in this country took a wider view of this question than the mere money one; they looked upon the matter as one of conscience, because they objected to unnecessary slaughter. At the last General Election the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had raised his voice against the warlike policy of right hon. Gentlemen opposite; but it was impossible to describe the present policy of Her Majesty's Government as anything else than a "Jingo" policy. He believed that such a policy was altogether opposed to the principles held by the Prime Minister; and therefore it was that he begged to move his Amendment, the object of which was not adverse to the Government, but to strengthen the good intentions of the right hon. Gentleman for the future. He was not going to carp about the money which had been thrown away in the past; but what he wanted to obtain from the right hon. Gentleman was a declaration of the intention to withdraw our Forces from the Soudan as soon as possible, and not to interfere further with those independent men who the Prime Minister himself had stated were rightly struggling to be free. He begged to move his Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To add, at the end of the Question, the words "and at the same time expressing a hope that the available forces of Her Majesty will be speedily strengthened by the prompt withdrawal of the troops from the Soudan."—(*Mr. Labouchere.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. GLADSTONE: I think that the House in general will be disposed to agree that it will be convenient to limit this discussion to those provisional matters—the Constitutional question not having been raised—which may call for remark, and to postpone, until an occasion which will very soon arise, the discussion of the policy of Her Majesty's Government at large with regard to the restricted use in the Soudan of the Military Forces of the Crown. That is a subject which I cannot disguise is of importance, and is one which may be properly discussed at a convenient season. With regard to that subject, the senior Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) has exercised a great deal of self-denial, but not quite enough. The hon. Member has not made the speech which he intended to make, because he has not dealt with this question with that incisiveness and force which usually characterize his utterances when discussing interesting topics such as he has just now merely glanced at, or, perhaps, I should rather say, has skimmed over. I have often observed that much injury is done by attempting partially to anticipate a discussion, and I venture to hope that hon. Members will see that it would be impossible to deal effectively with this question now. With regard to the speech which we have just heard I wish to maintain an absolute reserve, neither admitting nor denying anything it contains, nor expressing approval or censure of the statements it contains. At the same time I must enter a *caveat* against any disposition to interfere with the right of any hon. Member to draw any inferences he may think fit from it. Having said that, I must assert the absolute responsibility of Her Majesty's Government for both what we have done and for what we intend to do in the Soudan; but I hope that it will be understood that it is not open to us to enter partially into a discussion of the subject. If we enter into it at all we must go through with it and declare our whole intention, and must give the House and the country the clearest view of our policy in Egypt that it is in our power to convey. At present there is

no course open to us but to remain silent, and to ask for a short postponement of the discussion. I hope we shall be excused if we retain within our own breasts all that we have to say on this subject until next week, when it will become our duty to place before the House in a form perfectly intelligible our views upon the question, so as to enable the House to deal with it in any manner they may think fit, according to the recognized rule with respect to the responsibility of Ministers in Office.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, that it appeared to him that the attitude taken up by Her Majesty's Government upon this question would, under any circumstances, be an unusual one. He imagined that when the Government of the country made a demand upon Parliament for a large increase of our Military Forces, if no statement of policy had been made to the House before, it was the invariable rule that the statement should be made when such an increase of our Forces was asked for. But even if that were not so the Government should not endeavour to put pressure upon the House to prevent hon. Members from expressing their opinions with regard to the question before them. If the attitude of the Government would be unusual at any time he certainly thought it was especially unusual when the position of Her Majesty's Government at the present time was considered, because it must be recollected that Her Majesty's Government no longer occupied the position of a powerful Government commanding an immense majority in that House and possessing the confidence of the country. ["Oh, oh!" *and Opposition cheers.*] He could only judge upon that point from absolute recorded events. It was beyond dispute that it was only by a majority of 14 upon this very question of the Soudan that Her Majesty's Government had been able to retain the Offices which they now held. He hoped that this fact would be regarded as some excuse for his not altogether yielding to the demand of the Prime Minister that no discussion should be raised with respect to this question at this particular moment. The Prime Minister had said that it was not necessary to discuss this question now, because the House would have an excellent opportunity of discussing it when the Vote of Credit came before it. On this point he must remark that although the Vote of Credit was to be laid upon the Table of the House on Monday or Tuesday next, the Prime Minister had intimated that the discussion with regard to it would come on more conveniently after the debate upon the Budget had been taken. Such a course would allow of very considerable delay before the House could discuss the question of the Soudan, and the question was not one which permitted of long delay, it being a vital and a pressing one. In these circumstances he felt bound to run the risk of doing what the Prime Minister had said might be done—namely, of doing injury by partially discussing this question. The Message now before the House was given Notice of in connection with the campaign in the Soudan, and he desired to make a few remarks with regard to the policy of that campaign. The policy of our large military operations in the Soudan had never yet been debated in that House. The matters that had been discussed related exclusively to the past conduct of the Government, and not to their future policy in that country. Although he was in India at the time, he was aware that the death of General Gordon had created a profound and an unparalleled expression of opinion in this country; and not only was the country deeply moved at the failure of the Military Expedition for his relief, but the country was justifiably and legitimately alarmed as to what might be the course of conduct pursued by the victorious Mahdi. He could easily understand how the House, under the influence of such feelings, had readily acquiesced in the despatch of a large Military Force to the Soudan; but the first blush of that great popular excitement having passed away it might be that the House might now be inclined to reconsider with greater judgment and deliberation the policy of committing the country to a large military expenditure in that part of the world. The House was aware that the original policy of the Government at the time of the defeat of General Hicks was the evacuation of the Soudan; and that was pressed, in fact forced, upon the Egyptian Government. He did not know that the policy of the evacuation of the Soudan had ever been condemned by any Party in Parliament, though he understood that the policy which led to

that step being taken, and the manner in which it was to be carried out, were condemned. But, whether that policy had been condemned or not, that was undoubtedly the policy of the Government, and it was accepted and ratified by Parliament. General Gordon was thereupon despatched to Khartoum, and expeditions despatched for the relief of Sinkat and Tokar; but the garrisons were not rescued, and the House was now face to face with the fact that the rescue of the garrisons had not been accomplished, and could not now be accomplished. He thought that sometimes the greatest disaster arose to individuals in private life, and also to nations in their public life, by an obstinate refusal to recognize what might be called a *fait accompli*. He would have thought that, however great might be the popular excitement at the fall of Khartoum, it would be the duty of Ministers at such a time to take a calm view of the situation, and instead of yielding blindly to popular impulse, to determine what was most in the interest of the country. He had himself the most profound conviction that the despatch of a large Military Force to Suakin was an immense error. He believed that it was not too late to remedy the error, and he believed that no special or particular blame would attach to Her Majesty's Government if they chose to reconsider the policy of the Expedition to the Soudan. But he maintained it was the duty of any Member of Parliament who did happen to think strongly on the point to take the earliest opportunity of endeavouring to arrive in some way or other at the opinion of the House upon the point. He was glad the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) had moved his Amendment; and if he took the sense of the House upon it he should support him. The Military Force now being maintained at Suakin consisted of the flower of the British Army. There were three battalions of British Guards, and two or more first-class regiments of British Cavalry; and the Government must be aware that the climate was perfectly deadly to a British constitution. That was why he pressed these matters on the House, because the health of the Army was deteriorating, and must deteriorate every hour. When he was on his way to India he visited the encampment of the Marines at Suez, which was called a sanatorium for invalided soldiers from India. When there he ascertained from an officer who had just returned from Suakin — an officer who was in every way calculated to give a sound opinion, but whose name he would not give, for the Military Authorities had a strange way of repressing the giving of information by officers—that since April last, when General Graham evacuated the Soudan, up to the month of December, Suakin had been held by a Force of Marines, averaging from 700 to 900 strong; and the effect of thus holding Suakin had been that for all military purposes two entire regiments of Marines had been wiped out of the Army List, the men having been invalided from Suakin at the rate of 100 a month. The same officer had told him that, in his opinion, no Englishman under the age of 40 had a chance of preserving his health there after a very short residence. So great, in fact, had been the drain upon the Marines that there were no reliefs to send out; and the Force at Suakin had to be reinforced by Regular Infantry. But the public did not know all this, though Her Majesty's Government knew it quite well; and he wished to know how, with their knowledge of the effect of the climate upon the Marines, who were all seasoned soldiers, they ever sent the flower of the British Army to Suakin and were keeping them there? If the Army were kept at Suakin, the loss by sickness would, perhaps, amount to a decimation of the Force. He did not think it was at all inappropriate to consider the desirability of not in any way weakening at the present moment the Military Forces of the country; but if these troops were maintained at Suakin, they would be weakened, and desperately weakened, and the day might come when the Government would be prepared to sacrifice anything almost to have these troops by them. If there were any large armies threatening to join the Mahdi at Khartoum and to pour down on Egypt, then, perhaps, something might be said as to the operations now being carried on at Suakin; but, though he could understand there was at one time a fear of the Mahdi pouring down on Egypt, there was absolutely now no fear. From all reliable accounts the Mahdi was at Khartoum, or occupied in settling some differences with some little spurious

Mahdi who had arisen in the rear. Then, again, where was Osman Digna? Heaven only knew. If he was near Suakin, he had no great army with him, and the Government were keeping a force of 10,000 men there to keep at bay a mere fugitive vagabond chief, of whom all reliable rumours said that he was not surrounded by an army. Then the Government said they were going to make a railway. He was surprised that so much importance was attached to the construction of such a railway. He had had an opportunity of acquiring information as to the purposes for which the railway might be useful; and he could inform the House that for all commercial purposes, for civilizing purposes, for purposes of profit, it was absolutely useless. It was quite true, too, that the Arab tribes were opposed to it, for they depended for their living upon carrying on their camels the slender trade that existed between Suakin and Berber; neither was the railway of any use from a military point of view. For it could not advance at any but a snail-like speed, and could not be ready by the autumn for an advance on Berber. Seeing, therefore, that there was no enemy in the neighbourhood of Suakin, that there was no intention of making an immediate advance on Berber, and that when it was made it must be in the nature of a dash, and seeing that the conquest of the Soudan was undoubtedly a policy that would never be sanctioned, he asked the Government for what purpose they were retaining that force at Suakin, and whether the Message from the Crown represented an intention on their part of maintaining that force there for any considerable time? If that was their intention, then he should vote with the hon. Member for Northampton; but if that was not their intention, he could not see why Her Majesty's Government should not announce to the House their minds on the subject, and say that they would take the question of the Soudan into their immediate consideration, and would be prepared to place these troops in such positions of climate and locality as would enable them when the moment came to be effectually utilized for the defence of the country. He did not mean to speak about another subject which he felt it was dangerous almost for anybody to discuss at the present moment; but they knew that matters were now at issue between the great Russian Empire and the British Government which had reached a very critical stage. He did not believe that there was a man in the House who did not hope from the bottom of his heart that peace might be preserved. But if they wanted peace to be preserved, their best chance of that would be in their strength from a military point of view; and if the Russian Government observed that with the sanction of Parliament the British Government was obstinately dissipating the best of its military resources in the centre of Africa, it would be more than human if it did not take advantage of that fact, and if it did not press with greater pertinacity claims of which it would, under other circumstances, be likely to take a more reasonable view. Unless the House was given a more satisfactory statement than it had yet had from the Government, he should support the hon. Member for Northampton if he went to a division; and he hoped that the hon. Member would receive a considerable amount of support, at any rate, from the independent sections of the House.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL admitted this was not the time to discuss the policy of Her Majesty's Government in the Soudan; but he thought the noble Lord opposite was quite justified in calling attention to the Suakin Expedition. Every hour and day was important, for at the present moment the Crown and flower of the British Army was carrying on this miserable bush war in the Soudan, and that circumstance itself appeared a sign of weakness. Up to the present the health of the troops had been good; but as the summer advanced we must be prepared for long lists of invalids. A growing mistrust of General Graham now prevailed among many officers in Suakin; in their opinion the troops were being moved unnecessarily, and he was glad to hear that Lord Wolseley was going there. He earnestly hoped that in the grave circumstances in which this country was now placed the Government would not leave its splendid troops in the Soudan.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, he thought the Prime Minister had dealt with the subject with undue levity. The Amendment of the hon. Member for Northampton deserved something better than the frivolous remarks of the

right hon. Gentleman. He had on several occasions asked the Government to declare their policy in the Soudan; but they had over and over again refused. He should like the noble Lord the Secretary of State for War to state what was the object of the Government in extending the Suakin-Berber railway. Summer was rapidly approaching, when the heat would be very great, and when the number of invalids would be very many. Did the Government intend to remain in the Soudan, and to erect any kind of Government in Khartoum? He hoped that some Member of the Government would answer the question, and that the right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Opposition Bench would not remain silent. He hoped the Leaders of the Opposition would tell the House what they were going to do, and whether hon. Members below the Gangway on that side of the House should follow the hon. Member for Northampton, or troop into the Lobby under the guidance of the noble Lords (Lord Richard Grosvenor and Lord Kensington).

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I do not rise to attempt to answer the questions put to me by the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down; but I desire to point out that the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock fell not unnaturally into an error from his absence from the House when he said the measures now under the consideration of the House were connected with the operations of the Government in the Soudan. That is not the case. The measures that were necessary for the present operations which are in progress at Suakin and on the Nile were explained in this House some time ago; and the House, by voting the Supplementary Estimates which were laid on the Table at that time, sanctioned the continuation of those operations. The Forces at the disposal of Lord Wolseley and General Graham are at present sufficient, in our opinion, for all they have to do for the present. The Reserves were not called upon for the purpose of undertaking these operations — they were called upon only to a limited extent. In addition to calling upon certain Militia regiments, the Reserves were called upon to this extent—that the transfer of men from the Colours to the Reserves was checked during the continuation of the operations, and a certain number of Reserve men were also permitted to volunteer from the Reserves to the Colours. The measures that were taken in connection with the Soudan operations did not go beyond this, and there was no intention of calling out the Reserves for the purpose of the Soudan operations. The Proclamation of Her Majesty, which appeared a short time ago, was in connection with a subject of quite a different character, as the House is aware, and had reference to military operations, the necessity for which is perfectly well understood. We are, therefore, in this position — that the House has already discussed, at great length, and has sanctioned, all the measures which are required for the present operations in the Soudan. We are in the further position that it is impossible that those operations, to which the noble Lord and the hon. Member for Northampton object, can be prosecuted without the Government calling upon the House to afford the means, and a Vote of Credit will accordingly be laid on the Table in a short time. It is upon that occasion that the House will have a perfectly legitimate opportunity of learning what the views of the Government are in regard to these operations in the Soudan, and of expressing the sense of the House as to the wisdom or unwisdom of those operations. The question of the policy of the Government in the Soudan is only very remotely connected with the measure now under the consideration of the House. The House is not asked to express any opinion on the policy of the Government in the Soudan. That has, up to a certain time, received the approval of the House, and another opportunity will be shortly afforded. The noble Lord called on us to consider our position, not only in the Soudan, but in relation to other affairs in other parts of the world. I need scarcely say that that is a subject that has been constantly engaging the most anxious attention and consideration of the Government. My right hon. Friend has stated that it would not be expedient to make any statement on that subject at present; but he has promised that it shall be made on the earliest legitimate opportunity.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: It seems to me that we are in a position which rather reverses what was said by the hon Member for Portsmouth (Sir

H. Drummond Wolff) just now. He spoke of the Government treating this matter with levity; but I am afraid if we were hastily to tack on, in answer to the Gracious Message from Her Majesty, the words proposed by the hon. Member for Northampton we should expose ourselves, and the House would expose itself, to the charge of levity in dealing with matters of such great and such immense importance as those which are involved in this question. With regard to the particular measures that have to be taken in the circumstances of the country, we observe that they divide themselves into two classes. There are the steps that are taken on Her Majesty's responsibility, by Her Majesty's command, and which are communicated to this House with regard to the calling out of the Reserves, and there is the request which Her Majesty will address to Her Ministers through Parliament to provide the funds which are necessary for the purpose for which those men are to be used. Unquestionably it is far more expedient that the House should discuss these questions upon the demand which has to be made for the money over which we have control, rather than upon an Amendment of any kind in answer to Her Majesty's Message. I think anything in the nature of a discussion upon the answer to Her Majesty's Gracious Message is much to be deprecated. I think it would produce a false impression as to the want of heart or unity in this House with regard to that which we are told is the principle and main object for which the Reserves are to be called out. I think it would be undesirable to let it go abroad that there was any difference of opinion on such a point as this. I shall be told that the Motion made by the hon. Member does not come within that category, and that it does not expose him or the House to any such charge, because he deals with a matter of a different kind. No doubt the matters are different; but the Amendment raises without Notice the great question of what the course of the Government should be in the Soudan and Egypt, and on a question of a proposal to add words to the Address does not seem to me to do justice to the importance of the question itself. Everyone must feel the weight of those words which fell from the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill). He has not had the opportunity of taking part in these debates this Session, and it is not to be wondered at that he has taken an early opportunity of expressing an opinion on the matter, and in such a manner as to cause the House, I am sure, to feel thankful to him for the assistance he has given it. But I think it would be a great misfortune if we now attempt to come to a decision which must be preceded by a full discussion of the whole question of the Egyptian policy of the Government; and when we know that we shall have before us next week, or the week after, the opportunity of a full and careful discussion of the matter with power in our hands to give effect to the decision we may arrive at. We must bear in mind that if we make feeble and ineffective attacks on the Government we only strengthen their hands—we give an appearance of large majorities when really there are no authorities in their favour. I do not think it is expedient as a question of tactics to raise this question on such an occasion as this. I think when we have a full explanation of what the Government policy is that explanation will require to be very carefully sifted and very carefully examined, and the House must come to a careful conclusion upon it; but I am not of opinion that it is desirable that anything in the nature of the words mentioned by the hon. Member for Northampton in response to Her Majesty's Message should be added.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said, he was one of those who, in the last debate on the Vote of Censure, ventured to express an opinion that the Soudan Expedition, from first to last, was a mistake, and that it was the true business of this country to withdraw from this unfortunate enterprize. The noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill), who had contributed very materially to this debate, had come on the scene some two months later than other Members were obliged to do, and had had longer time to make up his mind on the Soudan question. While the noble Lord was speaking what he believed to be sound sense on that question, he was curious to observe what support he might get on the other side of the House; and he was bound to say

Sir Stafford Northcote

there was very small response from Gentlemen above the Gangway on the Conservative side; but before they came to the genuine discussion, possibly what the noble Lord had stated that night might influence those right hon. and hon. Gentlemen; and he was quite sure that if, besides the expression of opinion given by many Radical Members as to the policy of the Soudan Expedition, they could only have a confirmation of the noble Lord's views on the other side of the House, the course of the Government would be very clear. [*Ironical laughter from the Opposition.*] He expected there would be some laughter at his remark; but he did not disguise the fact, nor did the people of this country disguise it, that right hon. and hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House wielded the military spirit of the country, and that, whatever Government was in power, when a question had arrived at a certain critical stage, it was they, and not the Liberals, who were really able to dictate the policy. He did not think that would be so long; but he confessed, and was humiliated by the fact, that whereas on the Liberal side of the House they represented the great majority of the people of the country, Gentlemen on the other side, representing small, influential, and select classes, were omnipotent on such an occasion. He did not wonder that the noble Lord on the Treasury Bench (the Marquess of Hartington) was candid enough to say that the calling out of the Reserves had no direct relation with any additional Forces wanted in the Soudan. Compared with a foreign war we might be called upon to engage in, the Soudan business was only child's play; but he was glad to hear the expression of opinion of the noble Lord opposite (Lord Randolph Churchill), than whom no other man on the Conservative side of the House was more competent to offer an opinion which would be valued by Parliament, because he had been disentangled from the earlier stages of the controversy during this Session, and he believed that right hon. Gentlemen opposite would find it to be politic to support the view expressed by Radical Members, that the sooner we escaped from the entanglements of the Soudan business the better. If we wished to impress either Russia or any other Power with our determination, the wisest thing we could do was to call away the flower of our troops from the Soudan, and not have them destroyed in that pestilential climate. He was afraid that when this Soudan chapter of our history came to be written, it would be said that, from first to last, it was a mistake and a discredit to the Empire. Whatever might have been the advice given by Lord Wolseley when Khartoum fell, the Government and the people of the country must now, at all events, see there was no excuse for the continuance of this conflict. There was no foe to fight; and as to our remaining at Suakin in order to make a railway, he agreed with the noble Lord that there was nothing about that which would make the House of Commons for one moment hesitate in coming to a decision. He might add a word as to the graver question which was now troubling them. It had been intimated, on a previous evening, that Parliament and the country were united as to the necessity of our supporting the Ameer, and so forth. He only wished to say, at this moment, that many of his hon. Friends would like to give expression to their views, so that no misunderstanding might arise as to that supposed unanimity. He would not go into the question as to whose side the fault lay on; but he said it would be a melancholy thing if in this country, through the military spirit which pervaded certain quarters, the Government found itself in as helpless a position as the Russian Government seemed to be. They were told, on all hands, that the Russian Government was dominated by the military power. He hoped this country, at any rate, would keep its head cool, and would not be driven by rash councils, or even by a London Press, to any extreme course. If things arrived at such an acute point as to render hostilities almost certain, he hoped that even then, depending on the righteousness of our position and our cause, we should have the moral courage to appeal to an independent Power, in order that this conflict between two great Empires might, by some means or other, be avoided.

SIR WILLIAM HART DYKE said, that hon. Gentlemen opposite were always declaring that the Conservative

Party was never satisfied unless it was feasting on bloodshed. He could not but repudiate, in the strongest manner, the language used by the hon. Member who had just sat down. The vast majority of the Members of that House had been horrified by the proceedings of Her Majesty's Government in Egypt since the first shot was fired; and to assert that hon. Gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House approved of those proceedings was to assert that which could not be supported by facts. There was a great deal in the speech of his noble Friend with which he most heartily concurred. At all events, he ventured to say that no Tory Government could have done as the present Government had done—namely, keep a large British Force in the Soudan without giving a single sketch of its policy as regarded the future. Her Majesty's Government had done that up till now, and whether they would continue to do so or not would depend on the votes of hon. Members opposite. They had had opportunity after opportunity of deciding whether this was a right course or not; but in every case they had been content with accusing the Conservative Party of bloodshed, and then had invariably supported the Government. He thought it would be well if the hon. Member (Mr. Labouchere) were content with this discussion. He could not support the Amendment, much as he was horrified with the proceedings of Her Majesty's Government in the Soudan; and for this reason—that if it were passed it would place the House in the ridiculous position of directing the Government to close a campaign after a debate so brief that the Secretary of State for War was not even allowed to communicate with his Department.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 39; Noes 148: Majority 109.—(Div. List, No. 95.)

Main Question put, and *agreed to*.

Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, thanking Her Majesty for Her Most Gracious Message communicating to this House that Her Majesty was about to cause Her Reserve Force, and Her Militia Reserve Force, or such part thereof, as Her Majesty shall, from time to time, think necessary, to be called out for permanent Service.

To be presented by Privy Councillors.

Sir William Hart Dyke

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (REDISTRIBUTION) (*re-committed*) BILL.—[Bill 49.]

(*Mr. Gladstone, The Marquess of Hartington, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Attorney General, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 10th April.*]

[TWELFTH NIGHT.]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

SEVENTH SCHEDULE.

COUNTIES AT LARGE.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS AND NAMES AND CONTENTS OF DIVISIONS.

PART I.

ENGLAND.

MR. WARTON said, the first Amendment which stood in his name was to omit in page 43, line 3, the words "of Members and." His object was to follow the course which had already been taken in regard to the Sixth Schedule. The Sixth Schedule was described as containing the Number, Names, Contents, and Boundaries of Divisions; whereas the Seventh Schedule purported to give the Number of Members and Names and Contents of Divisions. The right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had been good enough to accept the Amendment he (Mr. Warton) had moved in the title of the Sixth Schedule, which Amendment altered the word "name" to "names." But there still remained a curious difference between the titles of the Schedules. He (Mr. Warton) thought it showed how carelessly the Bill had been drawn, and that no regard had been paid to symmetry. He might be told that there was no harm in that, as the Bill was capable of amendment. No doubt, there was no harm in it; but it occasioned inconvenience and waste of time; and he maintained that the objects mentioned in the title to the Sixth Schedule should also be the objects mentioned in the Seventh, or the objects mentioned in the Seventh should have been equally provided for in the Sixth. The proposal in the Sixth Schedule was to divide the boroughs, and under the present Schedule it was to divide the counties. He did not know what view the right hon. Baronet would take of the matter; but he proposed to omit

the words "of Members and," as the first step towards making the Schedule similar in its terms to the one which had already been passed. He might be told that this was not a similar case, and if the right hon. Gentleman could show that there was any distinction he would be perfectly satisfied.

Amendment proposed, in page 43, line 3, to leave out "of Members and." —(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the hon. and learned Member opposite (Mr. Warton) was quite right in stating that there was a difference between the Sixth and Seventh Schedules in regard to the point to which he had alluded. But there was necessarily a difference, because if the hon. and learned Member looked at Clause 9 of the Bill he would find that it enacted that each of the counties at large named in the Seventh Schedule should return the number of Members named in the said Schedule; whereas, if he turned back to the 6th clause, which dealt with the division of Parliamentary boroughs, he would not find that that was the case. The reason was, that the number of divisions in the boroughs was very small, whereas in the counties it was very large, and provision was made in other Schedules for the altered representation of boroughs. In fact, from the way in which some of the counties were divided, it was necessary to give all the details as to the divisions in the Seventh Schedule. All the counties in England, with the exception of Rutland, and some of those in Wales, were divided, whereas a good many of the boroughs remained in their present position. That was the reason why the title of this Schedule had been varied from that affixed to the Sixth Schedule. It was considered that that was the most convenient form in which to arrange the matter.

MR. WARTON said, that after the explanation of the right hon. Baronet he would withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. WARTON said, he proposed in the next Amendment to leave out the second word "and" for the purpose of subsequently inserting the words "and boundaries." He did not know any reason why they should not have the boundaries of the divisions inserted in the title in connection with the counties as well as in the boroughs. He saw no necessity whatever for a difference, and it was strictly in accordance with the 8th and 9th clauses of the Bill, each of which, in the 2nd sub-section, specified the boundaries. If the two clauses had been differently drawn for any special reason he could see the force of an objection similar to that which the right hon. Gentleman had raised in connection with the last case. He admitted the full force of what the right hon. Gentleman had said there; but the same ground did not apply to the boundaries which were specially mentioned in both clauses.

Amendment proposed, in page 43, line 3, leave out the second "and."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question proposed, "That the second 'and' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the boundaries were not, technically speaking, described either in regard to the boroughs or counties either in the previous Reform Act, or the later Act relating to boundaries. The description was rather in the nature of contents than boundaries, and included Petty Sessional divisions, and so on. Therefore, he thought the phrase "contents" in the Bill was the better phrase, although there was certainly no very serious objection to the insertion of the word "boundaries."

MR. WARTON said, he quite admitted that a question as to contents might arise; but his only object was to make the Schedules consistent with the clauses of the Bill. There was certainly a number of cases in which the description contained in the Schedule might be looked upon as contents of divisions rather than boundaries. For instance, this phrase was frequently employed—"Including certain parishes." But if the right hon. Gentleman would look at the borough divisions specified in the Sixth Schedule, he would find that precisely the same circumstance arose; and yet the term "boundaries" was contained in the title, and no mention whatever was made of the line being drawn at the contents of the divisions. He did not, however, wish to press the

Amendment against the objection of the right hon. Baronet. He would only ask the right hon. Gentleman to turn his attention to the previous Schedule, where he would find a great number of boroughs in the same condition as the county divisions, in regard to which the word "boundaries" was made to apply.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would prefer the phraseology of the Bill as it stood.

MR. HICKS said, he would suggest to the right hon. Baronet a reason why he should accept the Amendment of his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Warton). By the Bill, as drawn, the counties were divided into Petty Sessional divisions, and he took it for granted that it was the intention of the Government that all the parishes included in those Petty Sessional divisions should remain as parts of the several divisions of the county as long as the Bill remained an Act. But as the Schedule was now drawn without the addition of the words proposed to be inserted by his hon. and learned Friend, he (Mr. Hicks) thought they might find themselves involved in this difficulty—that a Petty Sessional division might be altered, and by that means the boundary of the division, so far as the county was concerned, might be changed also. He did not know whether that was so; but it struck him it was possible that a difficulty might arise hereafter which would be prevented by the insertion of the word "boundaries."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that no difficulty of that kind would arise. The future boundaries of each division were provided for by the Bill. As to the second point raised by the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Hicks), if that were not so, the insertion of the word "boundaries" alone would not cure the evil.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. WARTON said, the next Amendment was consequential, and, therefore, he would not move it.

MR. RAIKES, in moving, as an Amendment, in page 43, line 8, after the word "The," to insert "Northern or," the object of which was to provide that the first division of the county of Bedford, instead of being designated "The Biggleswade Division" should be named "The Northern or Biggleswade Division," said, the Amendment which stood in his name at that particular stage of the Bill was the first of many, the object of which was to restore the former nomenclature of the constituencies to something rather more closely approximate to what had hitherto been the case, according to the custom of the country, at least since the Act of 1832. That Act dealt with the divisions of counties, and in every case it attached to the different divisions names in accordance with the points of the compass—for instance, North Lancashire, South Leicestershire, or any other practical division, by which a positive idea was conveyed to the minds of hon. Members of that House, and enabled them at once to realize the fact that an hon. Member who was alluded to under that designation was the Representative of a constituency which in past times returned such and such men who had been more or less distinguished. By the Instructions given to the Boundary Commissioners, and given, he thought, in consequence of the pledge which had been made by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board in regard to the county divisions, they were particularly requested to take into consideration the claim of any borough disfranchised under the Bill, and merged in another constituency, in order to see whether the rude blow inflicted upon that borough might not be in some degree softened by introducing its name into the county division of which it was henceforth to form part. He had nothing at all to say to the course taken by the right hon. Gentleman in framing the Schedules of the Bill, because it certainly was in accordance with the statement which he had made in that House. Still less had he any fault to find with the course taken by the Boundary Commissioners in carrying out their Instructions; but he thought there was this noteworthy fact to be considered in connection with the subject—that in Scotland and Ireland, where these particular Instructions had not been given to the Boundary Commissioners, they had, in almost every case, adopted the points of the compass as the best means of designating the boundaries to which the new divisions applied. Whenever it was left to their own unassisted judgment, or to the advice taken on the spot,

the Commissioners had followed that course, and had proposed to constitute the divisions of the Scotch and Irish counties exactly in accordance with the ancient practice in regard to the English counties in connection with the representation of the people. That being so, he ventured to ask whether this was not the time for the Committee to consider how far it was desirable to depart from that ancient practice in regard to England and Wales? They were to have the North Donegal Division in Ireland, and the Eastern Division of the county of Perth in Scotland; and nearly all the other divisions in the case of Scotland and Ireland were to be named in accordance with the points of the compass. Why, then, should not the same rule be followed in regard to the English counties, and instead of having, in this case, the Biggleswade Division and the Luton Division, why not have North Bedfordshire and South Bedfordshire, so that they might carry out the system with which all of them were familiar? There was another point which deserved consideration in connection with this question, and it was this—they had been constantly told by the Government that this was not a Bill for the purpose of establishing electoral districts, and that, whatever other objects the Bill had, it did not aim at the establishment of electoral districts. The Prime Minister himself had laid considerable stress upon that point in one of his earlier speeches, either upon this Bill or the Franchise Bill. Then, if this was not a Bill to establish electoral districts, he (Mr. Raikes) thought it was desirable that the fact should be marked by the adoption of a particular sort of nomenclature which would show that they were dealing with a county in the one case and with a borough in the other, and that they were not naming a constituency in a way that would lead to endless confusion between the counties and boroughs hereafter. He did not wish, in any way, to criticize the work which had been done by the Boundary Commissioners. He thought that, on the whole, they had performed a difficult task with signal success; but he was bound to say that the names which had recommended themselves, or which had been recommended to the Commissioners, seemed almost to be a burlesque upon our system of Parliamentary representation. He did not know whether hon. Members had made this question a study; but it was worth while to point out how, in the future, Members who rose to address the House might be designated. He had ventured to make a list of a few of the remarkable examples of nomenclature adopted in this Schedule. If any hon. Member happened to be at a distance from England in the course of next year or the year after, and were to take up a newspaper, he might find that an animated discussion had taken place on the Motion of the hon. Member for Ramsey, seconded by the hon. Member for Eddisbury; that an acrimonious speech was delivered by the hon. Member for Brixworth, supported by an equally strong harangue from the hon. Member for Morley; that a judicial summing-up was delivered by the Representative of St. Clears, and suggestions made by the hon. Member for Pudsey. The person who for the first time heard of these designations would imagine that he was rather dealing with one of Dean Swift's interesting attempts to represent the usages of this country when transferred to another planet than the state of public opinion in a great and historic country like this. If he (Mr. Raikes) were to attempt to examine hon. Members of that House as to where these places were to be found, he undertook to say that, in the majority of cases, no hon. Member, unless he happened to belong to the particular county in which the place referred to was situated, would be able to give an answer. He would like to know whether any hon. Member not belonging to the actual county in which it was situated could say where the division of Bromfield was to be found? Was there any hon. Member, who did not possess exceptional geographical attainments, who could say where the division of Barkston Ash was to be found? He thought there were a good many hon. Gentlemen who would be content to remain in ignorance as to where Llandilo, Eivion, Thornbury, Bedwelty, Wansbeck, Rushcliffe, Pirehill, Buckrose, Colne Valley, Kingswinford, and Osgoldcross were to be found. When they had long had before them an ancient and a well-known system for the sub-division of counties,

according to the points of the compass, he could not help thinking that the Government would do well to consult the natural sentiments of the House in dealing with the matter. However highly they ought to esteem the opinions of others, even Members of Parliament had some feeling and some right to be considered in a question like this. He was quite sure that if it were left to hon. Members now representing the counties, they would, by a great majority, prefer to continue to represent a constituency bearing the name of the county, rather than a local division, as proposed by the Bill. He believed that that feeling was not at all confined to either side of the House. He had no wish to detain the Committee by speaking at any greater length upon the question; and he would, therefore, simply move the first of the Amendments which stood in his name. At the same time, he did not think that the question would be necessarily concluded by any decision which the Committee might arrive at on this particular Amendment, because there were special circumstances in almost every county which might require further consideration when they came to deal with it in its turn. If, however, the Government were at the present time prepared to consult what he thought was the evident sense of the Committee, he would be extremely happy to leave to the right hon. Baronet the task of revising the Amendments he (Mr. Raikes) had placed upon the Paper, with a view of seeing whether, although he might not agree absolutely with the particular geographical designations he (Mr. Raikes) had endeavoured to allot to particular constituencies, he would, at any rate, accept the principle of these Amendments. If the right hon. Baronet would do that, he thought he would greatly accelerate the progress of the Bill through Committee; and he trusted that the great good sense and moderation which had characterized the action of the right hon. Baronet in dealing with the Bill throughout its progress in Committee, up to the present moment, would again be exemplified by his acceptance of a principle which he (Mr. Raikes) believed would be acceptable to the Committee, and not very likely to be objected to, or made a subject of dispute outside the walls of Parliament. He begged to move the Amendment.

Mr. Raikes

Amendment proposed, in page 43, line 8, after the word "The," insert the words "Northern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the right hon. Gentleman was quite right in stating that the Government were under a pledge in this matter as regarded the merged boroughs; but no similar pledge had been given with regard to other places.

MR. RAIKES said, he had not stated that the Government were under a positive pledge, but rather a less definite engagement.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, there was a pledge by the Prime Minister in answer to a distinct inquiry. But although there was a pledge as regarded the merged boroughs, there was no similar pledge with regard to other places. It was true that in Scotland and Ireland the Boundary Commissioners had followed a different rule from that which they had pursued in England; but it had not been universally followed, although it was followed generally. The reason why they had selected the points of the compass as the names for the divisions of counties in those two countries was that in many cases in Scotland and Ireland there were no towns or well-known places in the divisions from which to name them. In England there were in nearly all the divisions of the different counties either merged boroughs, or municipal boroughs, or local government districts, or localities, commonly known as hundreds, or Petty Sessional divisions, or Poor Law Unions, from which to name them. That was the case, indeed, in regard to the first division in the Schedule—the Biggleswade Division of the county of Bedford. It was the name both of a Poor Law Union and of a Petty Sessional division, and was, therefore, well known in the county. Then, if the Government were now to change the system of the nomenclature of the divisions, and were to alter in that House the names which appeared in the Bill, even if the alterations met with the general assent of hon. Members, they might expose themselves to a very general attack from persons outside the House. It would be said that if there had been the slightest idea that any change was to be made from

the proposals of the Bill, great protests against such change would have been made; and he was bound to say that a general assent to the change on the part of the House might have very little effect. He believed that the names given to the divisions by the Commissioners had been pretty well received in the counties—perhaps better received in the counties than in the House of Commons, and he thought there had been more opposition or resistance to names within the House than throughout the counties themselves. Generally speaking, throughout the country the names appeared to have been well received. ["No, no!"] That, at all events, was his impression, and he had had a good opportunity of judging the matter, having received a good many communications upon the subject. He was bound to say that any change would occasion much disappointment to a great number of persons throughout the country. The right hon. Gentleman proposed the much milder course of applying to the new divisions names signified by the points of the compass. Now, there would be some difficulty in applying the points of the compass as names for divisions, because it would introduce confusion between the new, and the old, and well-known divisions of the counties—for instance, a voter would say—"I am an East Sussex voter;" but he would not know whether he was speaking of the old division or the new division of the county, and by that means a considerable amount of confusion might be created if they continued to use the name for a county division which was altogether and completely different from that to which the name formerly applied. As to the use of the alternative, he thought they would run the risk of creating a considerable amount of confusion by adopting that plan, in addition to which there would be a risk of error occasioned by having double names, and much additional trouble. In practice, two names were not likely to be used, and one or other would very soon be suppressed; while, at the same time, it would be necessary to use the whole of the name in all legal documents. If the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman were carried, in each case the legal name would be the whole name, and in the Writ the division would have to be called the Northern or Biggleswade Division. That might occasion confusion, trouble, and difficulty, and it certainly would entail the risk of error. Having stated these views to the Committee, he had no wish to express himself strongly upon the matter, either one way or the other. His own view was that it was not important by what name the division was known, inasmuch as hon. Members were likely to be called by the name of the county, one of the Members of which they were, rather than by the name of the division of the county for which they sat. He had already stated that opinion in the course of the debates upon the Bill. In many cases it was clear that the names of the divisions could not be taken from the points of the compass, because the county divisions were too numerous to allow that to be possible. In Lancashire and Yorkshire, as well as some other counties, there were so many divisions, and the counties were so large, that it would be absolutely necessary to give the divisions distinguishing names. If, therefore, they were to give distinguishing names in some instances, and in others to call divisions after the points of the compass, the Bill would have a certain patchiness which would be undesirable. It was perfectly true that that argument was to a great extent met by the fact that patchiness, to a certain extent, existed as between Scotland, Ireland, and England. The whole question was, however, one of convenience; and if any general feeling was shown by the Committee on this matter of alternative names, he would reconsider the question before the Report. There would be certain other difficulties in the adoption of the points of the compass, arising from artificial distinctions, which had been established by the Boundary Commissioners themselves. There was more than one case on the Paper already in which it was proposed to give different names for one and the same division; and there would be considerable liability to confuse the arrangements if any alteration were made in the names selected by the Commissioners. When they named a county division after a district, town, or place they ran no risk whatever; but in many counties there would be great difficulty, even if the county were only small, in designating one or other of the artificially shaped divisions by a compass name. The right

hon. Gentleman himself admitted that it was desirable to have certain differences of treatment in regard to the matter, because he had not only inserted borough names, but in some cases he had left in the name proposed by the Bill, while in others he proposed to substitute an alternative name, showing that he had himself followed some of the considerations which he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had endeavoured to place before the Committee. He would repeat that if there was any general or strong opinion upon the subject, he would reconsider the matter before the Report stage of the Bill; but, as at present advised in regard to the feeling of the Committee, and still more from what had reached him from correspondents in the country, he felt disposed, on the whole, to adhere to the scheme of the Boundary Commissioners.

MR. JAMES HOWARD, as Member for the constituency affected by the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Raikes), said, he rose to say that he entirely concurred in the views which the right hon. Gentleman had expressed. He was strongly of opinion that geographical divisions would be much more advantageous and more appropriate than the designations contained in the Bill. In this particular instance nothing could be more inappropriate than to turn the Northern Division of the county of Bedford into the Biggleswade Division. The town was in the extreme east of Bedfordshire, on the confines of Cambridgeshire. Then, again, he preferred the geographical division, because it followed the established practice. Hitherto every county in England which had been divided had been subjected to designations in accordance with the points of the compass; and why there should have been any reason for departure from that established practice he failed to understand. Considerable feeling was manifested in favour of geographical divisions when the Boundary Commissioners visited Bedfordshire. The sitting Members, however, by previous arrangement, abstained from taking part in the proceedings before the Commissioners. He should certainly, but for that understanding, have supported the application for geographical divisions. The right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had suggested that the course pursued in the Bill was generally popular; but he (Mr. Howard) was persuaded that geographical divisions would have been more popular.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he agreed very much in what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman opposite; but, at the same time, he was bound to say that he had himself received a considerable number of communications from different parts of the country with regard to the Bill, and there was considerable difference of opinion among his correspondents upon this particular point. While some expressed an opinion in favour of retaining the names proposed by the Boundary Commissioners in preference to geographical divisions, for one letter he had received in that sense he had received three or four in the opposite sense. If they were to go through all the names which had been suggested by the Boundary Commissioners, he was afraid they would find themselves engaged in a good deal of discussion, in the course of which there would probably be some heated expression of opinion in regard to the claims of one place over another. He felt that the proposal of his right hon. Friend the Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Raikes) ought not to be made absolute in every case. It might be that taking the points of the compass would not always be the most convenient plan. There were certain counties in which, as the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had truly said, such a mode of division would not conveniently apply, and he should have felt that a serious difficulty, if it were not that his right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Cambridge proposed an ingenious method of meeting the difficulty, by giving an alternative. It seemed to him that, on the whole, to give an alternative was the best way of dealing with the matter. No doubt it involved the inconvenience of giving a long title; but, after all, it was only seldom that it would be necessary to make use of that title. It would generally be the case, as the right hon. Baronet had pointed out, that in speaking of one another they would use the name of the county which was represented. For instance, one Member would be spoken of as the Member for Bedfordshire, and others for whatever county they happened to represent. It would

only be occasionally that any necessity for being more particular would arise, or that it would be necessary to refer to the particular division of the county for which the Member sat. He did not feel very strongly upon the subject himself; but he was inclined to think that, as far as the evidence went, there was a balance of testimony in favour of the alternative proposal.

Mr. WALTER said, that, as his county (Berkshire) was affected by the Amendment of his right hon. Friend (Mr. Raikes), he merely rose to say that he was glad the subject had been brought under the consideration of the Committee. At the same time, as far as his own observation went, he felt bound to say that while he had received no expression of opinion in favour of the plan adopted by the Government of giving the names of towns instead of the points of the compass to the divisions of counties, he had received a good many expressions of opinion of an opposite character. Although he quite admitted the impossibility of attempting to apply the rule universally of what sailors called "boxing the compass," especially in the case of large counties, yet where it was practically easy, in counties like Bedfordshire or Berkshire, to take the compass points it would be preferable to do so, instead of taking the names from some unimportant towns. He thought the geographical was the better plan, and that was certainly the case in his own county. He would, therefore, support the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. FLOYER thanked his right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Raikes) for the able manner in which he had brought the matter forward. Although it was not of vital importance, it was still a matter which was considered to be of some little importance to the counties; and in discussing the Amendment he thought that hon. Members might have a little more latitude than in ordinary circumstances, and that they might be allowed to go a little beyond the point they would be strictly confined to in the case of an ordinary Amendment, seeing that it was an Amendment which applied not to one particular case, but to a whole series of cases. His right hon. Friend had raised the whole question of county divisions, in bringing this Amendment before the Committee; and, therefore, hon. Members ought not to be considered bound to confine themselves strictly to the consideration of the case of the county of Bedford, when they were really dealing with a much larger question. It would possibly save a good deal of time if, upon the present Amendment, the Committee were allowed to discuss the way in which the counties generally were affected in the matter. The right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had stated that all the representations, or a great majority of them, which had been made to him, had been rather in the direction of keeping the designations proposed by the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman said that, as far as he knew, there was no great objection to these designations, and that the particular occasion for discussing all these points in connection with the recommendations of the Boundary Commissioners was when the Commissioners paid their visits to the different counties. The right hon. Gentleman appeared to think that that was the proper time for those who took a particular view to express their opinion, and that they ought to have gone before the Commissioners. As a matter of fact, they had gone before the Commissioners, and when they had stated their views they were met by the statement that the Commissioners had been instructed to adopt the nomenclature from the extinguished boroughs. In his own case, in regard to the county he had the honour to represent (Dorsetshire) there was this little difficulty. The Bill of the Government, unfortunately, had been so very destructive in the West, and the boroughs had been so largely extinguished, that when they came to consider the necessity of fixing a name from that of some extinguished borough, they found that there were two or three deceased boroughs, or boroughs in the process of dying out; and, consequently, they had two or three boroughs competing for the honour of designating the new division of the county. What was the consequence? So far from everything being harmonious, and so far from everybody being agreed, as the right hon. Gentleman seemed to think, in the new nomenclature, each borough naturally wished to perpetuate its existence, as far as it could, in the nomenclature

of the new division. Each borough was anxious to get its name attached to the division. No doubt the Commissioners carried out their work with the greatest urbanity, and expressed a wish to please all parties. In his county they proposed to give a sort of double name to the division. In the first instance it was proposed by the Commissioners, although the scheme had since been altered—he presumed by the right hon. Baronet—that the division in which he (Mr. Floyer) had the honour to live should be called the Dorchester and Weymouth Division. It would seem that the right hon. Baronet had demurred to that, not wishing to have a long title of that kind. Then, again, with regard to the Wareham Division, it was originally proposed to designate it as the Poole and Wareham Division. What was the consequence? When the Bill came to be examined, they found that in some cases the right hon. Baronet had retained the name of one borough, while that of the other had altogether disappeared. That course had given rise to great dissatisfaction; and the only way in which they could now remedy the grievance was, he humbly submitted, to support cordially the proposition of his right hon. Friend (Mr. Raikes). Certainly, the only way in his own county of dealing with this little difficulty was to adopt the points of the compass. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Devon (Sir Stafford Northcote), whose lead they were happy to follow on that side of the House, had said very truly that they could not have a fixed rule for all counties. But, at all events, in Dorsetshire they were better situated than some other counties in regard to this question. He did not think that the youngest scholar in one of the elementary schools would be at any loss in dividing the county, seeing that there was only one part of it naturally North, another naturally South, a third part naturally East, and a fourth naturally West. The county, therefore, would easily be divided; there was no geographical difficulty whatever; and, under all the circumstances, without losing sight of what his right hon. Friend had so happily put before the Committee, he thought the old traditions of that side of the House—and the traditions of the counties were not the least of England's great traditions — should be preserved. He, therefore, sincerely trusted that the old names of the counties would be preserved; and, although he was afraid that "the knight of the shire" would hardly appear again in that House, still some of the descendants of those who had enjoyed that title might in future years represent divisions of the old county under the old county name, without the county being absorbed in the name of some extinguished borough, however important that borough might be. He therefore cordially supported the proposition of his right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Cambridge; and he hoped that the evident sense of the Committee, which had already been distinctly shown, would induce the President of the Local Government Board to accept the proposal.

Sir HUSSEY VIVIAN said, he had also to thank his right hon. Friend the Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Raikes) for having brought this matter so clearly and forcibly before the Committee. The county of Glamorganshire, which he (Sir Hussey Vivian) represented, could be very easily divided by the four points of the compass, seeing that it lent itself geographically to such a division. He thought he might safely say that there was a general consensus of opinion in that county in favour of the points of the compass being adopted instead of the names now proposed in the Bill, which did not in any way represent the divisions to which they were to be attached. The names were those of very small places, and did not strictly or accurately, in any way, represent the divisions to which they were supposed to be applied; whereas, on the other hand, the points of the compass would strictly and accurately represent those divisions. There was a very strong feeling on the subject in Glamorganshire. They had not the least desire to lose their old name, of which they felt very proud. He had a letter in his pocket from the Chairman of the Quarter Sessions — a gentleman who did not agree with him in politics, but on this point he was very strong—and he said that he was himself decidedly of opinion that they ought to sail under the old flag. He (Sir Hussey Vivian) certainly could not understand why these fancy

names should have been introduced into the Bill contrary to the feeling of the counties. Surely the county feeling ought to prevail in matters of this kind. There was nothing depending on the name in a political sense, and all political Parties were agreed as far as his county was concerned. He therefore trusted that the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would give way in the matter, and that he would not postpone the question until the Report. Why should it be postponed until the Report? He (Sir Hussey Vivian) had already expressed a strong opinion before the Commissioners, and he had received many intimations from persons who belonged to the county that there was a general desire to adopt the points of the compass; whereas, on the other hand, he had not received a single communication in opposition to that plan. Under such circumstances, why should the consideration of the matter be postponed until the Report? Why should they not settle the question now? If they made any mistake they could easily rectify that mistake hereafter. Surely the Committee stage was the proper stage for dealing with a question of this kind. The object of the Report was to enable the House to set right any mistake which might have been made in Committee, or for reconsideration of any point. Under all the circumstances, he trusted—and he would urge it very strongly upon his right hon. Friend the President of the Local Government Board—that he would allow the Committee to adopt, in the case of the counties, geographical designations.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that after the appeal which had been made to him by the hon. Baronet who had just spoken (Sir Hussey Vivian), as well as by the right hon. Baronet the Leader of the Opposition and others, he felt bound to give way. He hoped that hon. Members would help him in bearing the brunt of the disappointed localities. He proposed to adopt the alternative names in certain cases—in such cases, in fact, as were contemplated in the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment.

MR. DODDS said, he was extremely glad that his right hon. Friend in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had yielded to the evident sense of the Committee; but he trusted that no arbitrary rule would be applied to every case, but that each case would be dealt with as it arose upon its own merits. For instance, in his (Mr. Dodd's) own county of Durham, there were three or four special names which might be preferred to the points of the compass. If each case was dealt with as it arose, he thought that no practical difficulty would be found; and, under the circumstances, he was glad to support the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman opposite.

MR. DUCKHAM said, he wished to say a word in support of the Amendment which had been moved by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Raikes). In the county which he represented (Herefordshire) there had been a great deal of correspondence in the county papers respecting the coming Election; but nobody ever dreamt of calling the divisions by the names selected by the Commissioners. The designations "North" and "South" were invariably preferred; and he was satisfied that the Amendment suggested by the right hon. Gentleman would be entirely acceptable in his county.

MR. FREMANTLE said, he was also in favour of the Amendment. There was a strong feeling that the county he represented should be known by geographical names — such as North and South Bucks, rather than as the Buckingham, Aylesbury, and Wycombe Division. That opinion was almost universal. A Memorial of some importance and weight was presented to the Commissioner in favour of that course when he visited the town of Aylesbury; but, of course, the Commissioner was obliged to abide by his instructions. The divisions would go by the names of North, Mid, and South Bucks, whether those were the official names or not. He (Mr. Fremantle) sincerely trusted that the county of Buckingham, as well as others, would have the benefit of the alternative suggested by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University.

SIR HUSSEY VIVIAN said, he wished to guard himself against its being taken as satisfactory by himself and other Members of the House that the points of compass should only be alternative names. Many thought the names originally proposed should be omitted, and that the points of the compass should be adopted *per se*. When

the proper time came he should be ready to move an Amdndment to that effect as far as his own county was concerned.

MR. RAIKES said, he was sure the House was much indebted to the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) for having so speedily caught the evident sense of the Committee. He (Mr. Raikes) wished merely to ask the right hon. Gentleman what course he proposed now to adopt in regard to the Amendments? He (Mr. Raikes) had placed a large number of Amendments on the Paper which the right hon. Gentleman was now good enough to say that he would accept, in the main, very much as they stood. He wished to know if the right hon. Gentleman desired that he (Mr. Raikes) should postpone them for the present, or was he prepared to go into them at once? It appeared to him that it would be the most convenient course to take them as they were arrived at on the Paper.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had already stated that he would accept the principal part of the Amendments; therefore the best course would be to proceed with them at once. He had already proposed to deal with the matter on the Report; but he gathered it to be the evident sense of the Committee that the matter should be dealt with now.

MR. WARTON said, he wished to make a very small suggestion to the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke), who had displayed his usual wisdom in accepting at once the evident sense of the Committee. His suggestion had reference to the mode in which they were to deal with the points of the compass — whether they were to use the terms "North," "South," "East," and "West," or "Northern," "Southern," "Eastern," and "Western." He did not know whether it was necessary to have any Amendment upon that point; but he would like the right hon. Gentleman who had moved the present Amendment (Mr. Raikes) and the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill to consider the matter. All through the Sixth Schedule, wherever they had to deal with the points of the compass, they used the words "North, "South," "East," and "West;" and he wished to know whether the right hon. Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Raikes) and the right hon. Baronet would prefer in regard to the counties the terms "Northern," "Southern," &c.?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, the Amendment, as he understood his right hon. Friend (Mr. Raikes), was as alternative proposal. He (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) quite agreed with the hon. Baronet the Member for Glamorganshire (Sir Hussey Vivian) that there should be no alternative at all, but that the names attached to the divisions should be in accordance with the points of the compass, and that the names of the local towns should be omitted altogether. In that case it would be necessary to leave out the word "or," and he would therefore propose to amend the Amendment by omitting the word "or."

Amendment proposed to said proposed Amendment, to leave out the word "or." —(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'or' stand part of the said proposed Amendment."

MR. RAIKES said, he objected to the proposed alteration. In including the word "or," he had done so because it was necessary to fit his Amendment to the county divisions as proposed by the Bill. He understood there were a great many hon. Members who were prepared to accept the alternative proposal, but who would not go so far as to obliterate altogether the particular names of certain localities inserted by the Government in the Bill. His own view was strongly in favour of the points of the compass, and he was grateful to those hon. Members who had been good enough to come there to support his proposition. But if he were now to go further than the original proposition he had submitted to the Committee he might be accused of a breach of faith. He would, therefore, be glad if his right hon. Friend the Member for East Gloucestershire (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) would be content to leave the Amendment as he (Mr. Raikes) had proposed it, and allow any further matter to remain over for consideration upon the Report.

MR. P. A. MUNTZ said, the Committee were very much indebted to the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Raikes) for having brought the question forward. Although he (Mr. Muntz) had no connection with Biggleswade, he had placed an Amendment on the Paper in reference to the county which he had the

honour to represent. He was, however, quite prepared to accept the right hon. Gentleman's alternative Amendment, although he should not be prepared to accept an additional Amendment which proposed to leave out the alternative, and merely to give the points of the compass. He saw no objection to the suggestion of the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke), that they should take these alternative Amendments now. But he thought there might be a grave objection made in various counties if they were to leave out the designation of the names of towns merely in favour of adopting the points of the compass. The manner in which the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman had been supported by the Committee conclusively proved that the geographical knowledge of hon. Members was not sufficiently extensive to enable them to know the localities in which all the small boroughs whose names were mentioned in the Bill might be situated.

MR. JAMES HOWARD said, he hoped that the alternative proposal would not be disturbed. For instance, in the Southern Division of the county of Bedford there was a very important town and a very important industry associated with that town. He referred to the town of Luton, and he knew that the people of Luton held strongly to the view that the name of their town should not be entirely got rid of. He would, therefore, prefer the alternative proposed by the right hon. Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Raikes).

MR. FLOWER said, he fully concurred with what had fallen from his hon. Friend (Mr. James Howard), and he accepted the alternative proposed by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Raikes) with the same pleasure with which he believed the people of Luton were ready to accept it. He admitted the desirability of attaching the points of the compass to the county divisions; but, at the same time, it would be advantageous to abide by the alternative contained in the Bill, which gave the distinct designation of different localities.

MR. WHITBREAD said, that he also supported the view which had been expressed by his hon. Friend the Member for Bedfordshire (Mr. James Howard). He quite thought that it would give rise to a good deal of disappointment if the alternative name was not adhered to. He supported with pleasure the Amendment which had been made for inserting the points of the compass; but he hoped the other alternative names would also be allowed to stand. In so doing no injustice would be done to anybody.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he really did not wish to put the Committee to the trouble of a division, or to raise any lengthened debate on the subject. After the concession which had already been made by the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) he was quite willing, as far as he was personally concerned, to leave any further matter over until the Report.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that in reference the observations which had fallen from the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) he might state what the principle adopted in the first Reform Bill was in regard to the use of the term "North" or "Northern." In the Act of 1832 the words were "Northern" or "Southern," and so forth; but in the Reform Act of 1867, and in the Boundary Act of 1868, although the counties were divided into North, South, West, and East, the West Riding was divided into the Northern, Southern, and Eastern Divisions. In other cases, such as Lancashire for instance, the divisions were North, North-East, South-East, and South-West.

MR. RAIKES said, they were always in that House in the habit of speaking of hon. Members as, for instance, the hon. Member for North Norfolk, South Norfolk, or West Norfolk; yet he believed that the proper designation in the issue of a Writ was the Northern, Southern, or Western Division. He believed that was the practice created by the Reform Bill of 1832, and it was a practice quite in agreement with grammar, as well as geography; and he, therefore, in moving his Amendments, proposed to adhere to it.

MR. WARTON said, he thought that the words "Northern" and "Southern" were certainly better than "North" and "South." It was not necessary to go back to the first Reform Bill, when in the 6th Schedule of the present Bill they had inserted throughout the words "North" and "South," although, for himself, he preferred "Northern" and "Southern." What he wished to guard

against was the mixing up of the two terms.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE remarked that in the Acts of 1867 and 1868 both terms were used. It was not, however, a matter of any very great importance.

Amendment to said proposed Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Question, "That the words 'Northern or' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to*.

MR. WARTON, in moving as an Amendment, in page 43, line 11, to leave out the word "and," and at the end of line 12 to add the words "in the Sessional Division of Ampthill," said, the paragraph in the Schedule would then provide that the Northern or Biggleswade Division should consist of the Sessional Divisions of Bedford, Biggleswade, and Sharnbrook, the parishes of Ampthill, Claphill, Cranfield, Hawnes, Houghton Conquest, Lidlington, Marston Mortaine, Moulden, and Millbrook, in the Sessional Division of Ampthill, and the municipal borough of Bedford.

Amendment proposed, in page 43, line 11, to leave out the word "and."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'and' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the first of the two Amendments of the hon. and learned Member opposite (Mr. Warton) was undoubtedly right. The second was right to a certain extent; but it was proposed to be inserted in the wrong place. He agreed to the first Amendment.

Question put, and *agreed to;* word *left out* accordingly.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that before the hon. and learned Member moved the next Amendment, he wished to point out that the right place for it was before that in which it was proposed to insert it—namely, in line 11, before the word "parishes." He would propose to amend the Amendment by inserting the words "in the Sessional Division of Ampthill" at the commencement of line 11.

MR. WARTON said, he would accept the proposed Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

In page 43, line 11, before the word "the," to insert the words "in the Sessional Division of Ampthill."—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

On the Motion of MR. RAIKES, the following Amendment made:—In page 43, line 14, after "The," insert "Southern or."

MR. WARTON, in moving, as an Amendment, in page 43, line 16, to insert "and Luton," said, this was a verbal correction rendered necessary by the extraordinary way in which the Bill had been printed. It would appear that the Sessional Divisions were intended to comprise Luton; but that was not perfectly clear owing to the way in which the Bill had been drafted. He would, therefore, move an Amendment to correct the error.

Amendment proposed, in page 43, line 16, after the word "Woburn," to insert the words "and Luton."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he presumed the objection of the hon. and learned Member was to the three columns, instead of two, which appeared in connection with this division.

MR. WARTON replied in the affirmative.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he was not responsible for that; but he was afraid that if they were to attempt to amend the Schedule in that respect they would run the risk of creating some inconvenience. He hoped the hon. and learned Member would accept his apology, and would not press the Amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN said, he understood that it was quite unusual to alter the printing of a Bill, except for the purposes of amending it. The Bill had been committed to the House for the purposes of amendment; and it was not the custom, in amending it, to alter the mode in which it had been printed.

MR. WARTON said, the explanation was quite satisfactory, and he would not press the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

MR. WARTON said, there was another Amendment which was not on the Paper. In the last column were the words—

"So much of the Sessional Division of Ampthill as is not comprised in Division No. 1 as herein described."

He proposed to omit those words in order to insert the names of the different localities from the map. His object in moving the Amendment was to call attention to what seemed to him to be an error in the mode in which the divisions were described.

"So much of the Sessional Division of Ampthill as is not comprised in Division No. 1 as herein described"

was certainly a very clumsy way of avoiding the difficulty that might be involved in giving part of a sessional division in one portion of the Schedule, and the remaining part in another portion. In using the words "so much of a particular Sessional Division" as was not already contained elsewhere, what might happen was this—that after the parishes comprised in one part had been gone through, it was quite possible that some parish or other would find its way into the division of the county in which it was not intended to be placed. He maintained that in regard to both divisions there ought to be an exact statement of the parishes comprised within it. They had already inserted the names of the parishes contained in the Northern Division, and he thought they ought to take a similar course in regard to the Southern Division. He should like to know from the right hon. Baronet if this was the form in which the division was set out by the Boundary Commissioners, and whether they had put down carefully in each case what the districts were? If that were so, and he believed it was, he could not understand why the Bill had not been drafted in the same manner. The only object in putting down

"So much of the Sessional Division of Ampthill as is not comprised in Division No. 1 as herein described"

could have been to save trouble. He thought it was of great importance, in order to prevent mistakes, that this Amendment should be made, because, if it should so happen that some place or other was omitted in a particular division, it was quite possible for it to be placed in a wrong division altogether.

Amendment proposed,

In page 43, line 16, to leave out the words "so much of the Sessional Division of Ampthill as is not comprised in Division No. 1 as herein described."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, this Amendment raised the same question they had discussed upon a former occasion. He could not answer the question of the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Warton) as to the form in which the recommendation was received from the Boundary Commissioners, or whether it had been changed in the drafting of the Bill. As a matter of fact, the boundaries were set out in accordance with the Ordnance Survey. All the Petty Sessional divisions had been gone through and settled before the draftsman drew up the Schedule; but what the actual points were that were agreed to between the Commissioners and the draftsman he was unable to say. He understood, however, that they were quite satisfied with the way in which the Schedules had been drawn up.

MR. WARTON asked if the Schedules were submitted to the Boundary Commissioners after the Bill had been drafted?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the Commissioners told him they were of opinion that the Bill had been properly drawn up.

MR. WARTON said, that under those circumstances he would not press the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. RAIKES moved an Amendment in page 43, line 24, to describe the Abingdon Division as the "Northern or Abingdon Division."

Amendment proposed,

In page 43, line 24, after the word "The," insert the words "Northern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, it was right he should point out to the Committee that the case for the use of the word "Abingdon" was stronger than that in the previous instances, seeing that Abingdon was the name of an extinguished borough.

MR. CREEMER CLARKE said, that the Government had accepted the prin-

ciple of the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman, and he must submit. Had it proposed to leave out all reference to Abingdon he should have been compelled to have opposed the Amendment.

Question put, and *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

MR. RAIKES moved an Amendment in line 1, page 44, to describe the Newbury Division as the "Southern or Newbury Division."

Amendment proposed,

In page 44, line 1, after the word "The," to insert the words "Southern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE asked the right hon. Gentleman whether, in regard to this Amendment, he thought the word "Southern" was better than the word "Mid?"

MR. RAIKES said, that was a question entirely for the consideration of geographers; but, judging from the map, he thought that in this case the most accurate designation was to describe the division as "Southern." He had no objection, however, to call it "Mid," or "Western." Perhaps the most convenient course for the right hon. Gentleman would be to accept it in the form in which the Amendment now stood upon the Paper; and if he subsequently thought proper to vary the description, the alteration might be made on the Report.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he certainly could not call this the "Western Division," because it did not contain the most westerly portion of the county. The most westerly portions were in the Northern Division. In order, however, to save time, he would accept the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman.

Question put, and *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

MR. RAIKES said, he had one more Amendment with regard to the Berkshire Division—namely, in page 44, line 10, to describe the Wokingham Division as the "Eastern or Wokingham Division."

Amendment proposed,

In page 44, line 10, after the word "The," to insert the words "Eastern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

On the Motion of MR. FREMANTLE, the following Amendments made:—In page 44, line 21, after "The," insert "Northern or;" in line 27, after "The," insert "Mid or;" and in line 35, after "The," insert "Southern or."

MR. RAIKES said, that the next Amendment he had to move was one which raised a rather peculiar question. It was not merely an Amendment intended to introduce the points of the compass, but to change absolutely the name which the Commissioners had assigned to a particular division. The Commissioners had divided the county of Cambridge, to which this Amendment related, into three divisions, which they had named respectively the Wisbech Division, the Chesterton Division, and the Newmarket Division. Now, Newmarket was a place of some notoriety; but Wisbech and Chesterton were hardly equally well known. The division which it was proposed to name after the town of Wisbech—he wished no disrespect to Wisbech, for he believed it was a thriving and a rising town—contained a part of England which was famous in English history—namely, the Isle of Ely. The boundaries of the division were not, it was true, absolutely coterminous with the Isle of Ely; but he believed there was an Amendment on the Paper intended to bring them into closer uniformity with that particular district. At all events, the more important part of North Cambridgeshire would be the Isle of Ely; and he had reason to believe, from what he had been able to gather in the county, that there was a very strong feeling in favour of retaining the name of the Isle of Ely. The Commissioners had decided to adopt the name of the Isle of Thanet as a designation of an electoral district; and he could not see why the Isle of Ely, which contained rather more than the population required to form one of the new county constituencies, should not be entitled to retain that name. He did not speak as a Representative of Cambridgeshire, but as one who had considerable opportunity of learning what was the feeling of the people in that county; and he was bound to say he had found a unanimous feeling on the part of everybody connected with the county whom he had

seen in favour of the name of the Isle of Ely being given to this division of Cambridgeshire. He hoped the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would be willing to accept the Amendment as it stood. He was obliged to the right hon. Baronet for the intimation of his willingness to accept the first part of the Amendment—namely, the words "Northern or." He would move the Amendment as it stood on the Paper, and hoped to hear from the right hon. Baronet that he was willing to alter the name of the Wisbech Division to the "Northern or Isle of Ely."

Amendment proposed, in page 45, line 4, after "The," leave out "Wisbech" and insert "Northern or Isle of Ely."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Wisbech' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that perhaps the more convenient course would be for the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Raikes) to move the insertion of the words "Northern or," because by the Amendment, as it now stood, they were really raising two questions.

MR. RAIKES said, he would be happy to accept the suggestion of the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke), and withdraw the Amendment as it stood on the Paper, and confine himself to moving the insertion of the words "Northern or."

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed, in page 45, line 4, after the word "The," to insert the words "Northern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES said, he would now move, after the word "or" to leave out the word "Wisbech," in order to insert the words "Isle of Ely." He did not wish to delay the Committee in coming to a decision upon this question. It was quite true that the division, as proposed by the Commissioners, did not include the Palace or the Cathedral of the Bishops of Ely; but it did include the town of Ely. A very trifling rectification of frontier might enable the division to include also the heart of the City of Ely, in which case they would have the whole of the Isle of Ely included within the limits of the new division. He did not intend to raise the question of the rectification of frontier; it would be better spoken to by his hon. Friends the Members for the county. He could not help thinking, however, that it would be a great pity if they were to miss the opportunity, when they were making these new divisions, of giving to the Northern Division of Cambridgeshire, which consisted in so large a part of the Isle of Ely—which had its own jurisdiction and its own *custos rotulorum*; and which was, to many intents and purposes, a separate county—it was extremely to be desired that this new division should have given to it a local name—a name which was familiar, historical, and respected. As he had previously said, he meant no disrespect to Wisbech; but Wisbech had not hitherto played the same part in the history of England as the Isle of Ely. He presumed the intention of the Government was to give some indication of something with which a Member could be associated; and he imagined that the Representative of the division would much prefer to be known as the Member for the Isle of Ely rather than as the Representative of the Wisbech Division of the county of Cambridgeshire. He therefore begged to move that "Isle of Ely" be substituted for "Wisbech."

Amendment proposed, in page 45, line 4, to leave out the word "Wisbech," in order to insert the words "Isle of Ely,"—(*Mr. Raikes,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'Wisbech' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, his own personal feeling at first was rather with the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Raikes); but he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would put before the Committee the considerations which weighed very strongly with the Boundary Commissioners in this matter. He had had a conversation with one of the Commissioners, from which he was led to take their view—a view which was contrary to that of the right hon. Gentleman. As the right hon. Gentleman had said, the City of Ely itself was not in the Wisbech Division, and therefore the division could hardly be called by the name of the Isle of Ely without making an alteration of the boundaries—

a course which he thought the Committee would hardly like to take. Now, this was not a case which stood by itself. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of the Commissioners having called one of the new constituencies the Isle of Thanet. In that division the whole of the Isle of Thanet was included; but this was a case of a very different kind. The Commissioners felt themselves forced, in order to effect an equalization of the population, to disregard the boundaries of the Isle of Ely. Now, he repeated that this was not a case which stood by itself. There were a great many cases of divisions of counties—statutory divisions of counties—which were sub-divided. There was the case of the Liberty of Peterborough—of the Liberty of Havering-atte-Bower in Essex—of the Liberty of Ripon—and of another Liberty in Yorkshire; and there were cases in Lincolnshire—and there were statutory divisions in the county of Sussex—all these were similar cases to the Isle of Ely. The Commissioners had thought that the disparity of population which would be created if the Isle of Ely were made one division would be greater than the intention of Parliament appeared to authorize. The Isle of Ely would be a division of between 63,000 and 64,000 people; and the other two divisions of the county would have an average population of 40,000. [Mr. BULWER: 44,000 and 42,000.] He had worked out the figures which would result from the Amendment which appeared in the name of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridgeshire (Mr. Hicks), and the distribution would be as follows:—The Isle of Ely would have 63,328 inhabitants, the Western Division would have 42,451 inhabitants, and the Eastern Division would have 38,937 inhabitants — that being a very low population indeed for one division, as compared with the 63,328 for the Isle of Ely. Now, the local feeling upon this subject was by no means so unanimous as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge seemed to imagine. At the local inquiry which was held by the Commissioners a very strong opinion was expressed in favour of the divisions as now proposed, and since that time the opinion had been re-expressed. That being the case, he did not like to accede to the wish of the right hon. Gentleman. He thought that upon the whole they would do well to retain the divisions of the county as proposed by the Commissioners; and if they retained the divisions they must retain also the names fixed upon by the Commissioners.

MR. BULWER said, he differed from the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) in some respects with reference to statistics. He made the population of the Isle of Ely 63,323; of the Western Division, 42,290; and of the Eastern Division, 44,600.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he thought the hon. and learned Member would find that his total for the whole county was wrong; his numbers were certainly not correct for the Isle of Ely, according to the last Census.

MR. BULWER said, that as to the action of the Boundary Commissioners, they, no doubt, felt that the population of the several divisions should be equalized as far as practicable. But the object of the Bill was not to introduce equal electoral districts. In the directions to the Commissioners it was laid down that each division should be laid out, if possible, according to its geographical position, and based on existing areas. The case of the Isle of Ely was unique—there was not another like it in the Kingdom. He had inquired as to what took place before the Commissioners; and he was told that there had only been one person who raised any protest against the suggestion made on behalf of those who were in favour of the retention of the Isle of Ely as a separate division. He (Mr. Bulwer) had had an opportunity of ascertaining the views of those interested in the county; and he found there were a large proportion in favour of the retention of the Isle of Ely. There were others who were indifferent; but he had not met a single person who had raised any objection to the proposal. As to the feeling of the other two divisions, the population within them was, so far as he could ascertain, in favour of the retention of the Isle of Ely as a separate division. The only thing that could be said of the division made by the Boundary Commissioners was that it equalized the population, upon which the right hon. Baronet had laid such great stress. Well, he (Mr. Bulwer) would not trouble the

Committee by going into the different divisions of the whole Kingdom; but he would take, by way of illustration, the two adjoining counties. One, Bedfordshire, was to have two Members, and the population was 129,940 — that was, 64,970 for each Member. That was a larger population than it was proposed to give to the Isle of Ely. The other, Huntingdonshire, was to have two Members for a population of 57,220, or one Member to each 28,610. There was no single division in Cambridgeshire, supposing the population of the Isle of Ely to be taken out, that would have a population anything like so low as 28,610. With regard to the Isle of Ely, he had in his hand two Petitions that had been presented to the House, one from the magistrates, who he believed were unanimous on the subject, and the other—which had only reached him that afternoon — from the inhabitants of the Isle of Ely, with the approval of the Bishop and Canons, who were all interested in the retention of the City of Ely as a portion of the Isle of Ely. Without going very deeply into Parliamentary history, he might say that the Isle of Ely was, for all practical purposes, a distinct county. Ely was formerly a county palatine. As was well known in history, it was the last stronghold in the country that stood out against the invasion of William the Conqueror; it had a special *custos rotulorum* in the person of the Duke of Bedford, who was appointed by the Crown; it had a separate Commission of the Peace and a separate Quarter Sessions, and formerly a Chief Justice; a separate county rate and separate Coroners; and Sheriffs were chosen alternately from Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire, and the Isle of Ely. Physically and geographically, the Isle of Ely was distinct from the county of Cambridge. There were, no doubt, in the Committee hon. Members who had been to Newmarket and knew the distinction between Newmarket Heath and the Fen land of the Isle of Ely. And some might also understand the feelings of the Bishop and clergy of Ely at the prospect of being added to Newmarket. But he would point out to the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) that the magistrates of the county of Cambridge had no jurisdiction in the Isle of Ely, and that the magistrates in the Isle of Ely had no jurisdiction in the county of Cambridge. What, then, would happen under the proposal of the Bill? They were going to divide the Isle of Ely into three portions. To take a simple practical question—who was to appoint the polling places in those portions of the Isle which were to form parts of the Newmarket and Chesterton Divisions? The magistrates of the county of Cambridge would not be able to do it, because they had no jurisdiction in the Isle of Ely; and if the magistrates of the Isle were to do it, they would be acting in a matter which no longer concerned them. In addition to that, he might say that on many important questions there would be likely to be great diversity of opinion between these districts. Take the great question which was before the House in the last Parliament—namely, the drainage question. That which was to the interest of those residing in the uplands, or the Newmarket Division, was diametrically opposed to that which was to the interest of the inhabitants of the Isle of Ely or the Fen country. He thought, therefore, there was a very good case to be made out why "the Isle of Ely" should be retained a sa complete division by itself; and he hoped that, as the right hon. Baronet had stated that, *primâ facie*, he was inclined to agree to the Amendment, the proposal would not be rejected. He (Mr. Bulwer), in this matter, was speaking against his own personal interest—because a great addition would be made to the new constituency which he aspired to represent, and he need not point out to the Committee what that would entail.

MR. HICKS said, he wished to say a word or two upon the Amendment really before the Committee, the attention of hon. Members having been lately directed to that which was practically the second Amendment, which was of a different character. The question was simply as to a name, and he would submit that as the division or district named in the Bill was entirely the Isle of Ely, and as he knew, from his own communication with the inhabitants of the place, that they wished that name to be kept up, he thought there should be no difficulty whatever in accepting the Amendment of his right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Cam-

[*Twelfth Night.*]

bridge (Mr. Raikes) to leave out the name "Wisbech" in favour of "the Isle of Ely." The acceptance of that Amendment would not, he thought, in any way prejudice an Amendment of a very different character which stood on the Paper in his (Mr. Hicks's) own name. If the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would accept the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge, he (Mr. Hicks) could assure him that he would not look upon it as in any way strengthening his position. He certainly thought that, taking into consideration the historical value of the name "the Isle of Ely," it would be merely an act of grace on the part of the Committee to retain it as the name of a division.

Mr. WARTON said, he thought that even the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Charles W. Dilke) must be very much impressed by the number of reasons—solid and substantial reasons—adduced by the hon. and learned Member for Cambridgeshire (Mr. Bulwer) in support of the retention of the old name of "the Isle of Ely." He (Mr. Warton) was not going to repeat those arguments, because he was sure they could not be better expressed than they had already been by the hon. and learned Member; but he wished to call the attention of the right hon. Baronet to what appeared to him to be an inconsistency, if he might say so, on his part in fighting as he had done a short time ago—though, at last, he gracefully gave way—for the retention in the county of Bedford of such a name as Biggleswade. The attention of the Committee should be drawn to the fact that the Biggleswade area did not represent more than a fourth part of the county division, and yet it was proposed that that place should give its name to the division. Wisbech would really be composed for the greater part of the Isle of Ely; therefore, when the right hon. Gentleman had fought for the retention of the name of Biggleswade, it was straining at a gnat and swallowing the camel.

Mr. PELL said, that a great many reasons had been advanced by his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Bulwer) for making this change in the name of the division; but, amongst other reasons, there was one which the hon. and learned Member omitted to mention—namely, that the Isle of Ely had been represented in Parliament in 1654, when it sent two Members to that House as a separate county division. He did not know whether that would have any weight in the right hon. Gentleman's (Sir Charles W. Dilke's) mind; but he thought it ought to have. Beyond that, there had been arguments advanced by Members of the county which were very substantial ones. He himself had some knowledge of the district, and was aware of the fact that there was a very strong feeling—not a political one, but, nevertheless, a strong feeling—in favour of making the Isle of Ely a distinct electoral division. He was quite aware of the difficulty of acceding to that request from the point of view of numbers; but he believed that the statistics that had been laid before the Committee had been over-stated. What would constitute the new Isle of Ely? He had worked the figures out very carefully; and, supposing the Amendment were accepted, the result he had arrived at was that there would be 62,540 in the Isle of Ely, whilst one division of the county would have 43,222, and the other 39,900, or not above 3,000 one way or the other. The character of that part of the county was so marked that he had thought this proposal would have had more influence than it seemed to have had on the mind of the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill. The limits of it were extremely well defined, both by the river and other boundaries; whereas the district of Newmarket was extremely irregular, taking in three parishes of Ely, and running up into a point. The proposal of the Boundary Commissioners and of the Government really had regard to population alone. He was satisfied that that proposal had been made in ignorance of the real state of things that existed in the district in question; and he hoped, therefore, that having heard the arguments, the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider his decision upon the point.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he felt bound to point out to his hon. Friends that there was another principle to sustain in the discussion of these matters—one which he thought they ought to pay great attention to. The question was not only as to the position of the county of Cambridge, but as to how far they were to maintain or depart

from the decision of the Boundary Commissioners. That, he must represent to his hon. Friends, was a very important point. The whole of their scheme rested very much upon this—that having established the principles upon which the divisions were to be made, it was necessary to leave the mode in which the divisions were to be fixed to the gentlemen, appointed from their known capacity and impartiality, to go down into the localities as Commissioners, and devise a proper scheme of distribution. So far as the evidence before the Committee went it showed that these gentlemen had in all cases exhibited great fairness and anxiety to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. Of course, they might have been wrong in certain cases. There might be cases in which it was desirable that they should reconsider their decision; but he thought the Committee ought to be very slow indeed to make alterations, and to have a very strong case before they departed from the decision at which the Commissioners had arrived. If they once let go that stronghold, if they once went back upon that arrangement, they might find themselves in a very awkward position in regard to other cases that might be brought before them in the future. As a matter of name, they would, of course, all regret very much that so famous a name as the Isle of Ely should be passed over, and it might be well worthy of conderation whether that name might not be retained without altering the boundaries of the division as fixed by the Commissioners. He would ask the Committee, in the first instance, to decide the question of the boundary. On the whole, he thought it would be better for the Amendment to be withdrawn for the present, and leave the question of the name of the new division to be settled on Report.

MR. HICKS said, the Amendment before the Committee was simply as to the question of name, and the few remarks he had ventured to trouble the Committee with had been confined entirely to that question. It was perfectly distinct from the other matter, and if it were the pleasure of the Committee and of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Raikes) that the proposal should be withdrawn for a time, and the other Amendment standing in his (Mr. Hicks') name proceeded with, he should be prepared to bring forward the more serious Amendment which he had placed on the Paper.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that with regard to the name he must point out to the Committee that a very serious difficulty would arise. As the Commissioners had divided the county, the city of Ely, which was the most ancient part of the division of the Isle of Ely, would not be in the district which would take the name of the Isle. Therefore, there could not be very much force in the argument as to the name.

MR. RAIKES said, there seemed to be some misapprehension as to the Amendment which was really before them. As had been pointed out, the Amendment had nothing to do with boundaries except incidentally; it had entirely to do with the question of the name. He felt, however, there was some inconvenience in discussing the question of name before they had decided the question of boundary; and he, therefore, thought it would be a more convenient course if the Committee would allow him to withdraw the Amendment, and so enable the question of boundaries to be taken up. If that question should be settled so as to create a district more clearly coinciding with the ancient boundaries of the Isle of Ely, the question of name could be brought on at a more convenient time.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. HICKS said, he now begged to move the Amendment which stood in his name. As the Bill was drawn, certain parts of the Isle of Ely were taken away and added to the Western Division, and other parts were taken away and added to the Newmarket Division. The Amendment he proposed was simply to retain these places in the Isle of Ely, and constitute the Isle an independent division of the county. There were one or two misprints in the Amendment, but he thought they would be easily corrected. The Isle of Ely had been an independent district for centuries, and it had great historical associations connected with it, and it was not right, at the mere caprice of three Commissioners, that it should be cut into pieces. Surely, the Committee was free to entertain a question of this kind, affecting, as it did, the feelings of a large number of electors, without being tiedwithin the four

corners of a rule of proportion. At an earlier part of the Sitting, he (Mr. Hicks) had had the honour to present a Petition from Ely, praying that the division might be kept as a distinct one. As had been remarked by his hon. and learned Colleague (Mr. Bulwer), the Isle of Ely had for centuries had an independent jurisdiction. It had not only had a separate *custos rotulorum* and magistrates, but even a Judge of its own. Prisoners of the Isle of Ely were tried by the Chief Justice of the Isle of Ely, and not by the ordinary Judges. That had continued until the year 1836; but to this day the place retained its own magistrates and coroner. It was, to all intents and purposes, a distinct county; and, to a very great extent, its interests were different to those of the rest of Cambridge. It was true that there were parts of the county which were under different drainage rates. He trusted the Committee would consider this matter seriously, and would not, for the simple object of making the numbers of the inhabitants in the three districts as equal as possible, go counter to the feelings of the mass of the population. Allusion had been made to the operations of the Commissioners generally, and to the satisfaction which their work had given, not only in this district, but all over Cambridgeshire. Well, there was no objection to the decision of the Commissioners on any political ground whatever. If the county was to be divided in regard to population, he did not know a better way of effecting the object; but the question was whether it should be divided accordig to population, seeing that in order to do that it would involve the sacrifices that had been described. The Prime Minister had spoken of the unity of municipal life. Surely, the right hon. Baronet would also respect the unity of county life; and he trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would be able to accede to the reasonable prayer of the inhabitants of the whole of the Isle of Ely.

Amendment proposed,

In page 45, line 8, at end, to insert the words "and the parishes of Granby Fen, Haddenham, Mepal, Stretham, Sutton, Wentworth, Wilburton, Wilcham, Wilchford, Ely College, Ely Holy Trinity, and Ely Saint Mary."—(*Mr. Hicks.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Hicks

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had nothing to add to what he had said before in regard to the argument which had been placed before the Committee by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition. He had then very frankly admitted to the Committee that if he had had to divide the county he might not, perhaps, have adopted the same plan. But the Boundary Commissioners had the question brought before them in various memorials, and they came to the conclusion that the proposal was not one which they could accept. In this, as in other cases, he felt bound to adhere to the decision of the Commissioners. He himself was quite willing, at the recommendation of the Boundary Commissioners, to introduce changes where they were generally assented to; but he knew that the change, in this instance, did not receive general assent in the county of Cambridge. Although the majority were in favour of the alteration proposed in the Amendment moved by the hon. Member (Mr. Hicks), there was a large minority who did not take that view; and, that being so, he felt bound to adhere to the decision of the Commissioners. Another objection to the Amendment was that the population of the Isle of Ely, by itself, was about 63,000, which would be above the limit settled by the Commissioners; and the population of the division, as it was set forth in the Bill, was only 40,000. There was, consequently, a very great disparity in the figures.

Mr. BULWER said, he did not think the right hon. Baronet would find a single case, throughout the whole of the United Kingdom, which was on all fours with that of the Isle of Ely; and as to the great disproportion in the population pointed out by the right hon. Gentleman, there was a greater disparity in the case of the divisions in Bedfordshire, where the population of one of the divisions was much larger than that of the Isle of Ely, if the proposal of his hon. Friend (Mr. Hicks) were accepted. He had heard no answer to one difficulty which had been raised, and which he considered to be a very serious one—namely, that all the arrangements for elections must be carried out by the county authorities and magistrates in Quarter Sessions; and the magistrates of the county of Cambridge

had no jurisdiction in the Isle of Ely any more than those of the Isle of Ely had in Cambridgshire.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE remarked that the Bill would not increase that difficulty.

MR. BULWER said, that it would increase it, because the right hon. Gentleman must be aware that the register of voters for the Isle of Ely, although each elector voted at present for the three Members for Cambridgeshire, was a distinct register, compiled by a different set of officers, and sanctioned by a different tribunal—the magistrates of the Isle of Ely sanctioned one list of voters, and the magistrates of the county of Cambridge another. There would, therefore, be a confusion of jurisdiction, which he did not think they would be able to get over without the passing of a special clause. He was quite ready to admit that if the object was simply to treat the Isle of Ely and the county of Cambridge as one county, the numbers and proportion of the divisions proposed by the Bill would be perfectly fair. He would, however, call the attention of the right hon. Baronet the Member for North Devon (Sir Stafford Northcote) to the fact that although this was to be one of the considerations, it was, nevertheless, subject to this important rule—that the division was to be as compact as possible, and based upon well-known areas, such as Petty Sessional Divisions, Poor Law Unions, and parishes. In some instances it had been found necessary to extend a boundary; but it was laid down as essential that the additional boundary should never be allowed to intersect a parish. In this case, as a matter of fact, they were not intersecting a parish, but were destroying a county; and all the traditions of public life which had hitherto prevailed in the Isle of Ely would be blotted out. Under these circumstances, he hoped the Government would still be able to see their way to accede to the proposal contained in the Amendment.

MR. PELL said, he wished to point out another matter which he thought the right hon. Baronet ought to consider in reference to the question of population. The parishes which had been quoted in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cambridgeshire (Mr. Hicks), Wilchford, &c., were declining in a very remarkable manner. Upon looking at the Census Returns of 1881, he found that not only had the population of these particular parishes declined, but that there had been a decrease of nearly 1,000 in the population of the Isle of Ely between 1880 and 1881. If the decrease was to go on at the same rate for the next 15 years or more, the number would be reduced to that which the Boundary Commissioners appeared to think it was desirable to fix as the limit.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 26; Noes 96: Majority 70.—(Div. List, No. 96.)

MR. RAIKES said, the next Amendment stood upon the Paper in his name, and it was a proposal, in line 9, page 45, to leave out the word "Chesterton," in order that the division might simply be described as the "Western" Division of the county of Cambridge. But after what had already passed, he thought he would best consult the views of the Committee if he ventured to move the Amendment in the same terms as previous Amendments. He would therefore retain the word "Chesterton," and insert the words "Western or," which would describe the division as the "Western or Chesterton Division."

Amendment proposed, in page 45, line 9, after the word "The," insert "Western or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had no objection to the Amendment.

Question put, and *agreed to*; words *inserted* accordingly.

MR. RAIKES said, his concluding Amendment with regard to the county of Cambridge was in the same way to retain the word "Newmarket," and to insert the words "Eastern or," by which means the division would become "the Eastern or Newmarket Division."

Amendment proposed, in page 45, line 15, after the word "The," insert "Eastern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to*; words *inserted* accordingly.

MR. BULWER said, he wished to call the attention of the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill to the fact

that the parish of Thetford, with a population of 242, was altogether omitted from any of the divisions.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE intimated that if the hon. and learned Member would put him in possession of the facts, he would refer them to the draftsman of the Bill.

MR. RAIKES said, the Committee had now arrived at the county of Carmarthen, in regard to which he had proposed to amend Division No. 1, by omitting "Llandeilo," and describing the division as the "Eastern Division." Perhaps it might be found convenient, in the case of Welsh divisions which did not contain any considerable town which was not already included in a group of boroughs, to have simply the points of the compass attached to them in order to distinguish one division from another; but following the same rule which had been adopted in the case of the English counties, he proposed to retain the word "Llandeilo," and to prefix to it the words "Eastern or," which would describe it as the "Eastern or Llandeilo" division.

Amendment proposed, in page 45, line 22, after "The," insert "Eastern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. WARTON said, he was sorry to hear the decision which his right hon. Friend (Mr. Raikes) had arrived at, because it seemed to him (Mr. Warton) to have too much the appearance of postponing a good many of these questions to the Report. When the Report was brought on, it would be found that there were many important questions to attend to; the Government would be anxious to push on with the Bill, and everything would be hurriedly disposed of in order to arrive at other important matters which had nothing to do with redistribution at all. He was therefore sorry that, in the case of the Welsh counties, his right hon. Friend proposed to give an alternative name, and had not moved at once to strike out all the local names.

MR. RAIKES said, he quite felt the force of what his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Warton) said; but he did not think it was a matter of sufficient importance to sacrifice the time of the Committee in discussing it.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he thought the right hon. Gentleman was acting wisely in taking this course. In the case of Llandeilo, it was something more than a small village. It had the rank of a county town, and was, in addition, a large Poor Law Union and a Petty Sessional Division.

MR. WARTON said, that in regard to the argument which had just been made use of by the right hon. Baronet, it was quite true that Llandeilo was part of a Petty Sessional division; but there was only one part of that division in this county. Llandovery also constituted part of the St. Clears Division, and the only Petty Sessional division which appeared to be completely within this division was that of Llanelly, which the hon. Member for Carmarthen (Sir John Jenkins) proposed, in an Amendment to be moved later on, to substitute for that of Llandeilo. He could not help thinking that the Committee were asked to shirk the matter altogether; and he would like to know from the Chairman, whether, as a question of Order, if the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman were adopted, and the words "Eastern or" were inserted, the Committee would be bound by the word "or," or whether it would be competent for him (Mr. Warton) to move the omission of the words "or Llandeilo?"

THE CHAIRMAN: If the Committee decide to insert the words "Eastern or" in the Schedule, it would not be competent for the hon. and learned Member to move the omission of the word "or" for the purpose of moving another Amendment.

Question put, and *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

MR. RAIKES moved, in the 2nd division of the county of Carmarthen, an Amendment to alter the name of the St. Clears Division to "the Western or St. Clears Division."

Amendment proposed, in page 45, line 29, after "The," insert "Western or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. GREGORY hoped the Government would consider the full effect of all these alternative names. By inserting the words "Western or," or some

other name, they must materially affect the register. Every voter would have to be registered in this instance in an alternative way—namely, for "the Western" or "the St. Clears Division."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE remarked that his hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Gregory) had now made precisely the same speech which he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had made at the beginning of the evening. He found, however, that the sense of the Committee was against him, and therefore he had accepted the position.

Question put, and *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

MR. JONES-PARRY moved, as an Amendment, to change the name of the Eivion Division of Carnarvonshire to that of "South Carnarvonshire." The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Raikes) appeared to have placed a similar Amendment upon the Paper; but each had acted without the knowledge of the other. His proposal was, in page 46, line 4, to leave out "Eivion," and insert "South Carnarvonshire;" and if that Amendment were accepted, he proposed, in line 11, to omit "Arvon," and substitute "North Carnarvonshire." The reason why he desired to make this alteration was simply that these two names—Eivion and Arvon—were misleading, and really did not geographically represent the districts which from time immemorial had been called so in the county of Carnarvon. On the contrary, Eivion would include another district larger than itself, called Lleyn, and more than one-half of the northern district which it was proposed to call "Arvon" had nothing to do with Arvon. He might add that when the Boundary Commissioner, Major Tulloch, held a local inquiry at Carnarvon, a number of representatives of all shades of politics, and from all all parts of the county, north and south, attended, and a wish was unanimously expressed that the two divisions should be called North and South Carnarvonshire. The Commissioner said that, according to his instructions, he was not able to give effect to that wish, but that he would make a note of it. The two names proposed to be given by the Bill were not only misleading, but clumsy names; and, although they might sound somewhat singular and romantic, they were not easily pronounceable by strangers. He trusted that the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill would accede to the wishes of the inhabitants, who had unanimously expressed their feeling through the delegates they had sent to the Carnarvon meeting, to which feeling Major Tulloch, the Commissioner, saw no objection whatever. The Commissioner simply said that he was bound by his Instructions to accept nothing except territorial designations.

Amendment proposed,

In page 46, line 4, to leave out the word "Eivion," in order to insert the words "South Carnarvonshire,"—(*Mr. Jones-Parry,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'Eivion' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had no objection to the alternative names being given to the divisions of Carnarvonshire.

MR. JONES-PARRY said, he was willing to accept the alternative names.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he did not think there was a greater instance in the Bill of the absurdity of the names given to divisions. These names Eivion, and Arvon, did not correctly represent the districts they purported to represent. They had only an archæological significance, and conveyed no idea to the minds of anybody out of Wales. He should have thought that the Committee would have seen their way to accept the Amendment outright.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he did not wish to adhere to the proposal in the Bill too hardly. If the Committee generally, and the local Members in particular, were agreed upon the advisibility of the Amendment, he would raise no objection.

Question put, and *agreed to;* words *substituted* accordingly.

On the Motion of MR. RAIKES, the following Amendment made:—In page 46, line 11, after "The," leave out "Arvon," and insert "Northern."

MR. WARTON said, that before they came to the county of Cheshire, he begged to move an Amendment in line 14 of page 46. The Amendment was one exactly similar to that which the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) accepted in the case of the county of Bedford, for it had reference to cer-

tain parishes and sessional divisions. He desired to leave out the word "parishes," and insert "sessional divisions of Carnarvon."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would suggest that the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Warton) should bring up his Amendment on Report. Before accepting it, he would like to look into it. By accepting Amendments hastily, mistakes were sometimes introduced.

MR. WARTON said, that a similar Amendment, having reference to Bedfordshire, had been accepted. No great exercise of mind was required to conceive the importance of the point raised by the Amendment. As the Amendment had been accepted in the case of county of Bedford, there was no reason why it should not be accepted here. The right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would find that in the case of Bedfordshire he (Mr. Warton) proposed to insert the words "sessional division of Ampthill."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE thought the hon. and learned Member was right.

MR. WARTON: I am right.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he fancied the hon. and learned Member was right. One, of course, got rather confused with the many Amendments which were proposed. [MR. WARTON: No, no!] He did not mean that the hon. and learned Gentleman got confused, but that he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) sometimes did. If the hon. and learned Gentleman did not mind, he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would prefer to have it put down for the Report, so that he might consider the matter carefully.

MR. WARTON said, he was willing to attend to the suggestion of the right hon. Baronet.

MR. RAIKES said, that they now came to the consideration of the Bill as it related to the county of Cheshire, and the first Amendment he had now to propose was to change the name of one of the eight divisions into which Cheshire was divided. He had tried very hard to divide Cheshire according to the points of the compass, but he confessed he had failed to do so. He could not find a satisfactory redistribution of Cheshire, according to the Commissioners' scheme, in accordance with the points of the compass; and, therefore, he had not proposed the adoption of any of the points of the compass with regard to any of the divisions of that county. But, as he happened to know something of the county, and something of the particular district to which his Amendment referred, he ventured to put his proposition upon the Paper. The county of Cheshire had, as hon. Members generally might be aware, a speciality in the shape of salt manufacture. The River Weaver was the main artery of the county by which the salt trade was carried on, and which conveyed the manufactured salt down to the Mersey, and so abroad. The division contained two towns of secondary importance — namely, Northwich and Runcorn. Northwich was a manufacturing centre, and Runcorn was a port. There was a certain amount of jealousy between the two towns. In a small way, they were like Manchester and Liverpool, and had their grievances against each other, and it was almost impossible to put forward either of them as the head of the district without causing considerable heartburning. It appeared to him that by giving to the district the name of Weaver, they would be giving to it the name of that which was the main highway of its commerce, and they would be following the example of the great county of Kent, in which there was a Medway Division, named after the River Medway. If this division were named Northwich, there would be a certain risk of confounding it with Norwich. He could not help thinking that the name of Weaver was certainly a better name for the district than the name which was proposed by the Commissioners; but he was quite content to leave the matter in the hands of the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke), who, he thought, was quite able to appreciate the consideration which he (Mr. Raikes) had ventured to put forward. He begged to move the Amendment which stood in his name.

Amendment proposed, in page 47, line 10, after "The," leave out the word "Northwich," and insert the word "Weaver."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Northwich' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he feared he could not agree to the suggestion the right hon. Gentleman (Mr.

Raikes) had made. If the right hon. Gentleman left the matter to him, as he very kindly suggested, he would feel himself obliged to return a negative answer. The Commissioners were of opinion that the adoption of the name Weaver would be unpopular in the district. The town of Northwich was the centre of the salt industry, and there appeared to be a pretty general feeling in the division that the name of the central town should be given to the division. The town of Northwich had between 12,000 and 13,000 inhabitants, so it was itself a considerable place.

MR. RAIKES: Runcorn has far more inhabitants.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that Runcorn, no doubt, was the port of the salt industry. The understanding arrived at, at the local inquiry, was decidedly in favour of Northwich, and there was a sort of general feeling in favour of that name. He had every reason to suppose that the proposed change would be generally unpopular.

MR. RAIKES said, that after what the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had said, he begged to ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

MR. H. TOLLEMACHE said, that perhaps he knew a great deal more about the neighbourhood covered by the Amendment than either of the right hon. Gentlemen who had just spoken. The adoption of the Amendment would be extremely unpopular. He had communicated with the Chairmen of the Local Boards of the three principal towns—Northwich, Winsford, and Middlewich—and they all told him that the proposed Amendment would be most objectionable and very unpopular indeed. Besides, the River Weaver ran through no less than three districts in Cheshire; therefore, they might as well call the Eddisbury district, which he hoped to have the honour of contesting at the next General Election, the Weaver Division. He thought it necessary also to point out that the town of Runcorn had nothing whatever to do with the shipping of salt. Runcorn—unless the scheme with which the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Raikes) was connected—namely, the Runcorne Brine scheme, succeeded—would have nothing whatever in the future to do with the salt trade of the district.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS said, that perhaps he knew as much of Northwich as anybody in the House, for he had lived close to it for a very long time. He entirely agreed with what had fallen from his hon. Friend the Member for West Cheshire (Mr. H. Tollemache), and he wondered that his right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Raikes), who had taken so much pains about this Bill, did not use the really only strong argument he could have said in favour of his Amendment—namely, that the town of Northwich was so rapidly sinking, owing to the salt manufacture carried on, that it would very shortly altogether disappear.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

MR. COURTNEY said, he had now to move the first of a series of Amendments, intended to apply the principle introduced by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Raikes), to the county of Cornwall. He (Mr. Courtney) thought that the names he had to propose for the new divisions of Cornwall were suitable, and that they would commend themselves to the Committee at large. He thought, also, that they would be found to be supported by the Representatives of Cornwall in the House. His first Amendment was to insert, on page 48, line 17, after the word "The," "Western or," so that the line would then read "The Western or St. Ives Division." Perhaps he might be allowed to mention the names he proposed to give to the other divisions of the county, in order that the Committee might see the scheme as a whole. He proposed to call No. 2 Division, on line 21, "The North-Western or Camborne Division." That division ran along the coast of Cornwall, and was quite correctly described as the North-Western Division. No. 3 Division, on line 25, he proposed to call "the Southern or Truro Division." That division included the Lizard and the more southerly part of the county. Then, he proposed to call No. 4 Division, on line 33, "the Mid or St. Austell Division." That division ran right across the county, and divided it nearly in half. The 5th Division, on line 37, he proposed to call "the South-Eastern or Bodmin Division." That division was correctly de-

scribed as regarded the points of the compass. And the 6th Division he proposed to call "the North-Eastern or Launceston Division" — a description which was perfectly correct. The alterations commended themselves to the minds of the Members for the county, and he thought they were acceptable to the people of the county generally. He apprehended there would be no difficulty in the acceptance of them, and he therefore begged to move to insert, on line 17, after "The," "Western or."

Amendment proposed, in page 48, line 17, after "The," to insert the words "Western or."—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had no objection to the first Amendment, though he could conceive some objection to the second and third Amendments.

Question put, and *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

MR. COURTNEY said, that, as a matter of Order, he desired to point out that his hon. Friend (Mr. Borlase) proposed to make a considerable alteration in the No. 2 Division of the county of Cornwall, and the hon. Gentleman proposed to describe the division as the Helston Division. Perhaps it would be well that his hon. Friend should propose to insert the word "Helston," so that the whole question might be raised.

MR. BORLASE said, he would propose to substitute the word "Helston" for "Camborne." Perhaps it was well, however, that the position of matters should be made clear. He understood that, in moving that the word "Helston" be there inserted, he was only following out what it would be necessary to do in order that his hon. Friend's (Mr. Courtney's) Amendment might be taken. His (Mr. Borlase's) Amendment was of an altogether different kind to that they had just adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN said, he understood the hon. Gentleman was about to move that the word "Helston" be inserted instead of "Camborne."

MR. COURTNEY asked if he might be allowed to explain the position of matters? His hon. Friend (Mr. Borlase) proposed to alter No. 2 Division, by calling it the Helston Division, instead of the Camborne Division, and then he proposed to make some subsequent change in the division. He (Mr. Courtney) proposed to alter No. 2 Division, by inserting, after the word "the," "North-Western or." Of course, if "North-Western or" be inserted, the Amendment would not agree with the alteration his hon. Friend (Mr. Borlase) proposed to make. It would, therefore, be most convenient, as a mere technical form, that his hon. Friend should move to insert "Helston" simply. If that word be rejected, he (Mr. Courtney) would then be able to move his Amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. Member adopt the suggestion?

MR. BORLASE said, that the Amendment which he had the honour to move was, as he had just stated, different in character from the ones they had just been considering. It was one which affected the county as a whole, and that more than in a name. He wished at once to state what the effect of the Amendment would be. Its effect would be, not to define any new boundaries, but simply to return to those boundaries which were represented by the original scheme of the Commissioners. Now, the reasons for doing that were three. The first one was, "because"—to quote the words of the Instructions to the Commissioners — "the alteration produced in one of the two districts"—namely, the Helston and Truro one—"grave inconvenience, and involved boundaries of a very irregular and objectionable kind." The second reason was, that the notion of forming a so-called mining constituency, whose Member should be the Representative of mining in the whole of Cornwall and Devon, would be in distinct opposition to the best interests of that industry, and would be contrary also to the wishes of the mining population both within and without the proposed district. The third reason was, that the evidence produced before the Commissioners at Bodmin was unauthorized by those who were most deeply interested in the subject, and was in itself inadequate. Now, in the first place, he would consider the matter from a geographical point of view. Cornwall was a county which, considered as a geographical whole, presented a very striking contrast to its inhabitants in the ruggedness of its exterior and physical characteristics. So extremely irregular was the

natural outline of the county of Cornwall, that it was to be supposed that the Commissioners, when they came to deal with any artificial system of internal boundaries, would have endeavoured to make those boundaries as regular, as simple, and as comprehensive as they could possibly be. The original scheme which was submitted by the Commissioners was as regular, simple, and comprehensive as it could possibly be; but it was altered after evidence had been taken before one of the Commissioners, Mr. Pelham, who sat at Bodmin. Now, he (Mr. Borlase) was afraid that, for a moment, he must weary the Committee by saying something about what the size of these respective districts was, in order to contrast the old scheme with the one which had now been proposed. The size of the proposed Helston District, in the original scheme, by which the town of Camborne was joined to the town of Helston, was 15 miles from east to west, and 23 miles from north to south. The size of the Truro Division, in the same scheme, would be 15 miles from east to west, and 14 miles from north to south. Now, the towns, as grouped under it, were completely accessible by railway. Redruth and Truro were already joined by railway, and, as his hon. Friend the Member for Helston (Mr. St. Aubyn) knew very well, there was already a scheme, which had progressed some way, and which, no doubt, would be carried out, for connecting by rail the towns of Helston and Camborne. Redruth and Truro were eminently fitted to be joined together, since they had many interests in common, as anyone who travelled by rail between the two places could see, particularly on market days, and when there was any mining interest or market business to be attended to. He did not wish to enter into any political matter, but he might remark that the divisions, as they were originally proposed by the Commissioners, were eminently fair from that point of view. The Helston District, at the present moment, returned a Conservative Member to the House. Helston was the centre of a large Conservative district. The Camborne District was Liberal. The city of Truro, on the other hand, returned his hon. and gallant Friend (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg), who was a Conservative, and that city was to be joined to the Liberal town of Redruth; so that politically everything might be said to be just and proper. Now, he asked them to contrast these divisions as they were first of all proposed with what the Commissioners had since caused to be done. In the present scheme, the Camborne District was to be a very small district indeed; it was to be 13 miles by 10 miles, and was to contain nine parishes. The object of making this little district was that there should be a mining division; but out of the nine parishes, three were purely agricultural. Now he came to the question of this mining district, which had been formed in order to give the miners what was supposed to be an inestimable blessing, but one which, in reality, they themselves did not want. The part of the county on both sides of Truro had absolutely been cut into ribbons in order to attain this result. The new constituency of Truro, instead of containing nine parishes, was to contain 35. It was to be 31 miles long; in the centre it was only to be two miles wide, expanding to 10 miles wide on the north, and 12 miles wide on the south. It was like a wasp in shape, or figure of 8, with a small and narrow connecting centre and two broad ends. From an electioneering point of view the constituency would be unworkable, for the reason that the ends were almost inaccessible to each other, having no railway communication. The two parts were utterly unknown to each other, and were cut in two by a creek. A candidate starting from Truro, to go over the district westward, would have to proceed down the line 21 miles into a totally different division, and then drive eight or nine miles. Similar difficulty would have to be encountered in order to get to some of the eastern parts of the division. From Truro, a candidate would have to go 10 miles by rail into the borough of Penryn, and to drive 18 or 20 miles. Again, the arrangement would be unfair to the agricultural parishes of Gwythian, Gwinear, and Phillack, in the mining division, whose inhabitants had recently held a meeting at Hayle, and unanimously passed a resolution which they had transmitted to him, saying that if their Member was to be supposed to devote his attention entirely to mining, they would be utterly unrepresented. It would be unfair to the parish of St. Agnes, which

had everything in common with Truro, and whose overseers had sent him a Petition against it from their Vestry, on the ground that they had always been identified with Truro, which Petition he had, unfortunately, not been able to present, owing to a technical flaw in it, but which conveyed their meaning none the less for that. He came now to the second reason — namely, the mining reason. It was said that the arrangement had been effected in order to create a mining division, and because the miners wished it themselves. He denied that the miners wished it. On the contrary, they were utterly opposed to it. Why was it that they did not wish it? Why, because mining, being co-extensive with the boundaries of the Stannaries, extended all over Cornwall and into Devonshire, as everyone should know, and as certainly the Boundary Commissioners ought to have known. The Western mining interests of England had hitherto been represented by 15 Members. Every one of the Members for Cornwall had considered himself, and had been considered by his constituents, a Representative of mining, and not only had that been the case with the 13 Cornish Members, but the two Members for Devon within the Stannaries had also been Representatives of mining. And there was another reason why no small division could ever be made a mining centre in Cornwall, and that was because there was no industry in England so fluctuating as Cornish mining. At one time one place was the centre, and at another time another. There were at least six districts of Cornwall in which copper and tin mining was pursued, and each of which had at one time been the mining centre. Evidence had been given before the Boundary Commissioners sitting at Bodmin by a gentleman named Chilcott in favour of the adoption of this mining district, which was, indeed, his (Mr. Chilcott's) own conception. This gentleman had advocated the adoption of this place as the mining centre, because, he said, it had been such for centuries. Would Mr. Chilcott be surprised to hear that a quarter of a century ago, a local landowner, who had left behind her an honoured name (Lady Basset), maintained the principal mines of the district in question at her own expense? Would he be surprised to hear that 10 years ago, this particular district was not the centre of Cornish mining, and that, in all probability, 10 years to come, it would not be? There were at present in Cornwall and Devonshire—or, rather, there were at the end of 1883, for, unfortunately, the statistics for last year had not been published—103 tin mines at work, within the limits of the Stannaries, of which 62 were out of the proposed district, whilst only 41 were in it. In 1883 there were raised out of that district nearly 4,000 tons of tin—namely, 3,667 tons—valued at £192,000. Were the interests of all the miners employed in these works to be represented by one who lived at a distance, in some cases, of 60 or more miles from them? As to copper mining, he was sorry to say there was very little of that now; but in 1855 the copper raised out of the district was of the value of £559,000. Last year the amount raised was, in one district, of the value of £59,546, and in another, £26,940. If that was the case, it might well be asked what induced the Commissioners to come to the decision they did arrive at? It was because of the evidence taken at Bodmin. The evidence in favour of this mining constituency was given by two gentlemen, one of whom had no connection with mining whatever, and the other of whom lived far out of the district, and had nothing to do with it—who, in fact, lived down in the St. Ives district. Mr. Chilcott was asked by the Commissioner—

"Are you making these proposals on your own behalf, or who do you represent?

Mr. CHILCOTT: I suppose I may claim to be a Cornishman.

The COMMISSIONER: I simply wish to know whether you are representing anyone?

Mr. CHILCOTT: I represent the Conservative Association of West Cornwall."

Now, he (Mr. Borlase) ventured to protest against that kind of evidence, whether it came from a political agent of the Ministerial or the Opposition side of the House. Mr. Chilcott, as he had said, was a man wholly unconnected with mining—the paid agent of a Party. He did not mean to say that the evidence of such persons should not have been heard by the Commissioner; but what he did contend was that their evidence should be taken with the same reserve as that with which, when they sat on Committees upstairs, hon. Mem-

bers were wont to receive the evidence of specialist witnesses. Such men should have very little weight in enabling a man to form a judgment of a question of this sort—a man who, like the Commissioner, had no personal knowledge whatever of the district with which he was dealing. In common with the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Raikes), he gave all credit to the Boundary Commissioners for the work they had done in so short a time. But the time had been short. They had only been able to give one day to Dorsetshire, another to Devonshire, and another to Cornwall. In the latter case, they had had to mark out their boundaries in a less number of hours than there were districts to be adjusted. It might be asked how the Commissioners had come to arrive at the conclusion to which such strong exception was taken on the spot, and how it was that so little conflicting testimony was brought before them? Well, it was owing to a mistake. Some of the gentlemen who had given evidence had to travel some 50 miles. A telegram was sent by a body of gentlemen to Bodmin, asking that this particular district should be postponed until a later period in the day, when they would be able to arrive in the town. That telegram was never handed to the Commissioner; the case was closed, and it was only on sufferance that, later in the day, the Commissioner was good enough to hear the evidence of these gentlemen. Well, in the evidence the Commissioner then received, Captain Josiah Thomas said that he was the manager of the largest mine in the county. He had never heard any wish expressed by the mining community to be represented by a special Member; neither had the matter been mentioned in connection with the Mining Institute of Cornwall—an Institution which watched over the mining interests of the county. The mining industry was pursued in all parts of the county, and, if the scheme as laid down by the Commissioners was adhered to, it would still be represented by the whole of the Members. Evidence came from several other gentlemen directly connected with mining. Mr. Lanyon, for instance, complained that—

"In the absence of himself and other gentlemen who had previously spoken, the proposal to create a mining constituency had been brought forward by a gentleman who did not represent the mining interest at all. As one largely interested in the mining industry, and a member of the Mining Institute, he was prepared to state that the matter had never been broached to the mine managers or adventurers, and had not, therefore, received their approval. He again asserted that the proposal had been brought forward by those who had no interest whatever in mining, and added that it had only received the support of one gentleman, who was an intruder, for a gentleman belonging to the Penzance Division had no right to interfere with those of Helston and Truro."

Since that time this question had been opposed by every mine manager, and every miner in the county, and in particular by those in the very two towns mostly affected—namely, Redruth and Camborne. In both of those towns meetings, which were by no means Party meetings, but meetings of the inhabitants, had been held to consider this subject. The oldest and most experienced miners in the county had attended these meetings. They had come together to protest against the present scheme. At Redruth, a resolution to that effect was passed almost unanimously—that was to say, only one hand was held up against it; and at the Camborne meeting a similar resolution was passed absolutely unanimously. A unanimous meeting had similarly been held at Helston. At Truro there had been three to one in favour of an alteration of the scheme, showing that this was a county matter, and in no way a political question. In 11 other places, affected by the proposal, unanimous meetings of the inhabitants had been held. This being so, he had ventured to approach the right hon. Baronet the Leader of the Opposition (Sir Stafford Northcote) and the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke), to see whether it could not be arranged that the county of Cornwall should be represented as it ought to be. In both instances they had given him to understand that he had a good case; and he now appealed to them once more, as to the two judges who had to decide the question, sitting on the Front Benches in the House, to set the matter right. If they could not do so now, he would ask them to give him a promise that, in consideration of the merits of the case he had made out, they would request the Commissioner to reconsider his decision before Report, since the matter was one, as he thought he had clearly

shown, which deeply affected the interests of the greatest industry in the West of England, and the convenience of the inhabitants of the county.

Amendment proposed,

In page 48, leave out lines 21 to 32, both inclusive, and insert,—

"No. 2.—The Helston Division.

The Sessional Divisions of Kerrier West and Kerrier East (except the parish of Gwennap).

The Municipal Boroughs of Helston, Penryn, and Falmouth; and the parishes of Camborne, Crowan, Gwinear, Gwithian, and Phillack.

No. 3.—The Truro Division.

The Sessional Division of Powder West (except the parish of Ladock).

The Municipal Borough of Truro; and the parishes of Gwennap, Illogan, and Redruth."—(*Mr. Borlase.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Helston' stand part of the Schedule."

THE CHAIRMAN said, that as there was another Amendment by which it was proposed to alter the name of the division, he had put the Question, "That 'Helston' remain part of the Schedule," so that the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) might have the opportunity he sought.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he thought that this proposal was practically to revert to the original scheme of the Boundary Commissioners—that was to say, the scheme prepared before they had made their local inquiry. He need hardly point out to the Committee that the original schemes were drawn up in London, before there had been any opportunity of consulting local feeling, and before the Commissioners had had an opportunity of looking thoroughly into the question, and gauging it as it appeared after local inquiry, to see whether it came under the terms of their Instructions that changes could be made in the original scheme. In some cases parts of the original scheme might have told in one direction in a Party sense, and other parts in another direction. The present instance was one in which it was believed by the local leaders of the Liberal Party that the change would be detrimental to their interests, and which should be reversed. He knew that feeling generally prevailed amongst Cornish Liberals. But surely, when an impartial body of Commissioners, representing both sides of politics, went into a district entirely unknown to them, and consulted with persons of both political Parties of whom they knew nothing, and came unanimously to a conclusion, after local investigation, that it was desirable to create a division of a certain kind, it would be monstrous for the Committee to reverse that decision. It would be monstrous, he contended, for the Committee now modelling the Bill to reverse the view of such a Commission, on the strength, not of a general opinion in favour of such reversal, but only of a feeling in the county on one side. It must be borne in mind that the final scheme was not proposed in accordance with the Report of those who had made the local inquiry, but after repeated reconsideration of the matter. The Commissioners had changed their provisional scheme after repeated consideration of the Report of the Visiting Commissioner by the whole Commission, and each time they had confirmed their previous decision. He knew that the whole of the Commission had considered this case in that way, as well as the case of Cheshire and one of the Scotch cases. They had been aware that there was great opposition to the scheme, and were familiar with the line of argument that was adopted in the locality on the one side and on the other; and, therefore, as he had said, they had considered and reconsidered the matter, and had adhered to their original decision. Under the circumstances, it was clear that he had no alternative but to ask the Committee to support the decision of the Commissioners. The argument which had weighed with the Commissioners was this—that, on the whole, the arrangement they proposed would have the effect of grouping together persons of similar pursuits, both in this mining district and in the neighbouring district, which was mainly agricultural. The Commissioners were aware that there were large mining interests scattered through the whole of Cornwall, and conceived it to be impossible to throw the whole mining population into one division. There were mines all over the county. The Commissioners had effected this—they had created a division, mainly mining, and had constituted by the side of it a division mainly agricultural, and they believed that in so doing they had strictly adhered to their Instructions. The pro-

visional scheme would have drawn a line between Redruth and Camborne, and would have cut in two what was virtually one town; because the Camborne and Redruth people worked together, were associated in their pursuits, and had common interests and wants. This was so, notwithstanding that many of the miners had to travel considerable distances to their work. [*A laugh.*] The hon. Member (Mr. Borlase) laughed at that; but he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) was as familiar with the case of Redruth as anyone in that House. He had happened to be a Member of a Royal Commission whose duty it had been to examine witnesses from that district upon these subjects, and in the course of their investigation the Commission had elicited from local witnesses in detail the fact of the distances they had to travel to their work.

MR. BORLASE said, he should like to explain why he laughed. When the right hon. Baronet had referred to Redruth and Camborne being so identical as to be almost one town, he (Mr. Borlase) had remembered that there were no two places in the Kingdom which worked so badly together. The Redruth and Camborne people were too close neighbours to be good friends.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that, as he had stated, these places were virtually one town. The line drawn by the provisional scheme would have severed that which, for mining purposes, must be considered as one community. Therefore, for all these reasons he would ask the Committee to reject the Amendment; and he had no doubt that the Committee would feel that, where the whole Boundary Commission had been unanimous on the point, it was the duty of those in charge of the Bill to maintain the opinion of the Commission.

MR. C. ROSS said, that he should like to address a few words to the Committee on this occasion, as the subject was one with which he was somewhat familiar. In the first place, he would venture to thank the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) for the speech he had just made. He (Mr. Ross) could assure the right hon. Baronet that by a large number of people in the county his words would be read to-morrow with sincere pleasure. The right hon. Baronet had disposed of the main points of the speech of the hon. Member (Mr. Borlase). However, he did not think that that hon. Member's speech ought to be allowed to go out of the House without having a few points in it flatly contradicted. He (Mr. Ross) did not propose to inflict a lengthy effort of oratory upon the Committee such as the hon. Member (Mr. Borlase) had just uttered; but he had taken a few notes of the remarks which had fallen from the hon. Member in the course of his remarkable speech, and these, with the permission of the Committee, he would now go over. As he saw the junior Member for West Cornwall (Mr. A. Vivian) in his place, he might say that, whatever the hon. Member who spoke last might say about the strong feeling existing in the county in regard to this mining division, there was at least one Cornishman in the House who did not agree with him; for no sooner was the final scheme of the Commissioners brought before the country than the junior Member for West Cornwall had seized the opportunity to hurl an address at the heads of what he hoped to be his future constituents. He did not know whether or not the hon. Member (Mr. A. Vivian) now agreed with the hon. Member for East Cornwall (Mr. Borlase), and, if so, the Committee would be at a loss to know what had made him change his mind. Possibly he had found another constituency, or had discovered, for some other reason, that he did not want to represent this constituency. Possibly the hon. Member had discovered what he (Mr. Ross) was afraid was a more likely thing—namely, that the proposed new constituency did not want him. The hon. Member for East Cornwall had said that one of the strong objections to the new revision was that it was, from a geographical point of view, very badly laid out; but he (Mr. Ross) could only say that the hon. Member must know as well as he that the new district of Launceston was a very much more inconveniently mapped district than the new district of Truro. One point to which the hon. Member had referred was as to the evidence given before the Commissioner. He (Mr. Ross) should just like to remind the Committee of what had taken place at the inquiry before the Commissioner. The Committee would remember that, according to the old scheme, the mining division was to be cut in two. When

the Commissioner came down to Bodmin, two gentlemen representing the Conservative interest addressed him, and laid the facts of the case before him. They showed him how the formation of this mining district would be distinctly carrying out, both in the letter and in the spirit, the Instructions given to the Commissioners. The Commissioner was very much impressed with what these gentlemen said. Later on, he was addressed by no less than seven Liberal gentlemen, all of whom inveighed against the new scheme; and yet, so cogent were the arguments of the two Conservatives as against the arguments of the seven Liberals, that the result was the formation of the new district, which everybody except those who were extremely violent partizans believed would work excellently in Cornwall. He (Mr. Ross) had it on very good authority that a well-known gentleman very much interested in this question on the Liberal side had declared that the mining district it was proposed to form would be a very good one, although he was afraid it might give the Conservatives a chance of winning a seat. No doubt, that very accurately described the attitude of the Liberal Party with regard to this matter in Cornwall. He thanked the Committee for having given such patient attention to his remarks; and he could only express the hope that in the division which would take place the Committee would support the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill, and would see the fairness of giving the miners of Cornwall one district in the county which really depended upon the mining industry—would see that it was only fair, when a district like this could be so easily mapped out, that those who were so largely interested in the industry should have a special Representative.

Question put, and *negatived.*

MR. COURTNEY: I beg to move that "North Western" be inserted in the place of "Helston."

MR. BORLASE: I rise to Order. I wish to know whether now is not the time to take my Amendment? It was, "Schedule 7, page 48, leave out lines 21 to 32, both inclusive, and insert, No. 2. The Helston Division, &c."

THE CHAIRMAN: I explained some time ago to the hon. Member that the Question put would be that the word "Helston" stand part of the Schedule, because it was necessary to give the hon. Member for Liskeard an opportunity of moving his Amendment. The word "Helston" has now been negatived, so that the hon. Member for Liskeard has the opportunity he seeks to bring forward his proposal for a geographical division.

MR. COURTNEY: I propose to insert the words "North Western or," in place of "Helston."

Amendment proposed, in page 48, line 21, after the word "The," to insert the words "North Western or."—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'North Western or' be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he presumed that this Amendment had the approval of the Committee, the hon. Member's wish being to insert this description of the Helston Division as corresponding to the description of the Camborne Division.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

MR. COURTNEY said, that in page 48, line 25, after the word "The," he wished to insert the words "Southern or."

Amendment proposed, in page 48, line 25, after the word "The," to insert the words "Southern or."—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'Southern or' be there inserted."

MR. EDWARD CLARKE said, that he thought that the course the hon. Member had taken would very likely lead to some inconvenience and some discussion upon this question on Report. There was no county in England which it was more difficult to divide according to the points of the compass than the county of Cornwall. There was no reason in the world why this division should be spoken of as the Southern Division.

MR. BORLASE said, that the hon. and learned Member opposite (Mr. E. Clarke) should have raised this question earlier.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that the first division was at the extreme West of Cornwall, and the division they were now discussing contained the ex-

treme South, though it was true it might run up to the North.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 47; Noes 154: Majority 107.—(Div. List, No. 97.)

MR. COURTNEY said, he thought there would be no objection to the three remaining Amendments he had to move, the first of which was to insert before the words "St. Austell Division" the words "Mid or."

Amendment proposed,

In page 48, line 33, after the word "The," to insert the words "Mid or."—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. EDWARD CLARKE said, if there was any strong opinion in favour of the term "Mid Division," he would not divide against it; but he thought the title would be better left alone, remaining as the St. Austell Division. From the configuration of the county, Cornwall was not suitable to such modes of division. For the "Western Division" something, perhaps, might be said; but in no sense could the arguments be used in favour of a Mid Division.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, as the Committee had inserted the "Western Division," he thought they had better put in the distinction "Mid."

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed,

In page 48, line 37, between the words "The" and "Bodmin," to insert the words "South Eastern or."—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed,

In page 49, line 1, between the words "The" and "Launceston," to insert the words "North Eastern or."—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES said, it would be more convenient to the Committee if he moved his Amendments following the addition of the words "Northern," "Western," and so on, as Amendments to the Amendment of the right hon. Baronet.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he was willing to move his Amendment with the addition suggested by the right hon. Gentleman, after "The," in line 9, to add the words "Northern or."

MR. AINSWORTH said, he should not object to those words; but he should object to the words following, because they would not really describe the district. The Eskdale, best known, was in what would be called the "Southern" Division, the valley of the River "Esk." The omission of "Eskdale," and other Amendments he had put down, were proposed in consequence of an universally expressed wish of persons in the county to have as far as possible a geographical definition. At the meeting of the Boundary Commissioners at Carlisle both political Parties were represented, and the Lord Lieutenant of the county took the opportunity of drawing the attention of the Commissioners to the desirability of having the true geographical names, and the names suggested by his Amendment were those approved at the meeting. The description "Cockermouth Division" was approved; no alternative geographical name was suggested. At present he should object to the Amendment proposed; not that he objected to the word "Northern," but he wished to have "Eskdale" left out.

Amendment proposed, in page 49, line 9, to insert the words "Northern or."—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, his Amendment would then run on in form, substituting the names now proposed for those in the Bill. The Clerk of the Peace for the county gave the names in a Return furnished last August; but it appeared now the names were not correct, and so the Clerk had sent the legal names, which he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) proposed by his Amendment to substitute for those given in the Schedule. It seemed that in the county of Cumberland one set of names was used by custom, but another set was used in all legal forms.

Amendment proposed,

In page 49, line 10, to leave out from the word "of" to the word "Carlisle," in line 14. —(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

[*Twelfth Night.*]

MR. WAUGH said, he must object to the word "Eskdale Ward;" it was a misnomer. Up to the year 1841 it was quite right; but since then Eskdale Ward had been divided into the two divisions "Brampton" and "Longtown," and all processes were issued out of the Brampton Division, not "Eskdale." Allerdale Ward below Derwent, also, would be in three divisions. It must lead to a good deal of difficulty to give the names as proposed. The Clerk of the Peace had given the names as they existed up to 1841, not taking into account the alterations made since. There could be no doubt the right names for the divisions were "Brampton" and "Longtown."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the hon. Member assumed that the names had been altered since 1841, but he was wrong; custom had brought about a change of names; but if the Clerk of the Peace was right, the names in use in 1841 were the legal names known at Quarter Sessions.

MR. PERCY WYNDHAM said, he was conversant with Quarter Session proceedings, and the only names known there were "Brampton" and "Longton;" he had never heard of the "Eskdale" Division.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, in practice no doubt such was the case; but a most careful examination had been made by the Clerk of the Peace, who was distinctly of opinion that no order of the Court had changed the names. If the Clerk of the Peace could be shown to be in error, he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would be glad to have an alteration made on Report.

SIR. R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he supposed it might be taken for granted that by the Amendment no alternative would be made in the boundaries; as shown on the map of the Commissioners, it was simply a change in description.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that was so.

MR. WARTON said, it seemed to him, from what he had gathered from Cumberland Members, that there had been some division of Eskdale Ward, whether legally or not he did not know, and Eskdale seemed to contain "Brampton" and "Longtown." It seemed to him curious that in stating the divisions "Eskdale" and "Longtown" should both be mentioned, and not "Brampton." Were both these parts of what was called "Eskdale," whether that was a legal definition or not? Why had they the whole inserted, and also one of the two parts of which the whole consisted? Why was the word "Brampton" omitted?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the name did not occur in that division.

MR. WAUGH said, he had no doubt whatever that the names were altered by the order of Sessions.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the Clerk of the Peace had written saying that the Boundary Commissioners in their letter asked him to give them the legal names of the several Quarter Sessions and Petty Sessional districts; he did so, and also searched the records of the Quarter Sessions, and sent a copy of the Order of June 29, 1841. He could find no Order altering the names. He (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had nothing to do with the practice of Petty Sessions in the matter; he wished he had, and must repeat that the Clerk had put down the names as settled at Quarter Sessions.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Amendment proposed,

After the word "Division," to insert the words—

"The Sessional Divisions of,—
Eskdale Ward,
Cumberland Ward,
Longtown, and
Allerdale Ward below Derwent (except so much as is comprised in Division No. 2 as herein described);
and the Municipal Borough of Carlisle."

—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. WAUGH said, the Allerdale Ward below Derwent extended into three other new divisions. The name of "Allerdale below Derwent" without "Ward," was its proper designation.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, on this Amendment perhaps he might be allowed to say that he knew nothing of the matter, and was not in a position to speak, except so far as he could judge from the letter of the Clerk of the Peace. He was bound to take the view of the Clerk of the Peace; but if his hon. Friend was clear that that gentleman was wrong, and could induce others to take that view, and produce a general impression in that direction, he would

reconsider the matter on the Report stage.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. RAIKES proposed to add, after "The," in page 49, line 15, the words "Eastern or," so that the line would read the "Eastern or" Penrith Division.

Amendment proposed, in page 49, line 15, after the word "The," to insert the words "Eastern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'Eastern or' be there inserted."

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE remarked that this was another example of the difficulty of naming constituencies after points of the compass. The right hon. Gentleman proposed to call the division "Eastern," while another hon. Gentleman preferred "North Eastern."

Question put.

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 62; Noes 130: Majority 68. — (Div. List, No. 98.)

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

MOTION.

—o—

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION, REVISED CODE, 1885.

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.

Mr. J. G. TALBOT: In the first place, I must apologize to the House for bringing a matter of this importance forward at this inconvenient hour (11.45). For that, however, I think I may ask the admission from the House that I am not personally responsible. The Easter Holidays took away a considerable portion of the time during which we were at liberty to consider the Code; and I must own that I did hesitate about telling my Friends with any certainty that I could bring forward this Motion to-night, knowing that the Government had possession of the night, and not knowing that I should really have an opportunity of introducing my Motion. I have to thank the Government, however, for allowing me to intervene at this late hour; and I promise the House that I will not detain them long. The Motion I have to make is in effect to ask Her Majesty to withhold Her consent to the Education Act in respect of a certain Article, with a view of providing that a larger proportion of the grant now given to public elementary schools should be allotted in the form of a fixed payment on average attendance. At the outset I should like to remove a preliminary objection to my Motion. I have been asked—"Do I want more money out of the Public Exchequer?" and I say—"No; I do not." It must, of course, be admitted that as the number of the children to be educated increases, as the schools increase, so the grants will be larger, and the demands upon the Public Funds will be greater; but in asking the House to agree to this Motion I do not ask for more money, but simply for a fixed grant, whatever that grant may be, at a particular time, to be distributed in a particular way. Having removed this objection, let me say I recognize the alterations the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Mundella) has from time to time made in the Code, as intended to meet the complaints made by both teachers and managers as to over-pressure both upon the teachers and the children. I feel that the right hon. Gentleman is sincere in his desire to remove this over-pressure grievance; and if he will go a little further in the same line, I am sure he would attain more effectually the end which he and we all desire. Let me once more say, what I think I have already said in this House on previous educational debates, that whilst the intentions of the right hon. Gentleman and the Department are excellent; whilst they desire to remove over-pressure, much is still left to the discretion of individual Inspectors, some of whom, I cannot help feeling, have rather exaggerated views as to the acquirements of children. Another objection raised to my Motion is that this is what is called a retrograde movement. I have seen it stated in the public prints that it is the duty of all true friends of education to rally their forces against this retrograde step. ["Hear, hear!"] I hear a sympathetic cheer from the opposite Benches. It has also been stated that such a Motion came from those who are really opposed to education. ["Hear!"] There, again, I hear one faint sympathetic cheer. It is not necessary for me to say anything about

my past career. I think I have spent as much time, and attention, and perhaps other things, in support of education as most other men. I am not an anti-Educationist in any sense of the word. What I desire is that the education shall be of a sensible and practical kind. I am afraid it must be said that a great deal of our elementary education is not of that kind which we should really desire. What we ought to desire is that the children we seek to educate should be fit for the position in life in which they are placed; giving opportunities for those who are really qualified of rising above the position they originally occupied. But, at the same time, I do think a great error is made on the part of those who call themselves educationists in under-valuing the proper position of manual labour. There is a tendency to extol the labour of the head at the expense of the labour of the hand. That I think is a great mistake; and what I feel convinced of is that we ought, so far as we possibly can, to assist the children to take their proper position in the state of life in which they were placed, and in which they have an honourable calling, and, at the same time, so to arrange our educational system that the physical energies of children shall not be over-pressed, but that as the children grow up they shall be able to discharge the duties for which a strong physical frame is essentially desirable. Well now, Sir, having said this, let me describe the position in which we now stand. It is understood that I represent the Church of England schools. Certainly I know more about them than about other schools, and they are no insignificant part of our educational system, for I think they still form very nearly one-half of the whole school accommodation of the country. As I am the champion, therefore, of one-half of the whole elementary school accommodation of the country, it cannot be said that I am occupying an insignificant position. The total grants to elementary schools in the last Return were £1,380,572, of which it was stated on page 29 of the Return that £1,275,358 was paid for average attendance. But that average attendance, so-called, was not what we understand by average attendance—I mean it does not represent the payment for the number of children. It represents a great many things besides, and though I know we must except the grants to the infant schools—of which I shall say a word hereafter, because a great part of my case rests on infant schools — making all the deductions which I think I am right in making, £855,000 still remains as earned by results. Therefore I say that a very large proportion of the grants to these elementary schools is earned by what may be technically called results. This I say is much too large a proportion, and for the reason I shall endeavour very briefly to lay before the House. What does payment by result mean? It means payment calculated by the examination of the children who are found in the school on the day of the Inspector's visit. It does not take into account all the work of the school during the past year, except so far as that work can be tested by the examination at the time. Now, I want to know, is that a rational way of examining schools? Is it a way in which we should be content to examine those schools in which our own children are educated? Of course, we feel a good deal about the result of the particular examination at the end of the particular school time; but should we be satisfied that those who inquire into our public schools should say, "We do not care how your children get on at other times; we judge them simply by the way they pass examinations on a particular day?" I say that this is not a rational or a considerate way of testing education, and it leads, I think, inevitably to over-pressure, not only to over-pressure of the children, but, which is equally important, also to over-pressure of the teachers. This is, perhaps, the strongest argument upon which I shall ask the House to agree to my Motion. Well now, Sir, I ask, though of course I admit there must be a certain amount of payment by result, why is my request unreasonable? Why is it unreasonable to ask, as I do, that the larger proportion of the grants now given to public elementary schools should be allotted in the form of fixed payments on average attendance? I am fortified in my opinion that this is not an unreasonable request by some very strong testimony. I think I hinted just now that it was considered that I came forward here as a reactionary and an antagonist of liberal education; but I am going to

quote the opinions of some people who certainly cannot be called reactionary. The National Union of Elementary Teachers, which is composed of the teachers of all sorts of schools, and not only of schools in which I am chiefly interested, and for which I am pleased to be chiefly speaking to-night—though I do not think the subject is one which affects only voluntary schools—the National Union of Elementary Teachers is an unsectarian body, and at their meeting at Leicester last year they resolved—

"In the opinion of this Conference, the system of payment by results and classification by Standards, as applied to the elementary schools under the conditions of the Education Code, is unsound in principle, is injurious to education, and productive of much over-pressure upon scholars and teachers; and a Code based upon this system cannot be deemed wholly satisfactory."

That was their opinion last year. Well, now, Sir, I have the latest utterances of this Union of Teachers. Only last week they had a large meeting at Norwich, and their President, who is a teacher in a London School Board school, and, therefore, cannot be said to have any reactionary or clerical proclivities, said—

"The Union has consistently and persistently maintained that over-pressure is an inevitable consequence of the system of payment by results; indeed, long before the Union was founded the effects of the system were confidently predicted; and I think we should be wanting in our duty if we failed to continue to point out the fundamental error of our present system. And though, when doing so, we are met by the evasive reply that payment by results is practically universal in all professions, or, on further insistance, are told that to change the system is impossible, we cannot forbear to repeat that, granting the difficulty of retracing our steps, yet it is absolutely impossible that the education of the country can be what all true friends would like to see it until it is administered in an educational spirit; now it is almost wholly pecuniary. It is, practically, not an Educational Code, but a system for distributing grants, and is drawn up and administered in that light, and from that arises the evils we so much deplore."

Now, Sir, I say that these two statements, if I were to rest upon them alone—if I had no other argument—would be a pretty strong argument in favour of what I have been endeavouring to put before the House. They show that, in the opinion of men and women—because a lady followed the President, and spoke even more strongly than he did—they showed that, in the opinion of men and women engaged in the daily work of education under the conditions that the Government imposes, and engaged, some in voluntary schools, some under the School Board system — under all these qualifications the deliberate judgment arrived at year after year—last year at Leicester, this year at Norwich—was that the system of payment by results, as now administered, is a most fruitful source of that over-pressure which we all deplore. I am not standing alone in this matter, therefore; nor can this, in any sense, be called a Party question. In that sense, I am sorry that I am the spokesman on the present occasion. We are all known to belong to Parties in this House, and I am supposed to be a strong Party man; but I would ask hon. Members to divest themselves of all personality as regards myself on this occasion, and to look upon the matter from its own standpoint, and not from the point of view of the person who advocates it. If hon. Members will do that, I think they will find that there are strong arguments in favour of my proposal. If payment by results be as I describe it, it is clear that it leads teachers to think chiefly of the results of the examination day, and not so much as they ought of the general well-being of the school, and of the children committed to their charge. And this really affects board schools, and schools of that kind, just as it does schools most intimately connected with the Religious Bodies. I pray in aid, as the lawyers say—the Government themselves—because I say that they themselves, by the way they deal with the infant schools, admit the principle for which I am contending. In regard to the infant schools, they do precisely what I ask them to do in regard to all schools—that is to say, they examine the schools when the Inspector goes round; and they say—"We will give you a grant for every infant here present," if they were in a satisfactory condition. That is what I ask them to do for every child presented, because, in that way, they would be encouraging the general well-being of the schools. The Government are not pressing upon little children now in the same way that they are pressing upon older boys and girls, because they conceive it to be necessary that they should be brought up to a certain standard of education on a certain day of examination. I go a step further than that even; and I ask

the House to consider whether it is not a strong argument in our case that in every foreign country the system of payment by results is unknown? [Mr. MUNDELLA: Hear, hear!] The right hon. Gentleman admits that. Then, if that be so, the request I make cannot be an unreasonable one. It may be said —"Oh! but the genius of the English people demands this special stimulus—Englishmen and Englishwomen cannot be brought up to the sticking point unless you put this tremendous screw upon them"—of making everything depend upon the examination of a day. That statement is unsupported, and I do not think it is one that is likely to be maintained. I think that our system is a system that is condemned by educationists, and it is also condemned—or, at least, partly allowed to be defective—by the Government themselves. It is condemned by the practice of foreign countries; and I maintain that I have made out a very strong case in support of the matter being taken into the favourable consideration of the Government, though, of course, I am not sanguine enough to believe that I can persuade the right hon. Gentleman the Vice President of the Council (Mr. Mundella) by a single speech. I hope, at least, that, if I do nothing more, I may succeed in getting this matter considered a little more in the future than it is at the present time; and that, if we do not get any redress now, we may get it at some future time. I shall ask the House to listen to another quotation. I would give the opinion of a gentleman who, I am sure, is known to the right hon. Gentleman the Vice President of the Council as one of the ablest and most intelligent of the Church Educationists — I mean Canon Daniel, of the Battersea Training College. In a speech made last year he said—

"The ultimate causes of over-pressure are to be mainly sought for in the abuse of the principle which underlies the Code—the principle of payment by results—a very good principle so long as we are dealing with results embodied in brute matter, but a most dangerous principle when indiscriminately applied to results produced in living children for the benefit of others than the children themselves. Pay a brickmaker for his tale of bricks, and you will not do much harm; bricks have no organization, physical or mental, to injure. Pay a body of managers, or a teacher, for a tale of passes, and there is a risk that in the process some of the children operated upon may suffer irreparable injury of body and mind. I am far from thinking that the principle is inapplicable to elementary education in State-aided schools. Indeed, I do not see how public grants of money could otherwise be made to such schools at all."

I quite admit that. I am not asking for the abolition of payment by results, but for a limitation of it, and I call upon Canon Daniel as an authority to support me, because he is not an out-and-out opponent of payment by results, but a moderate man who takes the thing fairly all round. He goes on to say—

"The business-minded British public will never be content to spend its money without being assured that it gets a satisfactory equivalent. But it is evident that the principle should be applied with the greatest care, both by the Department and by managers and teachers. By all means let payment be regulated by results; but let us be sure that the results required from each individual child are not unreasonable, that educational results are not purchased at the expense of health and life, and that children are not ruthlessly exploited for the sake of large grants. I do not at all believe that the requirements of the Code are excessive for the large majority of children, and I should be extremely sorry to see the general standard of elementary education lowered; but I am satisfied that the Code demands and teachers teach a great deal more than certain classes of children can safely learn."

That, I think, is a very moderate statement of the view I wish to put before the House. I should be content to leave that statement of the case—so much better expressed than I myself could express it—for the consideration of the House. I would conclude as I began by stating that I am not an opponent of education in any sense; that I am not an opponent even of the present system, taken as a whole; but that what I am in favour of is the adaptation of the Code to the capacities of children and of teachers, so that it will not bear hardly or injuriously upon either the teacher or the taught. I am desirous that it should be such as to attain the results we all profess to desire, and I trust all do desire — namely, the bringing up of children in the soundest way as regards both body and mind, and in the manner best suited to fit them for their future careers. In conclusion, I move the Resolution which stands in my name.

MR. R. H. PAGET said, that he rose to second the Motion. He himself had had a Notice on this subject on the Paper as follows:—

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty that She will be gra- ciously pleased to direct that the Elementary Education Code, as now laid upon the Table, be so amended as to afford adequate security against the continuance of over-pressure on children and teachers."

At that hour of the night it was quite hopeless to expect anything like a separate discussion upon that individual Motion; and therefore he begged now to second the Motion of the hon. Member who had preceded him. At the outset he wished to say that he was one of those who were entirely in favour of a complete system of elementary education. He had read with the greatest satisfaction the Annual Report; and he gladly recognized, from the figures set before the House, the steady progress in elementary education. He was desirous of seeing the efficiency of the elementary education of the country increased; and this particular Motion had been brought before the House, not with a view of hindering or obstructing education, but rather with a view of improving it, and freeing it from some of the unnecessary restrictions and features which, in his estimation, served now to hamper its action. The system of payment by results had been condemned in moderate and effective language by the hon. Member who had moved the present Motion. It seemed to him (Mr. Paget) that the system as it stood was one which contained all the objectionable features of the Dual Control. It was, so to speak, a Dual Control of the Education Department and of the Chancellor of the Exchequer with the Treasury. They might have a most enlightened Minister of Education, anxious to spend more money and to attain higher results; but he was constantly restrained and hampered by the Treasury. If he (Mr. Paget) were in the secrets of the Office over which the right hon. Gentleman the Vice President of the Council so ably presided, probably he should find from time to time anxious inquiries from the Treasury to this effect—"How comes it that you are spending so much money? How is it that your Estimates this year are £250,000 higher than they were last year? Do you not think that if your examinations were more difficult, if some little hint were given to your Inspectors in the matter, something or other could be done to decrease your Estimates, so that we might not be called upon to find so much money for you?" He did not know whether he got an absolute assent from the right hon. Gentleman the Vice President upon this point; but he thought there was a great deal in what he was putting before the House, and that the right hon. Gentleman would not venture to express a decided dissent from that proposition. If not, why was it that the recent additions to this Instrument with which they were presented from year to year had seemed to offer to all schools an opportunity of earning larger grants under the merit grant system; and yet, when he came to examine the application of this system, it was found that, so far from increasing the grant, it gave with one hand and took away with the other? The schools that suffered most under this system were not those where the school pence could be obtained in fourpences and sixpences, and larger sums, but the poorest of all poor schools, and in the poorest places of all poor places, where the system, if it was to be efficient at all, should offer the largest donations where education was mostly required. In places where the children came of the poorest parentage, and where the educational requirements were the strongest, and where the parents could not afford the least possible help for education, what did the Education Department do? Why, they offered a merit grant, which said—"If you can obtain a standard of 'good' or 'excellent,' the result will be paid you in £ *s. d.*—you will get your pound of flesh." But mark what happened. Simultaneously with the offer of the merit grant, the Department stepped in with Article 214, which was known only too well to those interested in education, and came down on schools that might have arrived at the highest pitch of excellence it was possible to arrive at and curtailed the grant, simply and solely because it had been too economically earned. If the school accounts of the year could have proved that the expenditure had been a little higher, the grant might not have been cut down; but there was an absolute penalty upon efficiency which was imposed upon schools of the poorest class, and on which it fell with the greatest severity. He knew that in answer to this argument he might be told that this

was an evil which, if it was to be remedied at all, could only be remedied by legislation. He was quite aware of that; but he merely gave this as an illustration of the system of payment by results of which the hon. Member for the University of Oxford (Mr. Talbot) had, to his mind, so rightly complained. They did not desire that the system of payment by results should be entirely abrogated; it was too deeply engrained in their educational system to give way at once to a single attack. Hon. Members were not there to ask that the Government should entirely destroy and upset the system; but what they did ask, and asked with reason in the interest of education itself, and in the interest of the parents, of the teachers, and of the children, and of all who were connected with or interested in education, was that there should be a modification—a reasonable modification—of this system of payment by results. They were of opinion that it had been proved, to a sufficient extent at any rate, that over-pressure existed in their elementary educational establishments. It had been denied, but it had been re-asserted, and he thought it would be generally recognized, that the first Report which appeared on the subject from Dr. Crichton Browne, although containing some statements with which hon. Members might not be disposed to agree, yet had not been without some substantial foundation in fact. What was going on at that moment? They were told that an investigation into the matter was taking place at the instance of the London School Board. The right hon. Gentleman the Vice President of the Council had not himself thought fit to have a general investigation into the matter, and had left it to the London School Board to take the initiative. Until their Report was received of course the House would not know what view the London School Board would take; but it was well known that that Body had already made some substantial modification in their system of education. They knew that opportunity had been allowed by the London School Board to parents to refuse to permit their children to have home lessons if they thought fit. What was that but a distinct concession? Previous to this action on the part of the London School Board home lessons were often insisted upon. It would be found, too, he thought, that from time to time additional school hours had been insisted upon. There was great straining for results to be obtained by the system of examination on which the whole principle of the grant hung. The system was one which must of necessity impose a great strain on all who were connected with elementary schools at the moment of examination. The prospect of the teacher in life, as well as his reputation for the time, depended upon the result of the examination; because if an insufficient grant was earned a reflection was cast upon him. The very revised system of the present year was an admission to some extent of that, because it contained a power to the managers of schools to withhold certain children from examination if they thought fit.

MR. MUNDELLA: The hon. Member means the Revised Code of last year.

MR. R. H. PAGET: Yes; of last year. This was often referred to by the Education Department. They declared that the teachers now were free, and could withhold children from examination, and that in that way they could get rid of this over-pressure. But what was the action of that Department? What took place was really this. If a teacher attempted to withdraw anything like a substantial number, say from 3 to 4 per cent of children from the examination, the Inspector would make an adverse Report, and the reputation of the teacher was injured, and suffered, and the grant to the school suffered also. This plan of withholding children from examination, of which so much had been made by the Department, was a plan which the teachers themselves would tell them was more of a sham than a reality. The system of payment by results was responsible for most of their difficulties, and anything that would tend to mitigate its effect would be beneficial to the real interest of education. It led to a system of constant cram for examination. Everything that one could do to mitigate its effects he believed would be for the benefit of education, for the benefit of the children, and for the benefit of the teachers, and would insure a satisfactory state of things. There was one other remark he wished to make. This system of examination, which was such a constant cause of worry, trouble, and axiety to the teachers,

was not equally harassing to the teachers of all schools. That worry and anxiety did not arise so much in the case of the board schools, in regard to which the financial question did not arise. They had the inexhaustible rate to fall back upon. Possibly the aggrieved ratepayers, particularly the ratepayers of London, began to see the objectionable side of this arrangement, as the rates were mounting up 1*d.* by 1*d.* until they became 8*d.* or 9*d.* in one year. But the unfortunate ratepayer's voice was not much heard. The board school would go on, however much the grant was reduced; but the case was different in regard to the voluntary schools, whose very existence depended upon their receiving such an amount of the grant as would enable them to pay their way, and the teachers of which were, therefore, much more harassed than the teachers in the board schools were. The very existence of those schools was rendered a matter of difficulty. He contended that they had no right to have to meet a difficulty such as that. Voluntary schools, it should never be forgotten, were in existence and doing a great deal of good work when there were no other schools in the country. That work had been well and thoroughly recognized by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) in his Act of 1870. They were told that the system of more complete education was to supplement, and not to supplant, those voluntary schools; and they had a right to ask, not for an exhibition of favour or affection for those voluntary schools, but that they might have some reasonable chance of existence, as was promised to them from the first, in consideration of their long services in the past. He hoped that that which they had a right to demand now would not be denied them. The system which at present existed required modification. All the children having passed the infant stage were usually bound to advance from Standard to Standard year by year. Otherwise the grants were reduced, and the efficiency of the school was held to be failing, and the teachers were liable to be under some kind of slur. Once the infant stage had been passed there was little possibility of classification left for the teacher. It was thought that in that respect modification should be made. They thought that amongst the children of the poor it was impossible, any more than among the children of other classes, that they should find the same capacity of advancing from Standard to Standard at the same rate of progress. [Mr. Mundella dissented.] The right hon. Gentleman the Vice President of the Council dissented. But within the very small limits of variation permitted by the Department it was impossible. He thought that the limits of variation the Department permitted were entirely insufficient to meet the innumerable cases of difference of intellect and capacity amongst the children who had to pass through the schools. He did not desire to detain the House at that late hour. The one remark he should like to make was this. They had a system to which they were used; but the evil effects of which they were beginning to-day more completely and thoroughly to recognize. This system was an English system, which was to be found in no other country in the world. It was absolutely unique. He was told that one of the teachers in one of the London schools had recently made a most able Report on this matter. And what did he say? That gentleman, Mr. Wild, had visited a great many schools in Europe, and had come back with a great deal of information. He said—

> "The whole system abroad is purely educational, not in the slightest degree pecuniary. Nowhere did I find one single 1*d.* depending on any examination. Nowhere did I find anything like our system of individual examination. Nowhere did I find any but adult trained teachers. Nowhere did I find any striving after percentages, or after that miraculous accuracy, to attain which costs English teachers and scholars so much weariness and painfulness. Nowhere did I find any signs of worry and anxiety."

If those schools could be maintained elsewhere without the anxiety and trouble which existed in this country, why should they not modify their system so as to get rid of those anxieties and worries? It was because he believed that the Motion of the hon. Member for the University of Oxford would tend to effect that by providing that a larger proportion of the grant now given to public elementary schools should be allotted in the form of fixed payment on the average attendance that he was prepared to support it. They did not ask the whole grant to be given in that way; but they asked that a larger proportion of it should be given in order that the worry and

anxiety might be diminished. They could not expect at the present moment entirely to get rid of it; but they hoped to diminish it, and in diminishing it they hoped they would get greater efficiency of education. They had acquired for the children of the country proper school accommodation, well ventilated, lighted, warmed, and adequately supplied with all kinds of educational apparatus, and with efficient teachers, who had proved by examination that they were perfectly able thoroughly to undertake the duties confided to them. Why, then, should they not believe that they possessed the means that would give good results, by increasing the grant in the form of fixed payments on average attendance, and so getting rid of this unnecessary worry, harassment, and over-pressure on children and teachers, which was one of the crying defects of the present system acknowledged by everyone outside those walls, and which it was the hope of those who made this Motion to mitigate?

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty that She will be graciously pleased to withhold Her consent from the Education Code in respect of Article 109 (a), with a view of providing that a larger proportion of the grant now given to public elementary schools should be allotted in the form of a fixed payment on average attendance."—(*Mr. J. G. Talbot.*)

SIR LYON PLAYFAIR said, that the hon. Member for the University of Oxford (Mr. J. G. Talbot) had deprecated the impression that he might be considered a reactionary in educational progress. No one could believe that of a University Member, who had so much interest to raise the level of education. But the question was—what would be the real effect of his Motion? It was an extremely vague Motion; the hon. Member had given them no figures, and he had spoken not of anything new in this Code, but of a provision which had existed for many years. At the present moment, out of 17*s.*, the average grant, 4*s.* 6*d.* was for attendance. How much did the hon. Member propose to raise it? In the time of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) it had been 6*s.*, and then it had been reduced to 4*s.* by Viscount Sandon, being finally raised by the present Government to 4*s.* 6*d.* The hon. Member did not say to what sum he proposed it should be raised; but he would presume that the hon. Member wished it to be raised to 10*s.*, as had been recommended by the teachers themselves. At present, 4*s.* 6*d.* was given for average attendance, and 12*s.* 6*d.* for educational effort throughout the country. If the sum for mechanical attendance were raised to 10*s.*, it would represent nearly two-thirds of the whole, while only one-third would represent educational effort. That was the way in which an hon. Member for a University proposed to improve the education of the country. The effect of the proposal would be greatly to increase the remuneration of bad schools, and largely to decrease the remuneration of good schools. ["No!" *and* "Hear!"] That was obvious, because with only one-third for educational effort there would be much less for good schools to win, while the bad schools would have two-thirds already secured. In Scotland, where national education had been much longer established and was of a higher kind than in England, and where there was also more educational effort, who ever heard of over-pressure? Some 84,000 school children died every year. Out of that number he should expect to find that 200 or 300 died from over-pressure. But only 20 or 30 were alleged to have died from that cause; and when the facts were inquired into, the allegation, except in four or five cases, completely failed. There was from 32 to 33 per cent less mortality in schools now than in 1870, when his right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford got his Education Act passed. Undoubtedly there were weaklings and diseased children to whom any amount of school work would be injurious; and it would always be a duty of managers of schools to take advantage of the provisions of the Code and prevent them being taxed beyond their strength. A Code, as long as it existed, must provide for the capacities of the great bulk of children, while it also protected individuals who were exceptionally incapable of any mental exertion. To legislate for those exceptions to the detriment of the vast bulk of school children was an extraordinary policy. The House must recollect that it had provided Standards of education before children were allowed to enter labour;

and if they diminished the ability to pass these at an early age they would dislocate the whole conditions of labour in the country. He objected to the Motion, because it would depress educational effort and substitute mere mechanical conditions for that healthy independence which now induced school authorities to bring their schools to a high standard of efficiency.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON said, the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir Lyon Playfair) had made a very strong speech against the Motion of the hon. Member for the University of Oxford, and had it not been for that speech he should probably not have intervened in the discussion. He thought the right hon. Gentleman had much overstated the practical effect of the proposal of his hon. Friend; and it appeared to him that he had contrived to misunderstand what were the objections which many on that side of the House, himself among the number, entertained to this rigid system of payment by results. This system, which was established by Viscount Sherbrooke, was never intended, and he never wished it to be applied in the manner it was now applied in elementary schools. It was a system for testing the acquirements of children in reading, writing, and arithmetic in elementary schools. He admitted that the right hon. Gentleman opposite had done a good deal of good, and he thought that the tendency of the alterations made in the Code had unquestionably gone in the direction of the proposal contained in the Amendment of his hon. Friend. But there was a widespread feeling amongst teachers and others that this system of payment by results was neither fair to the teachers nor to the children themselves. He had heard it said that the system of payment by results gave each locality more or less the opportunity of selecting subjects which could be best taught in that locality. But he would point out that the locality had nothing to do with it, because every subject was prescribed by the Education Department, and the only choice which the teacher had was to select one or two class subjects. The question they had to consider was, whether those who took an interest in education were thoroughly satisfied with the present system. He did not think that many were quite aware of what payment by results implied. Let the Committee consider for one moment that there were millions of children in the schools — infants and otherwise, for whom payment by results was obtained in proportion to the number of subjects in which they were examined. That meant that there were millions of children for whom 10 to 15 payments might be gained in reference to the different subjects in which they were examined; and the Committee would be able from that fact to realize something of the amount of trouble that resulted to the teachers and children, as well as to the Education Department, in checking the claims. It was too late to argue the question at that hour (12.50) at any length; but when the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Lyon Playfair) stated that elementary education in Scotland was in a most satisfactory state, he should remember that it was not arrived at by payment by results, which had been engrafted on the system of education in that country, and was not originally part of it. Again, in his opinion, many of the best Scotch teachers did not at all approve of the system. Since the time at which the system of payment by results was established, a very great improvement had taken place in the social status of elementary school teachers. If those teachers were subjected to a most severe test before they could obtain certificates of competency, could not the Department be assured that the outcome of their work was more or less good? But, having tested them by that severe examination, the Education Department proceeded to test every individual child which those teachers taught. He thought there might be some modification of that practice; indeed, he should like to see the system of payment by results swept away, and something in the nature of a capitation rate, to be regulated according to the efficiency of the school by inspection, substituted in its place. And he believed it would come to that, because the present system was so unpopular, and entailed such an enormous amount of trouble on the Education Department, that sooner or later some alteration must be made. He had come in contact, perhaps as much as had the right hon. Gentleman the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education, with elementary school teachers, and he

thought that all must be struck with the manner in which they performed their duties. There were, of course, some exceptions; but he thought that the great mass of them might safely be allowed some latitude in the matter of teaching. Under the present system, every child in a class was examined, and there was no regulation requiring that the child should have been in that class for a certain period—number of months. He always felt that they subjected the children of the poor to a test which they did not like their own children to be subjected to. No doubt the over-pressure existing in elementary schools was to some extent exaggerated; but he thought that everyone knew in the case of their own children, and in the case of the children of their friends, that their little brains were easily overworked, and that it was necessary to remedy that—a thing easily done by taking them away from school or getting them change of air. But the poor could not do that; and that fact alone ought to make them very careful not to overpress the children in their schools. Although he believed that something might be done to mitigate their condition by the supply of cheap and wholesome food, yet he did not think that the House ought to turn a deaf ear to the allegations made with regard to over-pressure. He quite admitted that the right hon. Gentleman had made some alterations in the Code, which were both generous and impartial, and he could quite understand his opposing or not giving his assent to a suggestion like that. He was bound to say that he could not indicate the precise remedy to be applied to the evils in question. It was no easy matter to do so in the face of the many complicated details involved; still he thought that they would be forced sooner or later in the direction pointed to in the Motion of his hon. Friend. He did not believe that, as long as they continued steadily to improve the social status of the teachers, and to subject them to a severe test, any such proposal as that of his hon. Friend would at all tend to the deterioration of their system of education. If he did, he would not give even a qualified support to his hon. Friend's Motion; and had it not been that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Edinburgh had cast upon hon. Gentlemen upon those Benches the charge of wishing to retard instead of advance the education of the people, he should not have intervened in this discussion.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, the noble Lord who had just spoken had stated that they subjected children of the class which attended the elementary schools to an examination to which their own children were not submitted. He was not quite sure of that. In his own class he knew that the examinations to which children were subjected were much of the same character. But it was most important that hon. Members should bear in mind that they had not yet got education in this country into such a position that they could say that they had arrived at the point at which the teaching of reading, writing, and arithmetic was secured to the general body of the population; and unless they secured by the payment of Government money that these should be taught, reading, writing, and arithmetic, he feared, would not be learned. When they had the same scale of education as they had in Germany, it might be possible to dispense with examination in elementary subjects; but if they got rid of it now, he believed they would soon return to that state of things which was in existence before Viscount Sherbrooke made his Code, when, although many in the elementary schools were well instructed, many were neglected, and the final result was that the elementary subjects were, by very many children, not learned. He did not believe that they could get rid of individual examination, which he had always regarded as an evil to which they were compelled to submit, inasmuch as the advantages overbalanced the disadvantages of the system. He had, by moving an Amendment at the time, endeavoured to modify to some extent Viscount Sherbrooke's proposal; but he was convinced that examination could not be got rid of, and that, so far as he could gather, was very much the object of the present Motion. At all events that was the general impression, because an educationist in his own district with whom he was acquainted had asked him to go down to the House and "vote for Mr. Talbot's Motion for the abolition of payment by results." That was the light in which the present Motion was

regarded. But he had another objection to urge—namely, that if they were able to make the change, and he was not sure that in a few years hence they might not be able to do so, he should certainly not be in favour of making it in the form which the hon. Member for Oxford University proposed—namely,

"That a larger proportion of the grant now given to public elementary schools should be allotted in the form of a fixed payment on average attendance."

That, he ventured to think, would not be the right mode of proceeding. If there were to be a change, it should be a change from individual examination to an estimate arrived at in the best manner possible of the general character of the school and the general result of the teaching. And on that account he was exceedingly glad that his successors had found themselves able to introduce a merit grant. It was in that direction, he thought, that in the future they might be able to make changes. Although he might appear to be rather contradicting himself, he must make one further remark before he sat down, and it was this. Although he had looked forward to that being the future mode by which they should find out what they got for their money, he thought it would be well that for some time they should let the Code alone. He thought that the vexation and the uncertainty of these constant changes of Code were evils which were not compensated for by any little improvement that was obtained; and he hoped his right hon. Friend (Mr. Mundella), if he remained in his Office—and he trusted the right hon. Gentleman might do so, for if they searched through the country they could not find anyone more earnest or more capable of doing his duty—he would turn a deaf ear to the little improvements and little reforms, and let managers have some notion of the stability of the Code for two or three years' time.

Mr. J. A. CAMPBELL asked the indulgence of the House while he explained very briefly how it was that with much regret he was unable to support the Motion of his hon. Friend (Mr. Talbot). It appeared to him that in the course of the discussion the question had become somewhat involved. Much had been said about the evils of overpressure, and, of course, he felt that those evils were not small. And they had heard of objections to the present system of payment by results. He did not deny that in some respects the present system was most unsatisfactory; but, at the same time, the question now before the House was whether in future they were to give a greater grant for mere attendance, and a smaller grant for what he might call ascertained efficiency. The modes adopted for ascertaining efficiency might be open to question; indeed, it was with regard to those modes that the difficulties to which reference had been made arose. In his opinion, the Motion rather suggested that less attention in future should be paid to ascertaining the efficiency of the schools receiving grants, and that more attention should be paid to the simple fact that there were schools to give grants to. He thought that if the Motion were adopted, there would be a danger of taking away from school managers a great stimulus to make their schools efficient. On that account he was unable to support the Motion.

Mr. MUNDELLA: I cannot help but be satisfied with the tone which has prevailed in this debate, and I am very grateful to hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House for the very fair manner in which they have recognized my desire to relieve the teachers and the children from anything like worry, strain, and over-pressure. I must at the outset, however, say to my noble Friend (Lord George Hamilton) that he must have been looking at a Code of his own, and not at mine, when he said the teachers have no choice of curriculum. As a matter of fact, there are no obligatory subjects now except reading, writing, and arithmetic. These are the only subjects that are compulsory in any school, except that the girls must be taught needlework. It is said that a teacher has absolutely no choice. Well, drawing has been added to the Code; but I think no Member of this House will quarrel with the necessity of taking in what I may call industrial drawing, and that is the drawing which we have now before us. It is not ornamental drawing, it is not drawing introduced with a view of making artists, but with a view of enabling the scholars to make accurate calculations so that the eye and hand may work together, and that our working classes may draw and

appreciate with greater accuracy the manual labour in which they are engaged. But when my noble Friend says—"If you have tested the teacher's certificate what more do you want?" I can only ask my noble Friend to refer to the Duke of Newcastle's Commission, and he will find that in some of the schools where there were the best children there was the worst teaching, because there was no proper test of the result. There must be a test of results, and, after all, the best test of results was an examination. I believe that the annual examination is the very essence of our system, and I do not care what system you have; it will fail if there is not a particle of examination. The American system is mainly defective on that account, and so are many other systems. But at this time of the morning it is quite impossible to answer a tithe of the arguments that have been advanced, and I hope the House will bear with me a few moments while I just refer to the main points brought forward. I may say at once that the Code on the Table is no new departure; there is no change of principle whatever, and there is none in detail. I quite agree with my right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) when he said—"Let the Code alone as far as possible; when you have got a good working Code keep it steady, and do not disturb it any more than you can help." Now, there is no change in the Code of to-day, even of detail, except this—a recognition that small school teachers may group their children into three grades for teaching purposes, as much for their convenience as the children's, and that in all schools we have got the consent of the Treasury—a consent for which I cannot be too thankful—that we may teach drawing as a class subject from one end of the school to the other. Now, I say, no Code was ever so threshed out as the Code we are now working; it was laid on the Table a year in advance; it had the full consideration of this House and the country; it was considered and debated by everybody interested in it; it was brought in in one Session, and in the next it was sanctioned without a single condition of it undergoing the slightest change or modification, so there can be no complaint that the Code has not been well and thoroughly considered. Now, whatever may be the defects of the present Code I may say this for it—that better work has been done under it, better attendance has been secured, better grants have been earned under it, than under any previous Code we have had in this country. All the Motions which appeared on the Paper of to-night respecting the Code were meant as attacks and assaults upon the system of payment by results. That principle has been adopted now for a quarter of a century. It was adopted after the system of capitation grants; practically capitation grants in aid were proved to be an absolute failure. If hon. Members would only turn to the evidence of the Bishop of Manchester given before the Royal Commission, they would find there the statement that out of 300 schools examined, less than 100 did their work properly, and that only one-ninth of the children turned out of those schools were as fairly educated as could be desired. That statement alone was sufficient to show what was the success of the antecedent of the system of payment by results. Whatever may be the merits or demerits of the system of payment by results, it has given a very powerful stimulus to education in this country; it has secured an honest equivalent for the vast expenditure of the State; it has enabled the Education Department to give to all schools, whether under private management or public control, pecuniary aid proportionate to the efficiency of the school. We are told that that principle is not in operation on the Continent. That is quite true; but why is that so? The conditions on the Continent are altogether different to the conditions in this country. There is no other country that I am aware of in which the State stands in the same relation to education that it does in this country. Payments are not measured by results on the Continent, because, as a rule, the State makes no payments. The payments are in the great majority of cases made from local sources to Local Authorities. Wherever grants in aid are made in France they are made exclusively to Public Authorities, and those Public Authorities work under State supervision and central control. In most Continental States there is a bureau of education, and the bureau of education lays down regulations to be enforced in all schools;

it prescribes the methods to be pursued, it prescribes what the time table shall be, and it has a large share in the appointment, in the dismissing, and in the payment of the teachers. Its members are very often *ex officios* of the Local Governing Bodies, and its control is one of the most severe and minute that can possibly be devised. I am quite sure that Englishmen would not submit to such a centralized system as that which prevails in France and other countries on the Continent. We have an illustration of it in the story that the Minister of Education in France could take out his watch and say at any given moment what so many millions of children were then engaged in. We are told, too, that the Minister of Education in Prussia has recently issued a list of 3,000 words assigning the orthography in the Prussian schools, dropping all the superfluous letters. I should be very sorry, as an English Minister, to have to send out such a list, Americanizing, so to speak, the English language. I am sure that any attempt on the part of an English Minister to require our language to be taught phonetically would not meet with any approval in the country. In Prussia the whole cost of education is paid by local taxation; but in this country the Education Department is charged with distributing a large amount of grant to aid local effort, and to secure the most efficient education possible for the mass of the population. You can only do that by laying down certain conditions, and those conditions take the form of a Code. No one can dispute that the money paid is paid very largely to private persons. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. J. G. Talbot) has admitted that one-half of the sum paid by the Treasury goes to the managers of the Church of England schools, who are, after all, private gentlemen, and who are not under any supervision whatever, and are only subjected strictly to the conditions laid down by the Act. Well, surely a vast expenditure such as is made upon education in this country must be subjected to some condition to secure that it is properly applied, and that there is no abuse of it. We are not dealing with a small sum of money. In 1860, when the Revised Code was introduced, the amount was something between £500,000 and £600,000 a-year. But what is the amount now paid for education in Great Britain, paid actually upon the system of payment by results? Including, of course, the South Kensington grant, it is over £4,000,000 a-year, and, with the payment to Ireland, it will be very little short of £5,000,000 a-year. In 10 years hence I believe it will be more than £7,000,000 a-year. Surely we must insure that a vast sum of money like that should be properly applied, and only be meted out for the purpose of good and successful education. We have endeavoured to distribute the fund so as to secure the greatest benefit to the children with the least possible strain on the teacher. I can say that, for my part, I have done everything I could to secure the teacher immunity from any unnecessary labour; I believe I have relieved them from every unnecessary Return — every Return that could possibly be dispensed with I have dispensed with. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. J. G. Talbot) says the present system stimulates too highly, and that, notwithstanding the relaxations we have made, there is too much left to the discretion of the Inspectors—young Inspectors. Now, so far as I am concerned, there has been no patronage exercised during the whole time we have been in Office. I believe that during the five years we have been in Office we have only appointed two Inspectors, and both of them have been most experienced men. We have opened the door to the teachers, we have taken the most capable and the most experienced men from the ranks of the teachers and made them Sub-Inspectors. We have thrown the door open to the whole teachers of the country to enable them to come in on their merits as Inspectors' assistants, with a chance of rising to the higher grade. We have not appointed, since we have been in Office, a single inexperienced man to inspect schools, and I think we have done the best we could to secure the teachers immunity from persons utterly untried and without any knowledge of the work of teaching, and without any sympathy with child life and the position and work of the teachers. The hon. Gentleman says that if we raise the fixed grant we will diminish over-pressure. Well, how does that appear? What statement has he made to support that proposition? I know what will be the result of raising the fixed grant. As my right hon.

Friend the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) has said, the more you raise the fixed grant the less you have to distribute to schools for good educational results. The fact would be that if you raise the fixed grant to 10*s.*, instead of having a larger sum to pay to encourage good educational results, you will only have less than half the sum; and as a result the poor schools—and by poor schools I mean, of course, poorly taught schools—would get more money, and the good schools would get less. I have taken 10*s.* as a basis of the fixed grant, and worked it out so that the whole grant should be what it is to-day. I have applied this test to a number of voluntary schools, omitting altogether board schools. I have taken some that are below fair and some that are fair, good, and excellent. Now, those below fair ought not to exist. There are too many of that class, and there are too many that rank as fair that are not by any means fair, and our children ought not to be compelled to attend such schools. Now the schools below fair will get an advanced grant of something like 10 per cent, and the best schools will get a diminished grant. You bring the two classes of schools so near to an approximation that there would be a great temptation to voluntary school managers all over the country, who are not thorough educationalists, to have poor staffs, poorly paid teachers, poor schools, and small voluntary subscriptions. Now, I put it to the hon. Gentleman (Mr. J. G. Talbot), is that the result he wants? I do not believe that such a result would be to the interest of the voluntary schools. I know there are voluntary schools in all parts of the Kingdom that are as good as schools can be made. Because voluntary school managers make great sacrifices and spend a large sum of money per head on the children, it would be hardly right to deprive them of the grant they got in favour of the miserable schools in the country of which there are too many. We want to encourage better attendance; we want to require from the children a longer attendance, and to require from the managers of schools that the schools shall be better staffed than at present. It is all very well to tell us that payment by result does not exist on the Continent. There are some other things that do not exist on the Continent; there are no pupil teachers on the Continent. Mr. Wild told me the other day that he had been all through Europe and had not seen a pupil teacher. He said that in some schools he had found an adult, a fully certificated teacher, at the head of every class. I do not think that we exactly wish to come to that state of things in this country. I hope the voluntary school managers will see the necessity of keeping a better staff; and the effect of the present Code is to reward their staff properly. Is it desirable that we should take away the stimulus, or diminish it in the least degree? Well, now as to the fixed grant. Mr. Lowe's fixed grant was 4*s.*; my right hon. Friend (Mr. W. E. Forster) raised it to 6*s.*; and when Viscount Sandon came into Office he reduced it from 6*s.* to 5*s.*, and then from 5*s.* to 4*s.* What have we done? We have done exactly what the teachers asked from us. The teachers, in a Memorial which they presented to me soon after I took Office, said—

"Your Memorialists are of opinion that by abolishing the payment *per pass*, and by substituting a payment on the average attendance according to the success at the annual examination, a great evil of the present system will be reduced, while, at the same time, the area of good instruction will be extended. Your Memorialists are also of opinion that while abolishing the payment *per pass*, the individual examination of scholars and the return of the Examination Schedule should be maintained in order to secure thoroughness of instruction and inspection, and to preserve a record of the result."

That is exactly what we have adopted in the Code; we based our own Code on average attendance; and I should like the House, for a moment, to consider what has been the result. The result has been that during the present year I have had to come down to the House—so rapid has been the rise of average attendance—for an increase of the grant by nearly £200,000; and I shall have to ask the House, when I bring in the Educational Estimates, for an additional £300,000. My hon. Friend the Member for Mid Somerset (Mr. R. H. Paget) said that what we were doing was not fair to the voluntary schools. He maintained that payment by results worked with extraordinary hardship upon voluntary schools. I really cannot agree with the hon. Gentleman in that respect, and I would like to show exactly what was the position of the voluntary schools when

Viscount Sandon's Act was passed in 1876. I will not go back to 1870, because that would make the contrast infinitely greater; but I will show what is the contrast between 1876 and the present day. In 1876 there were 12,677 voluntary schools, whilst in 1884, last year, there were 14,580, so that they had increased by over 2,000, and the average attendance had increased by 400,000. But while that increase has been going on, the voluntary subscriptions have decreased by £30,000 or £40,000. That is a remarkable fact. Whilst the number of schools has increased by 2,000, and the attendances by 400,000, the voluntary subscriptions have absolutely decreased by that large amount. And what has been the consequence? Why, whilst in 1876 each child cost £1 13*s.* 5¼*d.*, in 1884 the cost was £1 15*s.* 2*d.*, or an increase of 1*s.* 8¾*d.* In 1876 the voluntary subscriptions were 8*s.* 8½*d.*, whereas in 1884 they were 6*s.* 8½*d.*, and they were 4½*d.* less at the present moment. According to last year's estimate the voluntary subscriptions had diminished 23 per cent per child; and while that reduction has been going on the annual grants have risen from 13*s.* 0¾*d.* to 16*s.* 4¾*d.*, the cost now being 16*s.* 9*d.*—or an increase of 23½ per cent; so that whilst there has been a diminution in the cost of 23 per cent, there has been an increase of grant of 23½ per cent during the past eight years. With these facts before us, how can my hon. Friend (Mr. J. G. Talbot) make this appeal for voluntary schools, which he says have suffered through the system of payment by results? To say that they have suffered by that system is contrary to experience. My experience is that these schools are daily growing, and the need for subscriptions is daily growing less. I am perfectly satisfied that the voluntary schools will, in the future, earn more and cost less to voluntary subscribers. With respect to the over-pressure question, I could deluge the House with evidence which I think would drive it outside the doors of this Chamber. My right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair) has spoken of Scotch experience. How strange it is that Scotch experience should be so different to English experience, and the hon. Member opposite says it is. They have the same system of payment by results in Scotland that we have in this country; and why is it, then, that there is not the same cry of over-pressure? The matter has been considered in Scotland, and Dr. Tuke, of Edinburgh, an authority far higher than Dr. Crichton Browne, has examined the schools in the Scotch capital, and I should like hon. Members to take the trouble to read his reply to Dr. Browne's Report. He speaks of it as like reading a chapter in Mark Twain, and that there is nothing in common sense or reason to justify his statements. We are told there is no freedom of classification, and we are told that although, according to our Minutes, it is possible to withdraw children from a day examination, yet, by other Regulations, we render it impossible for the teachers to avail themselves of that power. But let me tell the hon. Member opposite that during the past year 150,000 children have been withdrawn, and have been paid for, because it has been found that they were not fit to attend the examination. Nearly 6 per cent have been withdrawn—5·60 per cent of the whole number of children. As a matter of fact, instead of there being a cry of over-pressure, I am beginning, at the Education Department, to experience an exactly opposite complaint—a cry of under-pressure. Parents are continually saying that the teachers pass over their children. They say—"We want our children to pass the Standards in order that we may have their services—so that we may avail ourselves of their labour." Seldom a week passes that I have not a complaint from one or other of our Inspectors—something like this—"If you do not look very carefully into this you will have a cry of under-pressure from the parents of the children." Let me read the hon. Member a letter which I have received on this subject. This document has come to me since this Motion has been on the Paper—

"National Union of Elementary Teachers,
"New Courts Chambers,
"57 and 58 Chancery Lane, W.C.
"March 25, 1885.

"To the Rt. Hon. A. J. Mundella, M.P.

"Sir,

"At the last meeting of the Executive of the National Union of Elementary Teachers the following Resolution was unanimously adopted:—

"'That the best thanks of this Executive be, and they are hereby, given to the Rt. Hon. A. J. Mundella, M.P., for the abolition of the Age

Clause and the Examination Schedule in Infant Schools.'

"I was instructed to forward a copy to you, which I do with much pleasure. No single step previously taken by the Department will do more to diminish the over-pressure on dull, delicate, and backward children.

"I am, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"THOMAS E. HELLER,

"Secretary."

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON: Has the right hon. Gentleman seen the Circular of the 8th of April?

MR. MUNDELLA: Yes; I have seen that, and I know exactly how to estimate it. I never quarrel with a little strong language that is used occasionally by teachers, because I know exactly how difficult it is for them on all occasions to appreciate the arrangements that are made, and besides I have been accustomed to dealing with large classes of *employés* for 25 years. I take it, on the whole, the teachers are a class worthy of all respect; and however little they may know it or appreciate it, I have done my best to secure them against the grievances that induced them to use that language. I am sorry to have intruded upon the House for so long; but the fact of the matter is there is so much to be said on this matter that I have been hardly able, consistently with coherence, to compress my observations into the small space of time at my disposal. If we have another opportunity of taking this discussion we shall be able to debate the subject with the Estimates before us, and we shall have a much better opportunity than we have now of going through all the details.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 53; Noes 117: Majority 64.—(Div. List, No. 99.)

House adjourned at a quarter before Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 14*th April*, 1885.

MINUTES.]—*Took the Oath for the First Time*—The Lord Bishop of Llandaff.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Committee*—Tramways (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 1) * (34).

Committee — Report — Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Labourers Act) (No. 1) * (35); Municipal Voters (Relief) * (39); Army (Annual) * (62).

CENTRAL ASIA — RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN — RUSSIAN ADVANCES ON THE MURGHAB.

QUESTION.

EARL DE LA WARR: My Lords, I desire to ask the noble Earl the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs a Question of which I have given private Notice—namely, Whether there is any confirmation of a telegram which appeared in *The Standard* of yesterday, dated from the Camp of the British Mission at Tirpul, the 7th of April, to the effect that the Russians are advancing along the line of the Murghab River?

EARL GRANVILLE: In reply to the noble Earl, I have to state that we are making inquiries on the subject.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: What time does it take to communicate with Sir Peter Lumsden?

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: The last telegram, I observe, has come in four days.

ARMY AND MILITIA RESERVE FORCES.

CONSIDERATION OF THE QUEEN'S MESSAGE.

Order of the Day for the consideration of the Queen's Message of the 26th of March last, read.

Message *considered* accordingly.

EARL GRANVILLE: In rising to make the Motion which stands in my name, I feel that your Lordships will consider, after what took place in "another place" last night, it will not be desirable on this occasion for me to make a statement as to the policy of Her Majesty's Government. At the same time, I may say that steps have been taken which will necessitate some action on the part of the House of Commons, but until that step be taken it will not be right to make any statement in this House; but I will take care when the proper time arrives that a similar declaration shall be made to your Lordships. I believe I should be safe upon this occasion in asking your Lordships to express approval of the Proclamation of Her Majesty. But we think it better to follow the precedent of the late Government, and merely to ask your

Lordships to thank Her Majesty for the information which has been given to us. It will be satisfactory to your Lordships to know that the measure taken under this Proclamation will entirely meet all the requirements which have been made by the Indian Government.

Moved "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, thanking Her Majesty for informing this House that the present state of public affairs and the extent of the demands on the military forces of Her Majesty for the protection of the interests of the Empire having constituted, in the opinion of Her Majesty, a case of great emergency within the meaning of the Acts of Parliament in that behalf, Her Majesty deems it proper to provide additional means for Her Military service, and that, therefore, in pursuance of those Acts, Her Majesty has thought it right to communicate to the House of Lords that Her Majesty is about to cause Her Reserve Force and Her Militia Reserve Force, or such part thereof as Her Majesty shall from time to time think necessary, to be called out for permanent service."—(*The Earl Granville.*)

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, obviously I think there can be no doubt of your unanimous response to the proposal of the noble Earl; and, indeed, if he had asked us to assent to the issuing of the Proclamation our response would, I think, have been given with equal heartiness. As to the noble Earl's observations with which he prefaced his Motion, I will say that I believe that not only the two Houses of Parliament, but the public generally, look with the greatest anxiety for a clear statement of the policy which Her Majesty's Government will think it their duty to pursue. We do not desire to press for it in a manner which will interfere with the interests of the Public Service, or with the very grave decision which it is incumbent upon the Government at this moment to form. Subject to that observation, I will only add that I hope the information which the noble Earl foreshadows may come as early as possible.

Motion *agreed to, nemine dissentiente.*

Ordered, That the said Address be presented to Her Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

NAVY (ADMINISTRATION)—THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL OF THE NAVY. QUESTION.

LORD ORANMORE AND BROWNE asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether there is any truth in the report that the present Accountant General of the Navy, who was only appointed three years ago, is to be compulsorily pensioned, and that a gentleman unconnected with the Admiralty is to be appointed in his place; and, if so, whether this arises from the incapacity of other officials in the Admiralty to fulfil the duties of Accountant General; and whether, unless this is not the case, the appointment of a stranger to that office will not be contrary to precedent, a wrong to the officials in the Admiralty, and a loss of public money?

THE EARL OF NORTHBROOK said, that the way in which the Question of the noble Lord had been put did not give a correct impression as to what had taken place. When Mr. Hamilton, now Sir Robert Hamilton, vacated the office of Accountant General, Mr. Willis, the Deputy Accountant General, was appointed. Mr. Willis was an excellent public servant; but being then above 60 years of age he was appointed on the distinct understanding that after filling the office for three years he should be retired at the option of the First Lord of the Admiralty. That time having arrived, he would now retire, and Mr. Fitzgerald had been appointed to succeed him. Mr. Fitzgerald was not in the Department of the Accountant General, and the noble Lord asked him whether it was not contrary to precedent to appoint a stranger to the Department to the office. It was not so, for the office had frequently been filled by gentlemen who had had no previous connection with the Department. A striking instance was that of Sir Robert Hamilton himself, who was appointed from the Audit Office. So far as the qualifications of Mr. Fitzgerald were concerned, he could speak from personal knowledge, as he had known him for many years in different Departments. When at the War Office in 1861, Mr. Fitzgerald was one of the clerks in charge of the Army Estimates. He was afterwards sent to India to assist in arranging the system of account, having been specially selected for the service; and for many years he filled a responsible office there with great credit to himself and advantage to the public. Subsequently he was chosen to fill a most important office connected with accounts and finance in Egypt. From his own personal knowledge of Mr. Fitzgerald, as

well as from the reports of his conduct both in India and Egypt, he believed that no man in the Public Service was better qualified by experience and general knowledge of accounts than Mr. Fitzgerald. Therefore, he was satisfied that the appointment was very much for the public interest. He was of opinion that where it was possible, consistently with the public interest, appointments such as that under discussion should be given to gentlemen in the Public Service and not to outsiders; but it would be detrimental to the Public Service if it was held that particular appointments were to be filled by gentlemen serving in those particular Departments. As long as an officer was in the Public Service generally his qualifications should be considered, and not merely the qualifications of those within the Department; and, however excellent the officers in the Accountant General's Department were at the present time, he believed that Mr. Fitzgerald, from his experience and general acquaintance with accounts, had claims for the appointment superior to any of them.

LORD ORANMORE AND BROWNE read a statement showing that the precedents as to appointments to the office of Accountant General of the Admiralty were not as stated by the noble Earl, as, with one exception, that office had been filled from officials of old standing in the Admiralty. He thought that Mr. Willis should not have been superseded, as he was quite able and willing to perform the duties of the Department. He would, however, be retired upon a pension of about £1,000 a-year, and, also, should Mr. Fitzgerald retire in a few years, there would again be a pension for him. The noble Earl's statement would go to show that he had made use of an opportunity for providing a snug place for an old friend.

POST OFFICE — TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WITH HONG KONG.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH asked, Whether the attention of Her Majesty's Government has been directed to the fact that the sole method of telegraphic communication with Hong Kong and some other British settlements in the East is by wires passing through a territory in the possession of a foreign Power; and whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to adopt immediate measures to insure the safety of intercourse by electric telegraph with those parts? The noble Viscount said, he was not quite sure whether he was correct in his statement of the facts; but he thought the matter one of sufficient importance to justify him in giving the Government an opportunity of making a statement on the subject.

THE EARL OF DERBY, in reply, said, the noble Viscount was probably aware that there were two alternative lines of telegraphic communication between this country and Hong Kong. One of those lines passed through Russian territory in Siberia and down the Chinese Coast to Hong Kong; the other—the route more generally used—was from England to Singapore, and then through the Straits Settlement to Saigon and thence to Hong Kong. Thus the noble Viscount would perceive that those lines, though they passed through foreign territory, yet did not pass through the territory of the same Power; and that if by any unfortunate event communication by one line was cut off there would still remain the other. He did not, of course, deny the disadvantage of not having a line of communication in their own hands; but he need not point out that there was a material difference between having only one line of communication passing through the territory of a Foreign Power and having two alternative routes passing through different States. There was at the present time under the consideration of the authorities a proposal to make a line direct from Singapore to Hong Kong. That proposal was being considered by the various Departments concerned; but he understood, and, indeed, was authorized by his noble Friend the First Lord of the Admiralty to say, that the Naval Authorities, while not denying that such a line would be useful, did not regard it as of primary urgency, and they considered that the expenditure which would be involved might be more usefully incurred elsewhere. At the same time, that was the opinion of only one of the Departments concerned, and no final decision had been come to by the Government as a whole. But there were two matters that must be considered. In the first place, the expense of maintaining the line between Singapore and Hong Kong would be very

heavy—about £20,000 a-year; in the next place, even if they made that line it would not serve the purpose in view—namely, that of having a line of telegraphic communication that did not pass through foreign territory. Unless they had also an independent line of communication to Gibraltar and Malta, the object of the proposal to create an entirely independent line to Hong Kong would not be obtained.

The Earl of CARNARVON said, that this question of submarine telegraphs ought not to be considered simply and solely on the ground as to whether the line would pay commercially. It must be remembered that these stations were valuable to this country, not only as great commercial *emporia*, but they were great military and naval coaling stations. He did not understand one remark of the noble Earl; he had spoken as if there were no direct submarine telegraph between England, Gibraltar, and Malta. So far as he (the Earl of Carnarvon) understood it, there was such communication, for he himself had seen it at work. He wished to call attention to an important point in connection with this matter; and that was the extreme importance at this particular moment of the Government taking every precaution in their power against these submarine telegraphs being exposed to greater risks than necessary. It should be remembered that most of their commercial transactions at the present time were begun in the first instance by telegraph, and also that nearly all these lines were worked and managed by English capital. Commercially and politically, therefore, they were English property, and deserved every consideration at the hands of the Government. But what he wished more particularly to point out was that these submarine lines were in times of war exposed to special and peculiar risks. While in the development of modern science they could be easily repaired, yet it was necessary that stores of material should be close at hand and available. He sincerely trusted that during a time of peace, when the Government had full opportunity of making preparations, they had taken the necessary steps to secure an available supply of stores. There was not a large stock of telegraphic cable in this country; but it could be manufactured very rapidly when a certain stage of the proceedings had been arrived at. The matter was a delicate one; but he thought it right to remind the House and the country that in 1878, when there were great alarms as to a Russian war, the Russian Government, who were, perhaps, more alive to the circumstances of the case than we generally were, had taken measures for cutting the submarine cables, and for equipping ships for that special purpose. It was said at the time and on good authority, and was generally believed, that there was a carefully elaborated scheme for taking measures against our submarine cables in the Eastern waters. It was quite right to mention these matters now, and he trusted that Her Majesty's Government had not been blind to the difficulty and danger of leaving them unprovided for; but that while they had had the opportunity and a full warning they had taken those steps and those measures which might be necessary to provide against this danger.

The Earl of NORTHBROOK said, that the question to which the noble Earl referred was of a somewhat delicate character, and that if he thought it necessary to bring the matter to the notice of the Government it would have been more advisable to do so by means of a private communication. If by making these remarks the noble Earl meant to imply that those who were responsible for such matters were not alive to their importance, he was quite mistaken. What his noble Friend behind him (the Earl of Derby) had said with regard to the telegraphic communication in question was perfectly correct. No doubt there was a line almost entirely in English hands to Gibraltar and Malta, and so on to Hong Kong and Shanghai. In regard to the route from Singapore to Hong Kong, there were two lines—one through Russia, and the other submarine touching at Saigon. Under the circumstances of the case, it appeared to the Admiralty—that was the advice which they thought it desirable to give to the Colonial Office—that if a subsidy was to be given for the construction of a new line of telegraph, there were other lines of communication of greater importance than this peculiar line. He could assure the noble Earl that he was quite mistaken in supposing that the

Government were not alive to the general subject. He did not understand what had been said by his noble Friend (the Earl of Derby) was intended to dispute that these submarine communications had other importance than that of mere commercial lines, and the Government were by no means blind to that fact.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, that the noble Earl (the Earl of Northbrook) had applied a rather severe measure of interpretation to the language of his noble Friend. In the first place, the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby) not only did not say that there was a submarine line to Gibraltar, but exactly the reverse.

THE EARL OF DERBY was understood to say that he stated, in reply to the noble Viscount (Viscount Sidmouth), that there was no independent line to Gibraltar and Malta.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, that another point on which the noble Earl entirely misunderstood his noble Colleague was on the question whether commercial considerations were to be of predominant weight in these matters. The Secretary of State for the Colonies had distinctly stated, as a ground for not making this submarine line to Hong Kong, that it would cost £20,000 a-year. That was the very commercial consideration which the First Lord of the Admiralty had repudiated. There was a peculiar point with respect to this question of submarine lines; and he did not know whether it had attracted the attention of the noble Earl (Earl Granville)—namely, whether it had been decided that a neutral's duty was fulfilled if he conveyed warlike messages of a belligerent by telegraph through his territories? If there was any doubt on that point, of course the question of submarine lines would become very important. He had heard it raised, and he was not aware whether it had been decided or not. He could easily imagine that if the neutrality of any Power towards us was not very benevolent the difficulty might arise.

House adjourned at a quarter past Five o'clock, to Thursday next, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 14th April, 1885.

MINUTES.] — PRIVATE BILLS (*by Order*) — *Second Reading*—Bexhill Direct Railway *; London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered* — *First Reading* — Gas Provisional Orders (No. 1) * [126].

Second Reading—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) * [120]; Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 5) * [117]; Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 6) * [118]; Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 7) * [119].

Committee—Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) (*re-comm.*) [49] — R.P. [*Thirteenth Night*].

Considered as amended—Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 2) * [107].

Third Reading—Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Orders * [100]; Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 3) * [108], and *passed*.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

LONDON, TILBURY, AND SOUTHEND RAILWAY BILL (*by Order*).

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. RITCHIE said, he hoped that his hon. Friend who had charge of the Bill would be prepared to make some statement before moving the second reading of it.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he thought it would, perhaps, be convenient if he were to say a few words in introducing the Bill, on the back of which his name appeared. The Bill itself seemed to have met with a certain amount of opposition upon more than one point. In the first place, considerable opposition was raised to one of the clauses of the Bill—Clause 8—in consequence of a proposal to deal with a certain disused burial ground, which came within the present limits of deviation, in regard to lands acquired by the Railway Company. It was an important question whether at the present moment, in regard to this power of purchase, seeing that the Railway Company had acquired it before the passing of the Disused Burial Grounds Act of last year, they were not legally entitled to exercise it without any fresh instructions being

contained in a separate Act of Parliament to that effect. The Company, however, had inserted this 8th clause in their Bill with a view, if possible, of saving the litigation which would probably arise on their asserting the right to exercise their legal purchase rights over the ground which had been thus acquired, and which was acquired prior to the passing of an Act which would otherwise have certainly made it illegal to use them. He found that considerable opposition had been raised in the House to the proposal to refer that clause to a Select Committee; but he ventured to think that that was a tribunal where it might be more fairly dealt with, and the whole question more properly considered, than in the House itself. The Railway Company, however, in view of the Notices of opposition which had been given, had considered it best, under the circumstances, to abandon Clause 8 altogether, and thus to leave themselves in the position they were in before the Bill was introduced in regard to the exercise of any legal power they possessed in reference to this land. Therefore, they were prepared to abandon any fresh powers the Bill proposed to give them for utilizing the land they had acquired by purchase, apart from any legal opposition that might be raised against their right to utilize it. That was the position in which the Bill now stood. The Railway Company would remain with any legal powers they now possessed for dealing with this property; but they did not propose to ask Parliament, by this 8th clause, to override those legal rights, and to give them distinct powers under the Bill. That being the case, with regard to Clause 8, he might mention that there was another opposition raised against the Bill in regard to one of the other clauses with reference to the stopping-up of a footpath in the parish of Leigh, near Southend. He might explain that by the Bill, which was an Omnibus Bill, the Company proposed to close a certain level crossing situated on the property of Messrs. Wells and Perry. At the time of the passing of the Act of 1875—the London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Act of that year—all public rights whatever were extinguished with regard to this level crossing, and the only right that was maintained in 1875 was the private user of the footpath by Messrs. Wells and Perry for the purposes of access to their property. So distinctly was that the case that the Railway Company had the power of closing the road at the present moment by putting up gates, and actually prohibiting the use of the road to all persons except the persons employed by Messrs. Wells and Perry. The Company had now acquired the land of Messrs. Wells and Perry, to which this right of way belonged, and they proposed to do away with what he believed everybody in the House would consider to be a most dangerous mode of crossing a railway. They proposed to do away with the level crossing altogether. Having become possessed of the land, and, consequently, of the rights reserved to Messrs. Wells and Perry under a case decided in 1875 by purchasing the whole of the land and the right of user, they proposed, to a certain extent, to improve the safeguards of the public by abolishing what had always been considered a most dangerous mode of passing a railway. He presumed that the objection which had been taken to this proposal was that this road, in consequence of having been left open for the purposes of Messrs. Wells and Perry since 1875, had been used by the fishermen and other people who lived close by on the other side of the railway, and who were able to pass by means of this crossing to the seashore for the purposes of their business. But there seemed to be some confusion in the Petition of these persons as to whether the right of way which the fishermen desired to have kept open for themselves was not a public carriage road and highway, and whether, in point of fact, they did not refer to another road not many yards further which had always been of a public character, and was at the present moment a public carriage way, and which it was not proposed to alter in the least as a public carriage way and highway. There was some doubt whether the Petition of the fishermen referred to that carriage way, or to this foot road which had been absolutely a private road since the decision that was given in 1875, and since the Railway Bill of 1875 was passed. Whether that was so or not, and whether this confusion really did exist in regard to this particular level crossing which the Railway Company proposed to abolish, even if a public right had

existed over it before the passing of the Act of 1875—and there were considerable doubts in regard to that matter —those public rights were clearly and entirely abolished by the passing of that Act. The Railway Company set forth in their statement the judgment and opinion of Lord Bramwell, and Mr. Justice Amphlett. Lord Bramwell said that all rights of the public over these footways were extinguished, and if there were any other public right of way over them it was gone; but the private right of Messrs. Wells and Perry remained. Mr. Justice Amphlett said the Act appeared to have left the right of way granted by agreement entirely untouched; but it did prevent the general public from having a right of way over that road, and the fact of the Company having the right of closing the road against the public, except against Messrs. Wells and Perry, by putting up gates and stopping the public from using them was conclusively shown; and, therefore, since 1875 the public had had no right whatever to use this road. By the purchase of the rights of Messrs. Wells and Perry the Railway Company were now entitled to close and abolish this level crossing altogether. He believed that was the only point on which there could be any opposition raised to the second reading of the Bill. He would remind the House that it was very seldom the House consented to refuse the second reading of a Private Bill in the House itself; and if the Petitioners could show that they had legal rights outside the decision of the Judges, and which would override that decision, a Select Committee was the proper tribunal before whom they ought to be heard. It was idle to say that they came before the House pleading *in formâ pauperis*, because as poor fishermen they were unable to incur the expense of appearing before the Committee, seeing that they claimed this road as a highway, and one of the Petitioners was the Surveyor of Highways for this particular parish of Leigh, and, therefore, the cost of opposing the Bill would not fall upon the fishermen; but, he apprehended, it would fall upon the general rates of the district. Under these circumstances, believing that, as far as the Petitioners were concerned, they had no real *locus standi* at all, their rights, if they ever had any, having been entirely abolished by the Act of 1875—seeing, therefore, that they had no *locus standi* against the Bill, he asked the House not seriously to reject the second reading of the Bill at the instance of the present opponents; but if there was any doubt upon the point that they would send the Bill to the only tribunal where that doubt would be properly considered and decided. It certainly could not be dealt with in the House upon the second reading of the Bill, and could only be dealt with by a properly constituted Select Committee upstairs. He begged to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

Mr. RITCHIE said, the statement of his hon. Friend showed that the course he had adopted was a more convenient one than the one which he had at first contemplated, because he had now made a very important statement as to what was proposed to be done with the Bill if the House consented to read it a second time. His hon. Friend said that it was very seldom the House refused to read a Private Bill a second time; but he (Mr. Ritchie) would remind his hon. Friend that it was very seldom a Private Bill proposed to set aside a Public Act of Parliament; and, therefore, the opposition which had been put down against the second reading of the Bill was, he thought, amply justified by the novel proposal contained in the measure to repeal, practically, for the purposes of the Bill, a Public Act of Parliament passed so recently as last Session. He had hoped, from an intimation he had received, that his hon. Friend who had moved the second reading of the Bill would have made such a statement as to what was proposed to be done by the promoters of it as would have rendered it unnecessary for him to trouble the House with any remarks, and would have prevented him from being under the necessity of taking the opinion of the House upon the second reading of the measure. Unfortunately, the statement which his hon. Friend had made was not of so satisfactory a character as to enable him to accept it as sufficient to induce him to withdraw the opposition he had placed upon the Paper to the second reading of the Bill. What was it that his hon. Friend told the

House? He told them that the promoters of the Bill, having inserted in the measure a clause setting aside for the purpose of the Bill an Act of Parliament — namely, the Disused Burial Grounds Act, proposed now to withdraw that clause, and to do without the clause which was proposed under it in defiance of the Act of Parliament. That was practically what his hon. Friend said. [Mr. Warton: No, no!] He (Mr. Ritchie) did not wish to misrepresent his hon. Friend or the promoters of the Bill; but what his hon. Friend said was this—that as there had arisen, in the minds of the promotersof the Bill, doubts whether the Disused Burial Grounds Act did not prevent them from doing that which they desired to do, they had inserted in the Bill a provision which would enable them to do a certain thing which the Disused Burial Grounds Act distinctly prevented them from doing.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that was not what he had said. He was very sorry to interrupt his hon. Friend; but perhaps he might be allowed to state what it was that he had really said—namely, that the Railway Company, having, as they believed, a legal power acquired before the passing of the Act of 1884, were of opinion that they were in a position to do without any fresh Act of Parliament; but that as it might lead to expensive litigation, and as they wished to avoid such expensive litigation, they had inserted this clause in the Bill in order to make the question distinctly clear. However, as the clause was objected to they proposed to abandon it, and they would be placed simply in the position in which they stood before the Bill was introduced in regard to any legal rights they possessed and were prepared to exercise. If those legal rights did not exist they would not be in a position to deal with this particular burial ground; but if they did exist then their position would not be affected by anything contained in the present measure.

Mr. RITCHIE said, that was precisely what he had stated, and he was glad to have elicited this further speech from his hon. Friend, seeing that it fully confirmed the accuracy of his (Mr. Ritchie's) previous remarks. His hon. Friend said that the promoters of the Bill were in doubt, when they brought in the measure, whether the disused Burial Grounds Act did not prevent them from making use of this particular site; and in order to set aside any doubt on the matter they introduced a clause in the Bill confirming the power they desired to obtain. Then, finding that their proposal was opposed, they now said that they would withdraw that provision, and do a certain thing without the authority of an Act of Parliament which they desired to do with the authority of an Act of Parliament. As to the question whether there was any doubt in regard to the powers the Railway Company proposed to take under this Bill, he wished to call the attention of the House to the manner in which the subject had been mentioned in the Preamble of the Company's Bill. The Bill said—

"And whereas by reason of the Disused Burial Grounds Act, 1884, the Company are prevented from dealing with the said lands for the purposes of the said Acts of 1882, 1883, and 1884, and it is expedient that, subject to the provisions of this Act, the said lands and the Company in respect thereof should be exempted from the provisions of the Disused Burial Grounds Act, 1884."

It would be seen, therefore, that, so far from the Company promoting the Bill being in any doubt as to whether the Disused Burial Grounds Act prevented them from doing what they desired to do, they expressly stated in the Preamble of their Bill that they were prevented by that Act from dealing with the said lands for the purposes of the Acts of 1882, 1883, and 1884. So much, then, for the doubts which had been expressed upon that subject. Under the circumstances, he was not disposed to rest satisfied with the proposal now made by the promoters of the Bill, because he desired, in the interests of his constituents, to preserve this piece of ground from being built over by the Railway Company; and although his hon. Friend said that if they had not got the power already and were to proceed to build upon this plot of land they would be liable to be stopped, he wanted to know what sort of position the poor of that locality would be in if they attempted to bring an action against a powerful Railway Company for covering in a piece of ground which an Act of Parliament said should not be covered in? Under the circumstances, he was sorry that he should be compelled to detain the House for a few

minutes while he gave some explanation as to what it was this Railway Company proposed to do. But, in the first instance, he desired to say one word in reference to the Disused Burial Grounds Act of last Session. The object with which that Act was passed was to prevent buildings from being erected on disused burial grounds except for the purposes of a church or chapel; and the reason why that Bill was passed was that it was considered necessary, in the interests of public decency, to prevent the scandals which had occurred on other occasions in removing bodies from burial grounds acquired by public Companies with a view of being built over. There was also the question of the sanitary condition of buildings erected on such ground; and, further, the necessity of retaining, as far as possible, the very few open spaces which were now left in the Metropolis for the benefit of the public. He might say, in reference to this particular open space, that it was not a large one. It was only about 100 feet square; but it was situated in a locality so dense that even 100 feet square was of vast importance to the people occupying it. It therefore became of essential importance that it should be protected and rendered free from the encroachments of a Railway Company or of any other persons. The present Bill proposed to set aside the Act of Parliament which was passed last year, and to enable the Railway Company, first of all, to purchase this land—in regard to which he had no quarrel—in the parish of St. Mary's, Whitechapel, for purposes connected with the proposed railway delineated on the deposited plans, and forming the site of the burial ground of a community known as the "Seventh Day Baptists." One of the places proposed to be acquired was, in fact, not a burial ground, but a chapel. He did not object to the purchase of the chapel; but what he did object to was the purchase of the small piece of ground connected with the chapel and school buildings. He might point out that the Railway Company said not a word about this being a burial ground, although, as a matter of fact, a large number of persons were interred there. He now came to the point with which he had started in the opening part of his speech—namely, the attempt which was made by the Railway Company to set aside a Public Act of Parliament by the provisions of a Private Bill. He was sure the House would agree with him that every attempt of this kind ought to be watched with extreme jealousy, and that the House of Commons ought not lightly to assent to the insertion of any such provision in a Private Bill. It was obvious that such a provision might slip through the House of Commons accidentally if the progress of Private Bills was not carefully watched; and he might say that it was entirely by accident he had discovered that this provision was contained in the Bill at all. He asked the House to see what the effect of sanctioning provisions of this kind would be. The Disused Burial Grounds Act was passed in order to restrict the facilities that might be given to Railway Companies for acquiring grounds of this nature. The effect of the Disused Burial Grounds Act was to decrease the value of all such grounds; and therefore it was obvious that a Railway Company would be desirous of getting hold of land so lowered in value, seeing it could be acquired by the Company at a comparatively small cost. It was said that this was a hardship upon the proprietors of land, and he confessed that he sympathized with the proprietors; but he could not at all recognize their claim to sell this particular plot of land as a justifiable one. Burial grounds that had been filled and closed ought not to be looked upon any longer as the private property of any living persons. Such burial grounds, after they were filled and closed, were not the property of the living, but of the dead, and they ought not to be treated as goods and chattels to be sold to the highest bidder. The Railway Company said that they had entered into an agreement for the purpose of acquiring this property in May, 1884, before the Disused Burial Grounds Act passed; but although they might have entered into an agreement to purchase before the Act was passed, they did so with their eyes open, because the Bill had been read a second time practically without opposition, in March, 1884, two months before the Railway Company entered into any agreement to purchase at all; and, therefore, any loss they might now allege that they had sustained ought not to be considered by the House.

Something had been said in reference to the Railway Company having a right to build over this land, and it was contended that that right was contained in Clause 5 of the Act. When he turned to Clause 5, he did not see that there was the smallest ground on which the Railway Company could take their stand for claiming any such right of exemption. Clause 5 simply said that nothing in the Act contained should apply to a burial ground sold or disposed of under the authority of an Act of Parliament. His hon. Friend had not told the House, nor did he pretend to say, that this burial ground had been disposed of under the authority of any Act of Parliament; and, unless that were so, it was impossible to contend that it came within the exception. He was, therefore, driven to the conclusion, looking at the words of the clause, and also at the provisions of the present Bill, which substantially said that the Railway Company were prevented from using this ground in consequence of the provisions of the Disused Burial Grounds Act of 1884, that what the Railway Company proposed to do was to withdraw Clause 8 from the Bill, and then to proceed to carry out their intentions without it, and to build over this land in defiance of the Act of Parliament. He hoped the House would not be led away by any such attempt, on the part of the Railway Company, from seeing the great importance of providing that this piece of land, in this densely-crowded neighbourhood, should be retained as an open space. He trusted that the House would not rest satisfied with the assurance which had been given by his hon. Friend; and he would, therefore, ask the House to negative the second reading of the Bill. He begged to move—

"That this House declines to assent to the Second Reading of a Private Bill which proposes to set aside the provisions of 'The Disused Burial Grounds Act, 1884.'"

COLONEL MAKINS said, he rose to second the Amendment; and, although he was not concerned in the point which had been raised by his hon. Friend, he was certain that there was a great deal of force in what his hon. Friend had said. The Bill was, unfortunately, one which not only interfered with the rights of the dead, referred to by his hon. Friend, but it also made a wanton attack upon the rights of the living. The proposal to do away with what was called a level crossing at Leigh was one which, if carried out, would involve an exceptional hardship upon a body of men who were deserving of the deepest sympathy. Leigh was a small fishing village near Southend, and he might fairly describe it as a village steeped in poverty. In 1875 the Railway Company stole a march upon these fishermen, and got a clause inserted in their Act of Parliament to which attention had already been drawn. Fortunately, that clause in the Act of 1875 only affected a footway; whereas the road now in question was a highway which had been used from time immemorial for the convenience of the people of the locality, and which formed a road between the wharf and the town. It was also an important road from the town for the supply of drinking-water, obtained from a public well upon the other side of the station; and if this road were stopped, and no bridge were constructed over the railway, the result would be that the fishermen and the general public would have to travel two or three times the distance they had now to go, by way of the station yard, and every woman and child who wished to obtain a little water would have to make the same detour in order to obtain access to the well. He quite admitted that the House was not in the habit of discussing details of this kind on the Motion for the second reading of a Private Bill; but he pleaded, as his hon. Friend the Member for West Essex (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) suggested that he would, *in formâ pauperis*, on behalf of these poor men. No doubt, it was the fact that the Petition was signed by the Surveyor of Highways; but he did not think that when that gentleman signed it he had any idea of committing the body he represented to any expense; and if the inhabitants of Leigh were compelled to appear before a Committee upstairs, the rate which would have to be made in order to meet the expenses would be a very serious burden indeed. He therefore hoped the House would not allow the Bill to be read a second time, unless his hon. Friend the Member for West Essex was prepared, on the part of the promoters, either to abandon this clause, as far as it related to the level crossing at Leigh, or to construct a bridge over the line in

order to give proper access over the railway. The road had been an open one, and it had been used ever since the line was constructed in 1852; and although he knew perfectly well, from personal experience, how very objectionable level crossings were, he did not think this could be described as a dangerous level crossing, because a train, on approaching it on the one side, was driven at a slackened speed, while on the other side it was brought to a standstill. During all the years the line had been open there had only been three fatal accidents, one of which happened to a person connected with the working of the line; so that it could hardly be described as a dangerous level crossing. But under any circumstances he contended that these poor people should not be compelled to go to the expense of a costly opposition to the Bill for the purpose of obtaining the concession they desired from the Railway Company, which concession was to them a matter almost of life and death. He would, therefore, second the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ritchie).

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House declines to assent to the Second Reading of a Private Bill which proposes to set aside the provisions of 'The Disused Burial Grounds Act, 1884,'"—(*Mr. Ritchie,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. BRYCE said, he had placed a Notice on the Paper of his intention to move—

"That, in the opinion of this House, Railway Companies ought not to be permitted to acquire open spaces existing in crowded districts of London except upon the terms of their undertaking to provide in the same neighbourhood other open spaces of equal area available for the recreation of the people."

He should have persevered with his opposition to the Bill if there had been anything left in it which tended to take away those open spaces from the people which he was anxious to preserve; and his hon. Friend the Member for Brighton (Mr. Hollond) had placed a Notice on the Paper for the rejection of the Bill on a similar ground. His hon. Friend the Member for Brighton had brought in a Bill last Session to prevent disused burial grounds from being built over; and it was conceived that this was an attempt on the part of the Railway Company, in the form in which they had brought in the Bill, to override the decision arrived at by Parliament in the passing of that Act. If the Railway Company had persisted in moving their Bill in the form in which it was originally brought in—that was to say, if they had insisted upon retaining the 8th clause, his hon. Friend and himself would have continued to offer a strenuous opposition to the Bill. But the Railway Company, recognizing the force of their objections, and seeing that the House was asked to set aside the provisions of an Act passed last year, had withdrawn the clause to which objection was raised; and in the Bill, as it now stood, he could find nothing which affected in any way the Disused Burial Grounds Act, or anything that took away any open space in the Metropolis. On the contrary, the Railway Company had, through the hon. Baronet opposite, who had moved the second reading of the Bill, given an explicit undertaking to the House to strike out Clause 8; and, under those circumstances, it appeared to him that his hon. Friend the Member for Brighton (Mr. Hollond) and himself had substantially obtained all they desired. It was now perfectly recognized by the Railway Company that open spaces in the Metropolis were not to be taken, and that the Act of last year was not to be overriden. Under the circumstances, he failed to see what was to be gained by continuing their opposition to the Bill. He had listened to the remarks of the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Ritchie) in order to see if there was any additional reason which should induce the House to throw out the Bill; but he altogether failed to find in the speech of the hon. Member any suggestion that the power, if any, of the Railway Company to take this burial ground would be diminished by the rejection of the Bill. The case stood thus. The Railway Company contended that they already had power to take certain land, and to build upon it, and that power was entirely irrespective of whether the House passed the Bill or rejected it. If the House rejected the Bill, the question of the burial ground would not be one whit the more safe than if the House con-

sented to pass it. Under those circumstances, he could not see that any question was involved in which the interests of the poor of London arose, and nothing would be gained by maintaining an opposition to the measure. Therefore, altogether apart from the question raised by the hon. and gallant Member opposite (Colonel Makins), he desired, on behalf of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Hollond) and himself, to say that they were content to withdraw their opposition, that opposition having been completely met, its propriety admitted, and its objects attained, by the course which had been taken by the promoters of the Bill.

Mr. GREGORY said, the House would see that the Bill, with the clause to which objection had been taken withdrawn from it, made no difference whatever in the position of the parties with regard to the question of the burial ground. If the Railway Company possessed any rights, they would have them whether this Bill passed or not; and, therefore, the Bill did not affect the question. As to the level crossing, which had just been referred to by the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Bryce), it appeared to be pretty clear that the Company did acquire certain rights under their Act of 1875, as against the public, to stop up a certain road, simply reserving a private right over the roadway. It was decided by the highest authority that that was the only right preserved, and that right the Company had now acquired under a deed of conveyance. As against the public, therefore, the Company had the right of stopping up this road. It might be a question whether that was desirable or not; but it was not a question that could be discussed there. If any improper course had been taken by the Railway Company, it was a question for a Select Committee upstairs to decide; and if the Company were taking away the rights of the public, without due cause, and without rendering them a proper equivalent or compensation, the Committee would have power to grant the costs of opposition to all of the parties who appeared before them, when the question was raised. He thought the parties ought to remain satisfied with that, and that no substantial ground had been shown for rejecting the Bill on the second reading.

Mr. WARTON quite agreed with the hon. Member for East Sussex (Mr. Gregory) that nothing had been shown by those who were opposing the Bill which should induce the House to depart from the ordinary and established rule of referring measures of this kind to a Select Committee. When questions were raised which were of considerable importance, it was impossible that they could be settled in a hurried debate in that House; and the House would not, therefore, be justified in departing from its ordinary rule. Two points had been brought forward as grounds of opposition to the Bill—first, that the Bill proposed to build over a burial ground in defiance of an Act of Parliament passed only last year; and, secondly, that the Railway Company proposed to shut up a public right of way. In regard to the first point, the hon. Baronet the Member for West Essex (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) had explained the exact position of the matter in the most fair and candid manner. If he had desired to be uncandid, he might have stated simply that the Company desired to withdraw Clause 8; but the hon. Baronet had stated with the utmost fairness that the Company had decided to stand upon their legal rights, unaffected by the Disused Burial Grounds Act of last year. He wished only to say, in regard to that Disused Burial Grounds Act, that he felt it his duty to oppose that Act when it was before that House in the shape of a Bill, and the ground upon which he opposed it was that it was calculated injuriously to affect the rights of property. No doubt before it passed there was nothing to prevent this Railway Company, or any other Railway Company, from entering into a contract for the purchase of any land whatsoever. In this case the Railway Company appeared to have entered into a contract long before the Act of last Session was passed, and any advantage which they had thereby gained they were entitled to retain now. He thought the House was indebted to the hon. Baronet for having stated, unquestionably, with the utmost fairness, that the Company proposed to stand upon their legal rights. No additional rights were now proposed to be given to the Company by this Bill; and there was no reason on that account, therefore, why the House should reject the second

reading of the Bill. As to the other point—the disputed right of way—it was quite clear, if he understood the statement of the hon. Baronet, that for the last 10 years the Railway Company had exercised the power, whenever they chose to enforce it, of stopping, by putting up the gates or otherwise, the right of way of anybody over this level crossing, except the persons employed by Messrs. Wells and Perry. That statement of the hon. Baronet had not been contradicted; and if the Company possessed that right, no mere sentimental question of the privilege of a number of poor men to enjoy access to an easier way of going to fish should be allowed to open a door to every kind of spoliation. He considered that both grounds of opposition had failed; and he had only one word more to say. He was glad that his hon. and learned Friend the Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Bryce), together with the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Hollond), who passed the Act of last year, had come forward to say that they were content with the Bill in the form which it now assumed.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put.

Bill read a second time, and *committed.*

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

THE PRINCE AND PRINCESS OF WALES —THE ROYAL VISIT TO IRELAND— RIOT AT MALLOW.

MR. O'DONNELL: I beg to give Notice that on Thursday I shall ask the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether his attention has been called to the circumstances in which a large body of the people of Mallow and Cork, accompanied by the Member of Parliament for the borough, while peacefully awaiting the arrival of the Prince of Wales, were violently assaulted and driven from the station by the police and other agents of Her Majesty's Government; whether the excuse for this violation of personal rights is that bands of music were expected to play Irish national airs on the arrival of their Royal Highnesses; whether the Prince of Wales gave any intimation that he regarded Irish national airs and similar manifestations of Irish national sentiment as insults to be repressed by force; and, if so, why is His Royal Highness visiting Ireland?

QUESTIONS.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (SCOTLAND)—SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION IN CAITHNESS.

DR. CAMERON asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether it is a fact that part of the parish of Bowar, Caithness, with about forty children of school age, has no school accommodation within three miles; whether, in consequence of a Petition from the inhabitants and ratepayers in 1882, an Inspector was sent down to visit the district, and report to the Department, and that his Report was in favour of a school being built; and, whether the School Board has yet taken any steps to carry out this recommendation; and, if not, whether the Department intend taking any action to secure the erection of the school which their Inspector reported as necessary?

MR. MUNDELLA: Yes, Sir; the facts are as stated in the hon. Member's Question. The Department wrote to the School Board in February asking them what they meant to do in the way of supplying the necessary accommodation. No answer has yet been received, and the Department wrote again on the 1st of April requiring an answer within a fortnight. We will take care that the educational deficiencies of the locality shall be supplied.

INDIA—ADEN HARBOUR.

MR. NORWOOD asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether the attention of the Indian Government has been called to the necessity for dredging Aden Harbour; and, if so, what steps are being taken to carry it out; and, whether it is true that the official account of receipts and expenditure of the Aden Port Fund for the year 1883-4, as published in *The Bombay Gazette*, shows a considerable amount at the credit of the Fund, and a large surplus for the year; and, if so, whether the Government will devote the said amount at credit and the annual surplus, after paying the expenses of the Port, to the dredging of the harbour?

MR. J. K. CROSS: The question of deepening the Harbour of Aden by means of dredging has for some time

engaged the attention of the Secretary of State and of the Governments of Bombay and India; and a dredger has been at work since January, 1883. The accounts of the Port Fund to the end of the official year, 1883-4, show an accumulated balance of Rs. 2,04,728. The balance of the year ending March, 1884, amounted to Rs. 62,532. The question of the creation of a Port Trust to carry out the improvements of the Harbour of Aden is now under consideration.

LANDLORD AND TENANT (IRELAND)—TURF RIGHTS.

MR. LEA asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If his attention has been called to words of Mr. Justice O'Hagan upon the Turf question, reported in *The Freeman's Journal* of March 19th, as follows:—

"There would be nothing more desirable than some statutory power of arbitrating between landlord and tenant as regards Turf rights, because it is easy to see they would be the source of heart-burnings hereafter;"

and, if the Government will undertake Legislation which the head of the Land Commission states to be so "very desirable?"

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am aware that the question of turf rights is one about which considerable interest has been felt; but the Government have no intention of bringing in any measure on the subject this Session.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (ENGLAND AND WALES)—CROYDON SCHOOL BOARD.

MR. GRANTHAM asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether, in consequence of the opinions of the Law Officers of the Crown in reference to the position of the School Board of Croydon that immediate Legislation is necessary to remedy the omission in the Education Acts of any provision to enable School Boards elected by a parish to continue to act as the School Board for the same area when it is afterwards created a Municipal Borough, he will at once bring in a Bill to remedy such omission, and hasten its passage through this House and the House of Lords; or, what other steps he proposes to take, or would advise the School Board of Croydon to take, to enable it to continue its duties, and to obtain its necessary funds from the Municipal authorities of the town?

MR. MUNDELLA: The opinion of the Law Officers has been obtained in this case, to the effect that, by reason of the Charter creating the municipal borough of Croydon, the School Board for the parish has no longer jurisdiction, and that a School Board must be set up for the borough. But in order to settle some legal doubts legislation is required. I am prepared to introduce a Bill for the purpose of settling these difficulties, and this Bill will be introduced at once, and carried through as soon as possible. In the meantime, I understand that the Municipal Authorities will pay the precept to the existing School Board, in order that no difficulty may arise in carrying on the schools. I think it right to add that the Town Council and Town Clerk have shown the utmost desire to facilitate the settlement of this question.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (REDISTRIBUTION) BILL—THE WIMBLEDON DIVISION.

MR. GRANTHAM asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether the parish of Mitcham has been omitted from the list of parishes in the Wimbledon Division by intention or by mistake, as it is within the limit of the proposed division?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: The parish of Mitcham, which is outside the Metropolitan area, forms part of the Croydon Petty Sessional Division; and it will be seen, on reference to the Schedule, that it is proposed that the Wimbledon Division of the county of Surrey shall contain "the Sessional Division of Croydon (except so much as is within a district of the Metropolis)."

MADAGASCAR—POSTAL COMMUNICATION.

MR. BAXTER asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If communications have been received from the British missionaries and residents in Antananarivo, Madagascar, complaining of the stoppage of their incoming mails, of the neglect of the authorities in Mauritius to forward their letters, and of their isolation in this respect since British ships of war have left the station; and, if steps will be

taken to provide a remedy for this state of matters?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: No communications have as yet been received at the Foreign Office of the nature referred to; but I believe that a representation on the subject is about to be addressed to Her Majesty's Government.

SPAIN—COMMERCIAL NEGOTIATIONS —DECLARATION OF DECEMBER 21, 1884.

MR. CARTWRIGHT asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, When the Commercial 'Modus Vivendi' negotiated with Spain will come into operation?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: By the Declaration of December 21, 1884, the Spanish Government engaged, subject to the approval of the Spanish Legislature, to grant most favoured nation treatment to Great Britain as soon as Parliament shall have given to Her Majesty's Government the necessary authority to extend the lower half of the alcoholic scale from 26 degrees to 30 degrees. The Spanish Bill passed the Cortes on the 28th ultimo. The date when the contemplated arrangement will take effect will be settled between the two Governments as soon as Parliament has given the authority, and due notice will be given.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS— RETURNS.

MR. BULWER asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is a fact that the number of soldiers serving at home admitted to hospital for venereal disease has, during the past year, largely increased, and is still increasing; and, whether he has any objection to lay upon the Table of the House a Return similar in form and detail to, and in continuation of, that presented to the House on the 3rd of March, 1884, showing the number of soldiers admitted to hospital for venereal disease since the end of the year 1883?

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER: There has been an increase of admissions to hospital for the cause referred to in the districts formerly protected from 110 per 1,000, in 1883, to 135 per 1,000 in 1884. The Return in continuation of that presented in 1884 can be given if the hon. and learned Member will move for it.

MR. CAVENDISH-BENTINCK: I wish to ask, whether, in the Return about to be laid upon the Table, the War Office will distinguish between the various forms of venereal disease, so as to show the proportions in which the soldiers have been affected during the past year?

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER: I will make inquiry.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—AMALGAMATION OF NEWPORT AND WESTPORT UNIONS, CO. GALWAY—COMPENSATION TO OFFICERS FOR ABOLITION OF OFFICE.

MR. HEALY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, in view of the order for the amalgamation of Newport Union with Westport from 29th September next, it is proposed that the Newport officers should receive no allowance or compensation upon abolition of office, Can he refer to any instance where civil servants whose offices have been abolished have been so harshly treated; and, whether, in view of the Poor Law Act, 1 and 2 Vic, c. 56, ss. 16 and 33, it is competent to dismiss these officers without superannuation or compensation; and, if so, will any legislative steps be taken to prevent such hardship?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Local Government Board have been advised that the officers of the Newport Union cannot, either by statute or at Common Law, be granted allowances or compensation on the abolition of their offices, which is involved in the amalgamation of that Union with Westport. It would, however, appear reasonable that some compensation should be given; and a clause to the effect might very properly be inserted in the Union Officers Superannuation Bill, which has long been under the consideration of Parliament, and which the Government would be prepared to introduce if there was any prospect of the opposition being abandoned which has hitherto obstructed its progress.

MR. HEALY: Might I ask whether this, being, as the right hon. Gentleman says, a hard case, and there being no prospect, as he says, of the Bill he refers to being passed, the Government will introduce a short Bill dealing with the matter, which, of course, would receive general assent?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I did not say that there was no chance that the Bill would pass.

MR. HEALY: There is not a ghost of a chance.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: But if there was any indication that opposition would not be offered to it the Bill would be introduced.

MR. HEALY gave Notice that unless a short Bill dealing with this case of exceptional hardship affecting 20 officers was introduced he would call attention to the matter very strongly on the Vote for the Local Government Board.

EGYPT—ZEBEHR PASHA.

MR. GORST asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, What were the respective dates at which the Government of Gibraltar was directed to prepare for the reception of Zebehr Pasha, and at which he was landed at Gibraltar; whether the Ordinance to authorise his detention in custody was made and published subsequently to his being landed; whether the Ordinance, as published, bore a date prior to that on which it was in fact made; and, what prevented the Ordinance being made before Zebehr Pasha was landed, and with that object it was ante-dated?

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY: The Governor was directed by telegram on the 25th of March to prepare for Zebehr's reception. Zebehr landed at Gibraltar on the 30th of March. The Ordinance was passed on the 27th of March, and its publication was reported by the Governor on the 30th of March, the day of the landing. It is clear, therefore, that the Ordinance was not ante-dated.

MR. GORST: Can the hon. Gentleman say, whether it is not a fact that this Order was never published in Gibraltar until some hours after Zebehr Pasha had landed?

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY: No, Sir. We received a communication from the Governor on the 30th, at 6 o'clock, stating that the Ordinance had been published. He does not say at what hour.

MR. GORST: Then I will ask again whether it is not a fact that the Ordinance was not published until several hours after Zebehr Pasha had landed, when it was published in an unusual and unprecedented manner?

MR. O'DONNELL: Has the Legislature of Gibraltar power, whenever required by Her Majesty's Government, to pass an order for the imprisonment, without trial, of any foreign person who happens to land on those shores?

[No reply.]

EDUCATION (INDIA)—THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION IN INDIA.

MR. SLAGG asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether he can give any information as to the reasons which have led to the supersession of Professor Wordsworth in the Directorship of Public Instruction in India?

MR. J. K. CROSS: The India Office has no direct information on this subject, the appointment being one which rests with the Government of Bombay. It is notified in *The Bombay Government Gazette* of March 19 that Mr. Lee Warren, M.A., C.S., is to act as Director of Public Instruction during the absence of Mr. Chatfield, or till further orders.

CYPRUS—THE REPORTED REVENUE FRAUDS.

MR. GORST asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, What are the particulars of the offences of which seven Revenue Officials of Cyprus have been recently convicted; whether one of the superior Revenue Officers of a higher grade than the convicted officials is a fugitive from justice, and what steps are being taken by Her Majesty's Government for his apprehension; and, whether any estimate has been made of the extent to which the revenue of Cyprus has been diminished by the corruption and depredation of Revenue Officials?

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY: Detailed particulars of the Revenue frauds in Cyprus will be found in Papers which will shortly be presented. They fall under three heads—forgery, embezzlement, and under-assessment of tithes. It is not true that the superior officer referred to in the Question is a fugitive from justice. On the contrary, he returned immediately from his leave to meet the charge made against him; and we have just learnt by telegram that the charge has been dismissed by the Court. The High Commissioner's estimate of the loss of Revenue is £3,500; but I hope that some of it may be recovered.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACT, 1884—FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE.

MR. DUCKHAM asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether, upon inquiry, the administration of the laws of Germany "are such as to afford reasonable security against the importation therefrom of animals affected with foot-and-mouth disease," in pursuance of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act of 1884?

MR. TREVELYAN: From the communications which have been received from the German Government the Privy Council are satisfied that the laws and the administration of those laws in Germany, and the circumstances generally, are such as to afford a reasonable security against the importation therefrom of animals affected with foot-and-mouth disease; otherwise the Privy Council would be called upon to prohibit the landing of animals from that country, or from a specified part thereof, in accordance with the provisions of Section 1 of the Act of 1884.

MR. DUCKHAM: Can the right hon. Gentleman inform the House what regulations have been adopted in Germany?

MR. TREVELYAN said, the House would gather from his answer that the information of the Government was to the effect that Germany was practically free from disease; but that it was necessary that reasonable security should be taken against the introduction of disease to this country.

MR. CHAPLIN: Does it not continue to prevail in Germany?

MR. TREVELYAN: Yes; and has been for a long period; but no disease has been introduced here with German cattle. Foot-and-mouth disease has prevailed in Germany during the whole of 1884, and during that year 500,000 sheep were landed in this country from Germany.

MR. CHAPLIN asked whether they were to understand that, in the opinion of the Government, the prevalence of foot-and-mouth disease in Germany was no bar whatever to the reasonable security contemplated by the Act?

MR. TREVELYAN said, that, if he were to answer the Question briefly, it was no bar to security.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—ELECTION OF GUARDIANS—THE NEWRY UNION.

MR. BIGGAR (for Mr. SMALL) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he can state the reasons why the Local Government Board in Ireland have not given any decisions on the cases reserved at the election of guardians for the Newry Division, although the particulars have been furnished to them more than a fortnight ago; whether he is aware that the returning officer has taken upon himself to declare certain candidates elected, although he might have waited for fourteen days from the 25th March; whether the Local Government Board will take steps to inform the candidates of their decisions on the reserved cases, and not permit the returning officer to keep them secret?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: There has been considerable pressure of election business at the Local Government Board; but I understand a reply will be sent to the Newry Memorialists to-day. The returning officer in this case made his return on the 5th instant, and there does not appear to be any reason why he should have delayed it longer. He is bound to send it in within 14 days.

RAILWAYS (INDIA)—RAILWAY FROM QUETTA TO CANDAHAR.

MR. ONSLOW asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether he could inform the House whether the consideration of the promotion of a Railway between Quetta and Candahar has been recently before the Government; and, if so, what decision has been arrived at?

MR. J. K. CROSS: In reply to the hon. Member for Guildford, I may say that on the 12th of March I informed the hon. Member for Harwich (Sir Henry Tyler) that the railway would be carried on to Shebo and Quetta; but the question of its further extension to Candahar has not yet been under consideration by Her Majesty's Government.

MR. ONSLOW: Has it been under the consideration of the Viceroy?

MR. J. K. CROSS: It may have been under the consideration of the Viceroy; but no determination has been come to in regard to it.

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—THE RUSSO-AFGHAN FRONTIER—RUSSIAN ADVANCES.

MR. ONSLOW asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he could not now, without detriment to the public service, lay Papers upon the Table on the subject of the Afghan Boundary Commission up to the date of the departure of Sir Peter Lumsden?

MR. EDWARD CLARKE had also a Question on the Paper on this subject—namely, Whether he will at once lay upon the Table the Correspondence which has passed between the British and Russian Governments with respect to the appointment and duties of the Commission for the delimitation of the Afghan frontier, and the instructions given to Sir Peter Lumsden?

MR. GLADSTONE: With respect to the Question of the hon. Member for Guildford, and likewise that put on the Paper by the hon. and learned Member for Plymouth, I have to say that I have communicated with the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and we are of opinion that we could not with any advantage to the public lay this information before the House at the present moment.

MR. MACFARLANE: I wish to ask the Prime Minister a Question on a point of fact. A few days ago the right hon. Gentleman was not able to answer my inquiry as to whether the Russian officers in Central Asia adhere to the statement made to Captain Yate, that they were not in possession of the arrangement entered into between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of Russia. Can the right hon. Gentleman now say whether the Russian Government have since offered any explanation why their officers had not received that information?

MR. GLADSTONE: I will answer the Question presently.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he can now communicate to the House the tenour of the Despatches, received from the Russian Government since 31st March, relating to the Boundary Commission; whether the report of a further Russian advance towards Herat has been received from Sir Peter Lumsden, or other reliable source; and, whether Her Majesty's Government have fixed a limit beyond which the advance of the Russian forces will not be tolerated?

MR. GLADSTONE: There are three paragraphs in the Question of the hon. Member for Eye. On the first and the third I have nothing to add to what has been said before. As to the second paragraph, I have received information that the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir Stafford Northcote) wishes to put a Question to me, and I will reserve my answer.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: The Question which I desire to put is of a general character. I was anxious to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he is now in a position to give the House any fuller or further information in regard to the state of affairs on the frontier of Afghanistan, and especially in respect to the report of the further advance of the Russians?

MR. GLADSTONE: Sir, I have nothing to communicate to the House to-day of a very important character, for nothing further has reached the Government in the course of to-day with respect to past events—a very important chapter of the whole matter that is before us. A telegram has been received from St. Petersburg to-day—not bearing upon past events—upon which communications are proceeding. I may say, in regard to the point raised in the Question of the hon. Member for Eye (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett), that no confirmation has been received from Sir Peter Lumsden of the report mentioned by him concerning an advance by the Russians. I may say that the evidence before us to-day—the question arises only incidentally—certainly amounts to a renewal of an assurance that no such advance will take place, according to the intentions and orders of the Russian Government.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered the third part of my Question—namely, whether Her Majesty's Government have fixed a limit beyond which the advance of the Russians will not be tolerated? I beg to point out that no Question of this sort has been asked before. Do I understand that he declines to answer it?

MR. GLADSTONE: I have nothing to add in reply.

MR. MACFARLANE pointed out that the Prime Minister had not answered his Question.

MR. GLADSTONE: I ask the hon. Member's pardon. The state of the case is this. As he said, and as I made known to the House at the outset, what seemed to me a very important statement was received from Sir Peter Lumsden respecting a conversation between Captain Yate and the Chief of the Russian Staff. The effect of that statement was immediately referred to St. Petersburg; but we have not yet received the answer, which, no doubt, the Russian Government will seek from its own officers, to that statement. Nor do I know that the time has yet elapsed that gives us any reasonable hope of obtaining that reply. When we have obtained that reply it will be for us, if we deem it of a character to convey a clear knowledge to the House, to communicate it to the House.

MR. MACFARLANE wished, as bearing on the *bona fides* of the Russian Government, to ask whether the Russian Government had stated on what date the arrangement made between them and Her Majesty's Government was forwarded to the Russian officers on the frontier?

MR. GLADSTONE: No, Sir; nor have I least idea that the Russian Government would state anything on the subject until they have received the Report from their own officers as to the grave allegation made against them. It is, I think, to be assumed without the smallest doubt—I do not question it for a moment—that it was the duty of the Russian Government, and I must presume that the Russian Government fulfilled that duty, to transmit to their own officers a knowledge of that arrangement at the very first moment after it had been made.

MR. CHAPLIN asked whether the report of the further advance of the Russians referred to yesterday had now reached the Government from Sir Peter Lumsden?

MR. GLADSTONE: It was mentioned by Sir Peter Lumsden as a rumour; but without any attestation or confirmation of his own.

MR. ONSLOW asked whether the break in the telegraph between Teheran and Meshed had been repaired?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: No positive information has been received at the Foreign Office on the subject; but from the time in which telegrams now arrive I have no doubt that the wire has been restored.

AFGHANISTAN—ARREST OF AYOOB KHAN.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the Government had any information to give the House in regard to the circumstances attending the alleged arrest of Ayoob Khan?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The hon. Member had better give Notice of his Question.

VISIT OF H.R.H. THE PRINCE AND PRINCESS OF WALES TO IRELAND—THE DISTURBANCE AT MALLOW.

MR. PARNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he has any information to lay before the House, or has he received any Report from Mr. Butler, R.M., in charge of the police at Mallow, with regard to the brutal attack of the police upon the people yesterday?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have not received any Report directly from Mr. Butler; but I have received a telegraphic statement of a summary kind of the occurrence which took place yesterday; but the statement does not differ materially from what can be gleaned from the newspapers.

MR. PARNELL: Will the right hon. Gentleman be good enough to give the House the benefit of the summary statement, and also be good enough to say from whom he received that statement?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: From the Police Inspector on the spot.

MR. HEALY: Mr. Carr.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, Sir. If the hon. Member will put a Question to me I will answer it. My information does not come from Mr. Carr, but from one whose name at this moment I forget. The gist of it is simply this—that a short time before the train conveying the Prince and Princess of Wales was expected to arrive at Mallow certain persons, some from the town and a good many from a distance, took possession of the platform. The railway authorities directed that the platform should be cleared, and in order that this should be done the police

had to eject those persons who were on the platform and who refused to leave peaceably and quietly; and it does not appear that any unnecessary force was used, or any more than was necessary to overcome the resistance that was offered.

MR. PARNELL: I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the action of the police was ordered by Mr. Butler, the Resident Magistrate in charge of the police on that occasion, or whether, on the contrary, it was ordered by Mr. Coote, a Railway Director, who had been with Earl Spencer the night previously, and had obtained from him authority to direct the action of the police upon the occasion in question; and also whether any special instructions were given to the police or to Mr. Coote by Earl Spencer; and whether it is the fact that the persons who were attacked by the police had return tickets to Cork; whether the people having return tickets, or any persons who were attacked and assaulted by the police on the occasion in question, were requested to leave before they were so attacked? [*Cries of* "Order!"]

MR. HEALY: Chair, chair!

MR. PARNELL: And whether the right hon. Gentleman considers that no more force than was necessary was used on the occasion in question, when, according to the accounts in the newspapers——

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is now putting his Question in a very argumentative form. If he will confine himself to a mere Question he will be in Order.

MR. PARNELL: Then, Sir, I will ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the account which he has received, and which he says tallies with the accounts that have appeared in the newspapers, relates that the constables, having given no notice to the people that they were required to clear away from the platform, used their batons freely upon the heads of the crowd; and whether the constables pursued the people, beyond the precincts of the station, over several cattle pens into the road, severe punishment being inflicted upon all indiscriminately?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have already said the Report which I have received is one of a very summary nature, and it does not contain the particulars which the hon. Member has alluded to. My impression on reading the Report is that Mr. Coote, who is a Director of the Railway Company, claimed the right, which I presume he legally possesses——

MR. WARTON: Unquestionably possesses.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: To eject from the private property of the Company any persons who had no right to be there without the permission of the Company. But I merely assume that. I have no positive knowledge of the circumstances or of the grounds which he followed. If the hon. Member will put the Question on the Paper, I will obtain the information.

MR. PARNELL: I will put further Questions on the subject; but in reference to the statement which has just been made by the Chief Secretary, that a Director has the right to clear persons away from the premises of a Railway Company, I wish to ask the Solicitor General for Ireland whether the law does not require that trespassers should be always requested to leave before force is used; and whether, if they refuse to leave, they can be expelled with the use of only such force as may be necessary?

MR. BULWER: Might I ask the right hon. Gentleman one further Question? Whether it is true, as reported in the newspapers, that one of the Parliamentary followers of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) got a well-merited rap over the knuckles on this occasion?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. Walker): The hon. Member for the City of Cork has asked me whether trespassers must be required to leave before force is used? It may be as he says; but how far it is applicable to this particular case it is impossible to say.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN: I beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, Whether it is the fact that the people who occupied the railway station at one time were not merely hunted out of the station, but over what are called the Queen's highways, and over roads and fields belonging to other people, to such a distance as would prevent the sounds of National music from reaching the ears of the Prince of Wales?

[No reply.]

MR. SPEAKER: The Clerk will now proceed to read the Orders of the Day.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

—o—

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (REDISTRIBUTION) (*re-committed*) BILL.—[BILL 49.]

(*Mr. Gladstone, The Marquess of Hartington, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Attorney General, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 13th April.*]

[THIRTEENTH NIGHT.]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

SEVENTH SCHEDULE.

COUNTIES AT LARGE.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS AND NAMES AND CONTENTS OF DIVISIONS.

PART I.

ENGLAND.

MR. AINSWORTH moved an Amendment, in line 15, the object of which was to describe the Penrith Division, No. 2, as the "Mid Cumberland or Penrith Division."

Amendment proposed, in page 49, line 15, after "The," insert "Mid Cumberland or."—(*Mr. Ainsworth.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he did not know what the local feeling in Cumberland was upon this subject; but his own opinion was that Cumberland was one of those counties which might be divided by the points of the compass. The question, however, in the case of Penrith, was whether the division ought not rather to be called "the Eastern or Penrith Division" in preference to "Mid Division?" Local opinion, he understood, was strongly in favour of retaining the name of Penrith.

MR. RAIKES said, he had moved an Amendment on Monday, the object of which was to call this division "the Eastern or Penrith Division;" but that Amendment was rejected after what he considered a very inadequate discussion. He only wished to say that he was prepared to support the Amendment which was now moved by the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Ainsworth) with the view of calling the division "the Mid Cumberland or Penrith Division," although he was bound to admit that, in some degree, they would be departing from geographical accuracy, because, although it was proposed to call it the "Mid" Division, it was, in reality, the Eastern Division. Sooner, however, than part with geographical divisions—although another designation would be more accurate—as he understood it was the desire of all persons in Cumberland to see the points of the compass used in designating the other divisions of the county, he would support the Amendment of the hon. Member for West Cumberland in giving the alternative name of "Mid or Penrith Division."

MR. WARTON said, the Amendment, as it stood on the Paper, proposed to call the division "Mid Cumberland," whereas the rule in other cases had been simply to insert the word "Mid." He would suggest to the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill the propriety of considering whether the Amendment should not simply be the alternative of "Mid or Penrith Division."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he assumed that is was not seriously intended to adhere strictly to the words of the Amendment, and that the Amendment would be put in the form suggested by the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton). Otherwise it would be in conflict with every division contained in the Bill.

MR. GEORGE HOWARD said, there was a unanimous opinion in the county in favour of the change proposed by the hon. Member for West Cumberland (Mr. Ainsworth). It would be most satisfactory to the people of the county generally if this change was made; and it was only because the Boundary Commissioners declined to accept the names which had been submitted to them that the Committee were troubled in the matter.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if the hon. Member for West Cumberland (Mr. Ainsworth) proposed to withdraw his Amendment, in order that another Amendment might be moved in accordance with the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board?

MR. AINSWORTH: Yes.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. GEORGE HOWARD moved, as an Amendment, to insert words describing the division as the "Mid or Penrith Division."

Amendment proposed, in page 49, line 15, after "The," insert the words "Mid or."—(*Mr. George Howard.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, the next Amendment was consequential upon the decision which had been arrived at last night. He would move, in the first place, to omit, in page 49, from line 16 to line 22 inclusive, the words—

"The Sessional Divisions of Keswick, and Penrith, and the parishes in the Sessional Division of Wigton, of—Allhallows, Bewaldeth and Snittlegarth, Blencogo, Caldbeck High and Low, Dundraw and Kelsick, High Bolton, High Ireby, High and Low Thursby, Low Bolton, Low Ireby, Mosedale, Sebergham High and Low, Torpenhow and Whitrigg, Uldale, Waverton High and Low, Westward, Wigton, and Woodside."

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

Mr. WAUGH said, he wished to ask for some information upon this point. The Amendment proposed by the right hon. Gentleman was very similar to one which he (Mr. Waugh) had placed upon the Paper. The right hon. Gentleman proposed to omit from the Schedule the parishes of "Bewaldeth, Snittlegarth, and Mosedale," and to insert "Blennerhasset and Kirkland;" and the only difference between them was that he (Mr. Waugh) proposed only to include the Sessional division of Oulton, leaving out that of Dundraw and Keswick, and including Bothel and Threapland in the Sessional division of Allerdale below Derwent. He thought the places mentioned in his Amendment, as they were within a mile and a-half of the polling place, might fairly be included in the division; and the changes he proposed would give a population very nearly the same as that which was originally proposed, and of precisely the same character.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he gathered from the remarks of the hon. Member for Cockermouth (Mr. Waugh) that he intended to oppose the Amendment for the purpose of substituting his own, which he appeared to regard as forming a better division for the county of Cumberland. There was not a very large deviation involved; but, nevertheless, it was a change from the divisions proposed by the Boundary Commissioners. The hon. Member desired to make that change for the convenience of the polling districts; but the polling districts would still have to be set out in the divisions, and therefore any argument drawn from that point was not an argument which could carry any weight with it. As a matter of convenience, he thought it would be best to adhere to the proposal he had made.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, that he understood the Amendment proposed by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) to be more in the character of a verbal or technical Amendment. The Amendment suggested by the hon. Member for Cockermouth (Mr. Waugh) was, however, of a more substantial character, and was, in fact, an important alteration of the arrangement as laid down by the Boundary Commissioners. He thought the hon. Gentleman had been led astray in arriving at the conclusion that there was a general consensus of local opinion in favour of the Amendment he had suggested. The information furnished to him (Mr. J. Lowther) was on all fours with that which had reached the President of the Local Government Board, and he found that there was a decided objection, in certain quarters, to the adoption of the proposal of the hon. Member for Cockermouth. He therefore thought the Government deserved the support of the Committee, and that it would be best to adopt the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. PERCY WYNDHAM said, he took exception to the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke); but with regard to the suggestion made by the hon. Member for Cockermouth (Mr. Waugh) for the Amendment of the Amendment, he was inclined to think that the alteration suggested would not be received with general satisfaction. The hon. Member proposed to leave out Blencogo, Dundraw, and Kelsick, for the purpose of inserting Bothell and Threapland, and Bewaldeth and Snittlegarth. Now, he (Mr. Percy Wyndham) thought that

proposal involved a very important change. He could quite understand the point raised by the hon. Member in reference to local convenience in reaching the polling booths. But this was a proposal which would do a great deal more than meet the case of local convenience, because two parishes were proposed to be left out from this particular division, whose position was fully discussed before the Boundary Commissioners, by whom it was decided that they were entitled to be inserted in this particular division. So far as he was personally concerned, knowing as he did the local feeling in the matter, he should certainly divide the Committee against the proposal of the hon. Member for Cockermouth.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Amendment proposed,

In page 49, after line 15, to insert—"No. 2.—The Penrith Division. The Sessional Divisions of Keswick and Leath Ward; and the parishes in the Sessional Division of Allerdale Ward below Derwent, of—Allhallows, Blencogo, Blennerhasset and Kirkland, Caldbeck High and Low, Dundraw and Kelsick, High Bolton, High Ireby, High and Low Thursby, Low Bolton, Low Ireby, Sebergham High and Low, Torpenhow and Whitrigg, Uldale, Waverton High and Low, Westward, Wigton, and Woodside." —(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. WAUGH said, he objected to the inclusion of the parishes of Dundraw and Kelsick.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that he had given to the Committee last night the views of the Clerk of the Peace for the county of Cumberland on this subject. If any fresh information could be brought to his knowledge before the Report stage of the Bill, he was ready to reconsider the matter; but the view of the Clerk of the Peace was perfectly clear, as was evident from the letter he had read last night.

Question put, and *agreed to;* words inserted *accordingly.*

MR. RAIKES moved an Amendment, in page 49, line 23, the object of which was to describe Division No. 3 as the "Western or Cockermouth Division." He was quite ready to consult the wishes of hon. Members who represented Cumberland, and to substitute the "North-Western" for the "Western Division," if they so desired; but, as at present advised, he thought it would be more accurate geographically to describe it as the "Western or Cockermouth Division." He had understood the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Charles W. Dilke) last night to say that he was somewhat desirous of retaining the names of the Cumberland divisions as inserted in the Bill, on account of their intrinsic beauty; but he (Mr. Raikes) did not think that this applied to this particular division if they were to give to it an alternative name. With all due respect to the borough of Cockermouth, which he had no doubt was a very ancient and interesting place, he did not see why such a town of such very small importance should be placed in a different position from that of other merged boroughs — such as Aylesbury and Buckingham, which hereafter would only become alternative names. He begged to move the Amendment on the Paper.

Amendment proposed, in page 49, line 23, after "The," insert "Western or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that the name was given to the division, because Cockermouth was a merged borough. He should not oppose the Amendment if it met with the approval of the Committee.

MR. WAUGH said, that it was the unanimous wish of the Cumberland people, at the meeting held before the Boundary Commissioners at Carlisle, that the division should be called Cockermouth only. They all knew that Cockermouth was a time-honoured name, and the proposal now submitted would not really make the division more distinctive, because, as a matter of fact, it was neither North, South, East, nor West. It was an all-round place, both in sentiment and position; and if it were desired to describe it by a point of the compass, it could be only described as rather Northern than otherwise. It would require no such name as that to distinguish the Cockermouth Division. It might be called the "Northern Division," although it was far from being absolutely North; but to call it the "Western Division" would be altogether a misnomer. He, therefore,

trusted that the Committee would not assent to the Amendment. He believed it was the unanimous wish of the county that the division should be called distinctively "the Cockermouth Division," and he hoped that that wish would be respected.

Mr. J. W. LOWTHER said, he could bear testimony in confirmation of the statement of the hon. Member for Cockermouth (Mr. Waugh) as to the wishes of the inhabitants of the locality. He believed there was practically a consensus of opinion as to the nomenclature of these divisions. It was generally desired that No. 1 should be called North Cumberland, that No. 2 should be called Mid Cumberland, both of which proposals had been accepted by the Committee, that No. 4 should be called West Cumberland; but that in regard to the No. 3, there was a general feeling, not only in the division itself, but throughout the county, that it should retain the name of the Cockermouth Division, and that it should be called the "Western or Cockermouth," as the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Raikes) proposed.

Mr. WARTON said, the point of the hon. Member for Cockermouth (Mr. Waugh) amounted to this—

> "Cockermouth is much the best,
> For it is neither East nor West;
> Nor can we call it North or South,
> For it is only Cockermouth."

Mr. RAIKES said, he wished to point out that if they had divisions in the county—Northern, Mid, and Eastern, and a fourth division was required, it would be creating an anomaly if they were not to take the other points of the compass. If, however, the name of Cockermouth was generally approved by the Committee, he did not think he would be justified in pressing the Amendment.

Mr. J. W. LOWTHER said, he would point out that if the Committee called this division "West Cumberland," it would be impossible to name a fourth division West Cumberland also, as the hon. Member for West Cumberland (Mr. Ainsworth) proposed to do, and it would be altogether inaccurate to call it South Cumberland. He believed that there was a strong wish on the part of the people of Cumberland that the Division No. 4 in the Bill, and there designated "the Egremont Division," which was largely identified with the Liberal interests of the county, should still continue to be associated with the name of West Cumberland, and a proposal to that effect would follow when this division was settled.

Mr. GEORGE HOWARD said, that the Cumberland people attached considerable importance to the name of "Cockermouth" in connection with this division. Cockermouth was fairly entitled to give its name to the division, seeing that before the Reform Act was passed, it was the place of voting for the whole county. It was a small division compared wih the others; but he did not think there was anything unfair in making an exception in its favour.

Mr. RAIKES said, that, under the circumstances, he did not think it would be worth while to persist in the Amendment, and in deference to the views which had been expressed he would withdraw it.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, they now came to Division No. 4, the Egremont Division. He did not propose to say anything in regard to it himself; but he was prepared to hear anything hon. Members, who were interested in the matter locally, were prepared to submit.

Mr. AINSWORTH moved an Amendment to describe the division as that of "The West Cumberland or Egremont Division."

Amendment proposed, in page 49, line 26, after "The," insert "West Cumberland,"—(*Mr. Ainsworth.*)

Question proposed "That those words be there inserted."

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he wished to call attention to the fact that the proposal now submitted to the Committee was to call the extreme South of Cumberland the "Western Division." They had cut out a considerable portion of the North-West, and called it "Northern;" they had also cut out the Western part of the county and called it "Cockermouth," and now they proposed to cut out the South and call that the "West." Hitherto the county had been divided into two divisions which were perfectly applicable; but now it was proposed to make the South the

West, and he believed that a very small portion of the original Western Division would be included. If agreed to, it would amount to a complete disregard of all geographical accuracy. Certainly, if they adhered to the points of the compass, the proper designation of this division was South Cumberland. The one proposed was simply ridiculous.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, he was disposed to agree very much with what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir Charles W. Dilke). He thought if they adopted the compass points at all, they ought to adopt them completely. He, therefore, objected to the Amendment of the hon. Member for West Cumberland (Mr. Ainsworth), and he thought the President of the Local Government Board was quite right in saying that to call the Southern part of the county by the name of "West Cumberland" would be ridiculous.

MR. RAIKES said, he should not himself have offered any opposition to the Amendment; but he quite agreed with the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) that it would be a flagrant disregard of a geographical fact to call the Southern Division Western Cumberland. But they had already disregarded geographical facts by refusing to call the Eastern Division East Cumberland; and, therefore, he did not think it was a matter of very great consequence what they did with the remaining divisions. At the same time, he thought it would be better to insert "Southern," instead of "Western;" and as he (Mr. Raikes) had spared the Committee the trouble of a division on the interesting question which had been raised by the last Amendment, he would ask the hon. Gentleman for West Cumberland (Mr. Ainsworth) if he could not see his way to withdrawing the Amendment in favour of one which would more precisely indicate the geographical position of the division?

MR. WAUGH said, he was prepared to admit that, on the face of the map, this division was situated somewhat to the South of the county; but he ventured to think that there was not a single person in Cumberland who did not look upon that part of the county as West Cumberland. Whenever a man went to that part from Carlisle, he always spoke of going to the West from the East, although, no doubt, in so describing his progress, he was entirely at variance either with the points of the compass, or the position of the county upon the map. At the same time, he (Mr. Waugh) was perfectly certain that the division would never be recognized as "South Cumberland," and it was much better to give it the name by which it was generally known—namely, that of "West Cumberland."

MR. PERCY WYNDHAM supported the Amendment.

MR. AINSWORTH said, that he had throughout been in favour of geographical divisions; but this part of the county had always been known as "West Cumberland." Whenever a man travelled across the Border, he invariably went, not North and South, but East and West. He trusted, therefore, that the Committee would accept the Amendment he had proposed.

MR. J. W. LOWTHER said, he was sorry to intrude upon the Committee again; but he felt called upon to say a word in support of the view of the hon. Member for West Cumberland (Mr. Ainsworth). It did not really matter whether the Bill called this division "South Cumberland" or "West Cumberland," because, whatever name was given to the division, it would always be known as West Cumberland. He therefore thought that, for the sake of simplicity, it was desirable that the Committee should accede to the wishes of the Cumberland people, notwithstanding the fact that they were a little wrong in their notion of the points of the compass, and that this division should be named West Cumberland.

Question put, and *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

MR. RAIKES said, he was glad to say that the Committee had now left the county of Cumberland and had arrived at the county of Denbigh in Wales. That county had been divided by the Boundary Commissioners into two divisions, consisting of No. 1, the Bromfield Division, and No. 2, the Vale of Clwyd Division. He thought it desirable to give those divisions alternative names; and he, therefore, proposed an Amendment to describe the first division as "the Eastern or Bromfield Division."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he was prepared to agree with the Amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN said, he must point out that the Amendment, as it appeared on the Paper, was to leave out "Bromfield" and to give no alternative name.

MR. RAIKES said, he believed it was preferred to retain the alternative name. He had had a conversation last week with the Lord Lieutenant of the county, who was strongly in favour of retaining the alternative. He would, therefore, move, in page 49, line 32, after the word "The," to insert the words "Eastern or," which would make it the "Eastern or Bromfield Division."

Amendment proposed, in page 49, line 32, after the word "The," to insert the words "Eastern or,"—(*Mr. Raikes*).

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES said, he now proposed, in accordance with the same principle, to move his next Amendment, which would describe the 2nd division of the county of Denbigh as the "Western or Vale of Clwyd Division."

Amendment proposed, in page 50, line 1, after the word "The," insert the words "Western or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. BARNES said, that, in reference to the county of Derby which came next, he proposed in regard to the 5th division to move, in page 50, line 29, to leave out "Belper" and insert "Alfreton." The town of Alfreton was a much larger and more important town than Belper. It was situated in the centre of a large iron and coal district, and it formed about three-fifths of the whole division. It also formed an important part of East Derbyshire, which he had the honour to represent. The Belper Division, as defined by the Bill, would comprise from 20,000 to 25,000 inhabitants; but the town of Belper itself, according to the last Census, had only a population of 8,000 or 9,000, and had very little manufacturing interests. It was almost entirely agricultural, and why preference should be given to Belper over Alfreton he could not conceive. The inhabitants of this part of the county felt very sore upon the matter; and seeing that in reference to Cumberland the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had acceded to the wishes of the people, even although by so doing the division was named in a way that was contradictory to the geographical facts of the case, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would accede to this Amendment. It would give satisfaction to the inhabitants of the division generally, who, at present, had a very just ground for feeling dissatisfaction at the proposal contained in the Bill. Certainly, so far as its importance and the number of its population were concerned, the town of Alfreton was entitled to have its wishes consulted. He, therefore, begged to move the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, in page 50, line 29, leave out the word "Belper," and insert the word "Alfreton."—(*Mr. Barnes.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Belper' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would point out that the Belper Division of the county consisted of the entire Petty Sessional division of Belper and the Poor Law Union; and as regarded the town it contained 10,000 inhabitants, while the town of Alfreton contained under 5,000. On those grounds, he thought that Belper had a strong case in favour of giving its name to the division.

Question put, and *negatived.*

MR. BARNES said, he had challenged the decision of the Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN said, the hon. Member had challenged his decision too late. The hon. Member had himself given his voice with the Noes.

On the Motion of MR. ACLAND, the following Amendments made: — In page 51, line 10, after "The," insert "Eastern or;" and in line 14, after "The," insert "North Eastern or."

MR. WARTON said, before the hon. Member for East Cornwall (Mr. Acland) moved the next Amendment, he (Mr. Warton) had to propose the omission of the word "exclusive," in page 51, line 16, in order to substitute for it the word "except." He had not given Notice of this Amendment on the Paper; but he felt sure the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would see the propriety of adopting the latter word, which had been made use of throughout the Bill.

[*Thirteenth Night.*]

Amendment proposed, in page 5, line 16, to leave out the word "exclusive," in order to insert the word "except."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question, "That the word 'exclusive' stand part of the Schedule," put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That the word 'except' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, as he understood there was a general feeling in favour of naming the divisions of the county after the points of the compass—with the exception of the Torquay Division—he was, upon that understanding, ready to agree to the Amendments in the name of the hon. Member for East Cornwall (Mr. Acland).

On the Motion of MR. ACLAND, the following Amendments made:—In page 51, line 19, after "The," insert "Northern or;" in line 23, after "The," insert "North Western or;" in line 27, after "The," insert "Western or;" in line 32, after "The," insert "Southern or;" and in page 52, line 4, after "The," insert "Mid or."

MR. RAIKES said, he had an Amendment to move to this division, the object of which was to substitute for the appellation "Teignbridge," that of "Ashburton." He hoped that the Committee might not be indisposed to adopt the word "Ashburton," an ancient borough which, in the 17th century, returned a relative of the right hon. Member for North Devon who at that time took a prominent part in the proceedings of that House. He trusted the right hon. Baronet might think fit to restore the name of Ashburton to the annals of Parliament.

Amendment proposed, in page 52, line 4, after the word "or," insert the word "Ashburton."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That that word be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the Question before the Committee was as to whether this portion of the county should be called the Mid or Teignbridge Division, or the Mid or Ashburton Division. He believed, from the result of a local inquiry that was held in connection with this subject, that the name of Teignbridge was rather preferred in the district. The River Teign ran through the division, and the affix "Teign," was to be found to the names of several places there, Again, Teignbridge was the designation of a large Petty Sessional district of 105,000 acres, and it was also one of the Devonshire Hundreds. The right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Stafford Northcote) would probably prefer the name of Ashburton.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, that as far as the feeling in the county was concerned, he believed that Teignbridge was the accepted name. But, personally, he had a little interest in Ashburton, which at one time returned two Members to that House. It having ceased to be represented as a Parliamentary borough, his ancestor, Sir John Northcote, who was Member for the county, by his influence obtained for it the restoration of its right of sending Members to Parliament, and subsequently sat as the Representative of Ashburton in the Long Parliament. On that ground, he should rather like the name of Ashburton to be preserved in the nomenclature of the representation.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he believed that the House would wish that the right hon. Baronet who now represented a division of the county of Devon should have the same interest in the electorate represented by the name of Ashburton as his ancestor had done formerly. He should, therefore, accept the Amendment.

Question put, and *agreed to;* word *inserted* accordingly.

Amendment proposed, in page 52, line 10, after the word "The," insert the words "Northern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. PORTMAN said, he hoped the Committee would be inclined rather to adopt the Amendment which his hon. Colleague (Mr. Floyer) had placed on the Paper than that of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Raikes). The feeling in the county was in favour of the designation contemplated by his hon. Colleague; and he believed that no county in the Kingdom had a stronger claim than Dorset to be styled after its simple and natural divisions of North, South, East, and West. It was in view of that fact that his hon. Friend had drawn his series of Amendments.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he should not offer any opposition to this Amendment, if it were acceptable to the Committee. If the view of his hon. Friend behind him (Mr. Portman) were carried out, he thought it should not be by adopting the words "Northern Dr." Personally, he should have preferred the divisions known by the points of the compass absolutely.

Mr. WARTON said, he had not been long connected with the county of Dorset; but he was aware that the view represented by the senior Member for the county (Mr. Floyer) and by the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Portman) was that of all parties in the county. He suggested that the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Raikes) should withdraw his Amendment, in order that it might be made in the form suggested by the right hon. Baronet. The Committee had, in the case of Cumberland, called the divisions of the county "North," "South," "East," and "West," and there was no reason that he could perceive why they should not do the same in the case of the county of Dorset, seeing that those designations were peculiarly applicable, and that there was an unanimous feeling in favour of them throughout the country.

Mr. MONTAGUE GUEST said, he did not agree with the hon. Member for Dorsetshire (Mr. Portman) that all the feeling in the county was in favour of his view and that of his Colleague; on the contrary, he (Mr. Guest) believed that the borough population was very anxious that the names of the boroughs should be associated with the divisions of the county.

Mr. RAIKES said, he should be glad to take any line that was most acceptable to the Members for Dorsetshire. But there seemed to be some difficulty on the point, as he understood the hon. Member for Wareham (Mr. Guest) to be under the impression that the names of the boroughs would disappear. If the hon. Member for Dorsetshire (Mr. Portman) would propose to amend his (Mr. Raikes's) Amendment, by leaving out the word "or," he would then be able to obtain an expression of opinion by the Committee as to whether they wished that word to be retained, and then he could move to leave out "Shaftesbury."

Mr. MONTAGUE GUEST said, he was speaking on behalf of Wareham, which included a large agricultural district 20 miles in length and 10 in breadth. He thought the name which had been in the annals of Parliament for many centuries ought not to disappear.

Mr. HALSEY said, as an elector of the county of Dorset, he wished to corroborate what had fallen from the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Portman) with regard to the feeling in the county in favour of naming the divisions after the points of the compass. As a county elector, he hoped the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) would understand that he objected to being turned into an elector for the "Bridport Division."

The CHAIRMAN said, it would perhaps be convenient if the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Raikes) would withdraw his Amendment, when the hon. Member for Dorsetshire (Mr. Portman) could move to omit the word "Shaftesbury."

Mr. RAIKES said, he rather preferred, and he thought the Committee would prefer, the alternative, although he did not think the matter of very great importance so long as they had the points of the compass. On the whole, he thought the hon. Member for Dorsetshire (Mr. Portman) would do better to move the Amendment of his (Mr. Raikes') Amendment, by leaving out the word "or," and then he might, having obtained an expression of opinion on the part of the Committee, also move the omission of the word "Shaftesbury." In that case, there would be raised the issue as between the alternative and the points of the compass.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, in that case, he would move the omission of the word "or."

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, to leave out the word "or."—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'or' stand part of the said proposed Amendment."

Mr. MONTAGUE GUEST said, that although it was not his intention to divide the Committee on the point, yet, inasmuch as the boroughs of Dorsetshire would be very much disappointed at their names not being associated with the

county divisions, he was bound to make a further protest against the proposal.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Original Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES said, he would now propose to leave out the word "Shaftesbury" from the Schedule.

Amendment proposed, in page 52, line 10, to leave out the word "Shaftesbury."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule," put, and *negatived;* word *left out* accordingly.

On the Motion of MR. RAIKES, the following Amendments made:—

In page 52, line 15, after "The," insert "Eastern;" in line 20, after "The," insert Southern;" and in line 28, after "The," insert "Western."

MR. JOSEPH COWEN said, he rose to move the substitution of the word "Blaydon" for "Chester-le-Street," in respect of the 3rd division of the county of Durham. He did so because there was a strong feeling in the most populous part of the district—which contained two-thirds of the inhabitants of the whole division—that the word "Blaydon" should be retained. He trusted hon. Gentlemen opposite would not object to the proposed alteration.

Amendment proposed,

In page 53, line 16, after "The," leave out "Chester le Street," and insert "Blaydon."—(*Mr. Joseph Cowen.*)

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, there was a great deal to be said in favour of the view of his hon. Friend (Mr. Joseph Cowen); but, on the whole, he thought that local opinion was against the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman. A part of Gateshead was in the Chester-le-Street Division, and but for the fact that there was already a Member for that constituency perhaps that would be the best name. Chester-le-Street, however, was in the very centre of the division; it was a Poor Law Union, it was a market town, situated on a main road, and it had good railway communications. Petty Sessions were held there, it was a very ancient place, and it had a population at the present time of 7,000 people. Blaydon had a population of nearly 11,000 people, and it covered a very large area. Blaydon was the name given by the Commissioners to the division in their original scheme; but Chester-le-Street was an ancient town, and its name found more favour. The Commissioners thought that although Blaydon had a larger population than Chester-le-Street, Chester-le-Street was the better name to give to the division. There was another point which he was surprised his hon. Friend did not mention in the way of objection to the name of Chester-le-Street, and that point was that the name would very much resemble that of another constituency in the country.

MR. RAIKES said, he had an Amendment on the Paper, to leave out Chester-le-Street, in order to insert Ravensworth. He confessed he found it inconvenient to discover the particular spot in that division to name the division after. His objection to the name of Chester-le-Street was entirely that indicated by his hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Joseph Cowen), and to which he thought the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) was inclined to attach a little importance. It was most desirable they should avoid the selection of names at all similar to those of other constituencies. Although he (Mr. Raikes) had not at the present time the honour of representing the city of Chester, he was, perhaps, as well qualified to speak on behalf of that constituency as anyone in the House. He was quite sure there would be a very decided feeling there against this proposal, because by the establishment of a Member for Chester-le-Street there must be a certain amount of confusion in the House. He believed that all the right hon. Baronet had said as to the antiquity and historical importance of Chester-le-Street was quite correct; and, if it were not for the confusion which would be created, he (Mr. Raikes) would be content to leave the name alone. Having regard to the confusion which would necessarily arise between Chester-le-Street and Chester, he should support the Amendment of his hon. Friend (Mr. Joseph Cowen). Personally, he (Mr. Raikes) thought that Ravensworth would have been a better title for the division.

MR. DODDS said, he hoped the Committee would not accept the name suggested by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Raikes). Ravensworth, although it was the name of the Earl of Ravensworth, and his seat, Ravensworth Castle, was neither a parish, nor indeed a township. Between the other two names of Chester-le-Street and Blaydon a great deal was to be said, and had been said already. Now, he (Mr. Dodds) attended the local inquiry held by the Commissioners; and, on the whole, the great weight of argument was in favour of the name of Chester-le-Street being given to the division. He thought it was a good name, for this reason—that it was the older name, and that Chester-le-Street was more in the centre of the division than Blaydon. He believed that the general feeling in the division outside of the two places was that Chester-le-Street was a preferable name to Blaydon, and therefore he trusted the Committee would retain the name now inserted in the Bill.

MR. W. H. JAMES thought it very desirable to avoid, as far as possible, creating local feelings of jealousy on the matter of a nomenclature of this kind. He could bear his testimony that in the division there was a strong feeling in favour of retaining the name of Chester-le-Street. No doubt, there was something in the appeal which had been put forward by his hon. Friend (Mr. Joseph Cowen); but Chester-le-Street had strong claims to give its name to the division, if only for its historical and antiquarian associations. He hoped the Committee would reject the Amendment.

MR. T. C. THOMPSON said, that there need be no fear of confusing this name of Chester-le-Street with that of the city of Chester; for, in the North, the people invariably spoke of the town as Chester-le-Street, and not as Chester. Chester-le-Street had a very peculiar historical connection with the county of Durham. Chester-le-Street was the birthplace of St. Cuthbert, whose tomb was the foundation of the city of Durham, and whose body rested for many years in Chester-le-Street. He (Mr. T. C. Thompson) thought that historical associations were of very great importance indeed. It was most desirable that they should stamp upon districts—not something connected with the points of the compass—but some individuality, something which separated them from other parts of the country, and impressed them on the mind of the people of the country.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN said, that if this were a question of archæological contention, he could call attention to matters which went much farther back than the time of St. Cuthbert. The point really was the convenience of electors, and he could say from intimate knowledge of the district—for he had lived there all his life—that Blaydon would be found a much more convenient name. Gateshead, no doubt, would be an appropriate title, but there could not be two constituencies bearing the name of Gateshead.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir FARRER HERSCHELL) said, that the hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. Joseph Cowen) was so intimately associated with Blaydon, that it was but natural he should try to give the name of that place to the division. So far as he (the Solicitor General) could judge, outside of Blaydon, Chester-le-Street would be a much more popular name than Blaydon. Certainly, one thing in favour of Chester-le-Street was that, in the first instance, the Commissioners fixed upon the name of Blaydon. They only changed the name of the division to that of Chester-le-Street because, after hearing both sides—after ascertaining so far as they could the general feeling of the constituency—they came to the conclusion that they ought to change the name from Blaydon to Chester-le-Street. He asked the Committee to consider if they were in a better position than the Commissioners were to determine what was the name that was most generally approved by the constituency. He submitted that considering that the change had been advisedly made as a result of discussion before the Commissioners, a very strong case ought to be made out before the name was changed. The only point of importance that he could see that had been raised in favour of the Amendment was that the name of Chester-le-Street would lead to some confusion. He could hardly think it would, because he could not understand how the Chester-le-Street Division of the county of Durham could clash with Chester. There had not been any confusion between Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Newcastle-under-Lyme, which

names were, perhaps, more nearly alike than Chester-le-Street and Chester.

Question put, and *negatived.*

MR. DODDS proposed, as an Amendment, to omit "Lanchester," in line 21, page 53, in order to insert "North Western." He did so for the simple reason that although Lanchester had much to be said in favour of it, it being a place very similar, in many characteristics, to Chester-le-Street, it, like Chester-le-Street, was the place originally named by the Boundary Commission in substitution for Consett; Consett was the most populous place in the division, and had great claims for consideration; but the rival parties from Consett and Lanchester had met before Major Tulloch held his inquiry, and arrived at the conclusion that if the points of the compass could be used for the division, they would be content. Major Tulloch, however, said it was contrary to his instructions to give the division a title according to the points of the compass. He (Mr. Dodds) proposed "North-Western," instead of Lanchester, not because he objected to Lanchester, but in the interest of the peace of the division. There would be less heartburning in the division if his Amendment were adopted. If the Committee accepted his Amendment, there would be greater satisfaction throughout the division—the Amendment would be acceptable to the people of Consett and Lanchester alike. He hoped the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would, under the circumstances, adopt his proposition, especially as it had been agreed upon by all parties. A glance at the map would show that "North-Western" was a very appropriate title to give to the constituency.

Amendment proposed, in page 53, line 21, leave out "Lanchester," and insert "North-Western."—(*Mr. Dodds.*)

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

MR. JOSEPH COWEN thought that if they accepted one name because of archæological considerations, they ought to accept another. As a matter of fact, no one knew which was the North-Western Division of the county; but everybody would know the division if it were called Lanchester.

MR. DODDS remarked, that everybody knew full well which was the North-Western district of the county. If a geographical name could have been found for the Chester-le-Street Division, he was sure that it would have been adopted. He (Mr. Dodds) did not object to Lanchester; but as the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had consented to adopt points of the compass, he thought it was quite right that this alteration should be made.

MR. RAIKES hoped the Government would see their way to accept this Amendment.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Yes.

MR. RAIKES said, that he supported the Amendment, not only because it introduced a point of the compass, but because it got rid of another of the ambiguities of which he had had to complain. Lanchester very much resembled both Lancaster and Manchester. He should support this Amendment for the very same reason that he supported the last Amendment.

MR. WARTON said, that the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had consented, in a very quiet manner, to accept this Amendment. He (Mr. Warton) hoped they would have the pleasure of hearing, on this question, some hon. Gentleman connected with the county. He could not understand how the right hon. Baronet had been so easily seduced by the arguments of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Stockton (Mr. Dodds), because those arguments appeared to him (Mr. Warton) to be extremely weak. The right hon. Baronet had accepted the points of the compass in the case of Dorset; but in that case the divisions were merely called North, South, East, and West. In Durham, however, they had adopted local names for some of the divisions. He thought it was desirable to avoid, if possible, mixing up in the same county points of the compass and names not points of the compass. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Raikes) seemed to be very much pleased with the adoption of points of the compass. No doubt, the right hon. Gentleman had done good service in the consideration of this Bill; but then it must be remembered that points of the compass were not, in every in-

The Solicitor General

stance, desirable. He (Mr. Warton) was inclined to think that the better plan was that where they had a county like Dorset, which was split up into four divisions, it was very desirable to adopt the points of the compass; but in a county like Durham, where they had adopted local names in some cases, why should they seek to adopt points of the compass in other cases? He hoped more consideration would be given to this Amendment.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had every desire to save the time of the Committee. He had assented to the Amendment because he thought it would be difficult to find a good local name. He did not think that Lanchester or Consett were as good names as North-Western.

MR. W. H. JAMES suggested that the alternative name should be given—North-Western or Lanchester.

MR. G. W. ELLIOT said, he was sorry the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had assented so quickly to the Amendment. Lanchester and Consett were well known in the division. Lanchester, Bishop Auckland, and Barnard Castle were perfectly well-defined places, and if these names were changed to points of the compass electors in the county of Durham would not know where the divisions were.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that as the matter had been discussed at greater length than he expected, he had better say something as to the reasons why he assented to the Amendment. Lanchester was a name very like Manchester. Lanchester was not a very important place; certainly it was the name of the Poor Law Union; but it was not a Local Board district, and it had only 3,000 or 4,000 people. Consett was a Local Board district, with a population of 7,000; so that if the Committee went by local importance Consett was of more importance than Lanchester, and Consett was the name originally taken by the Commissioners. He thought there was no good local name to give to the division; and, therefore, he had expressed his readiness to adopt the Amendment.

SIR GEORGE ELLIOT said, that if the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had not been a little hasty in his acceptance of the Amendment, he (Sir George Elliot) would have given one or two reasons why Lanchester ought to be the name given to the division, and not Consett. Lanchester was an old place, Consett was a new place; and, therefore, he thought it was well to adhere to the name finally given to the division by the Commissioners. Consett was a place which consisted of coal pits. Now, he happened to be a Member of the Royal Commission appointed some years ago to ascertain the quantity of coal in the county of Durham; and in the course of the inquiries of the Commission, he learned that the coal at Consett would be used up in a century. In 100 years, therefore, there would be no Consett. Lanchester had existed as a place for hundreds of years, and would, he had no doubt, continue to do so. He thought that Lanchester was as good a name to give to the division as North-Western, because the people would know where the division was if Lanchester was its name. He believed there were Members of the Committee who would live to see Lanchester increased in power and importance.

MR. T. C. THOMPSON regretted that the Committee were going to make these changes. The names adopted for the divisions were, in his opinion, very beautiful, and were well known all over the county. Everyone, for instance, knew where Lanchester was; but very few people had heard of Consett. Consett was a place which probably would not exist very long. Lanchester, however, was a place in very remote times. It would be impossible to instil into the minds of the people of Durham which was the North and which was the North-Western Divisions of the county. The people liked to keep to well-known names. He did not hesitate to say that there were not half-a-dozen people who knew where the Southern Division of the county began. He hoped that they were framing a Bill which would last for a very considerable time; and, therefore, he desired that the names adopted for the divisions should be well understood.

MR. DODDS said, he was astonished to hear the extraordinary argument of his hon. Friend the Member for Durham (Mr. T. C. Thompson). The hon. Gentleman knew, as well as any man in the House, that the two divisions, North and South, had lasted ever since the great Reform Bill of 1832. Now, whe-

ther or not Lanchester or Consett continued to be places, North-Western would always remain a point of the compass; and he thought that was an additional reason why they should adopt that title instead of Lanchester or Consett.

Mr. G. W. ELLIOT said, so far as he understood, there was no North-Western part of the county at all.

Mr. WARTON said, that the hon. Gentleman the Member for Stockton (Mr. Dodds) proposed to adopt points of the compass in the cases of three divisions of the county—North-Western, South-Eastern, and Southern. Now, if the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) was not so very averse to the adoption of the points of the compass, as the titles of divisions of the counties, he (Mr. Warton) put it to him whether it would not be desirable to adopt points of the compass in the cases of all the divisions of the county? It seemed ridiculous to adopt names of locality in some cases, and points of the compass in others.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE pointed out that they had already mixed up points of the compass with local names. That, of course, was a matter entirely for the Committee. If hon. Members thought it worth while to divide upon the Amendment, he should not use any influence he might have to cause the Committee to come to one conclusion or the other.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That the words 'North-Western' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. DODDS said, he now wished to move an Amendment as to which there had been a great conflict of local opinion. In the original scheme, the division to which he was directing attention was called Brandon; but that was very strongly objected to. It was proposed to call the district Mid Durham; but they had been told by the Commissioners that, according to their Instructions, points of the compass were not to be used in naming the divisions, and eventually Brancepeth had been decided upon. Although an important place, this was only a parish. This place had appeared to receive acceptance; but now that the Committee were at liberty to substitute geographical names instead of names of places, he thought that Mid Durham would be the most appropriate name for this division, seeing that the division was in the middle of the county. Every other division of the county, with one exception, abutted upon this, and he was sure the substitution of the name he suggested for Brancepeth would be well received. He would therefore move that that substitution should take place.

Amendment proposed, in page 53, line 25, leave out "Brancepeth," and insert "Mid."—(*Mr. Dodds.*)

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

Mr. WARTON said, that "Mid" was not a point of the compass, except in the mind of the hon. Member for Stockton (Mr. Dodds), which was usually somewhat confused.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, that if it were the general feeling of the Committee that that name should be substituted for Brancepeth, he would raise no objection to the alteration.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That the word 'Mid' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. DODDS said, he now desired to change the name of the "North Tees Division" to that of "South-Eastern Division." The name "North Tees" had no signification whatever. He had heard an hon. Member on the other side of the House declare it was a well-known name in the county; but, however that might be, it was nevertheless a fact that no one in the county had ever heard such a name applied to the district to which it had been affixed until they saw it in the Bill. The three most important places in the district were Stockton, Hartlepool, and Darlington; but none of these could be taken, as each of them retained its borough representation. As points of the compass could not at that time be taken, the Commissioners themselves had chosen this name "North Tees."

Amendment proposed, in page 53, line 30, leave out the words "North Tees," and insert the words "South-Eastern."—(*Mr. Dodds.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, in this case, also, he should leave the decision of the question to the Committee.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule," put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That the words 'South Eastern' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. DODDS said, that, in the next case, he wished to propose a composite name—that was to say, to give the "Barnard Castle" Division the name of "Southern or Barnard Castle" Division. Barnard Castle was an important place; and if names according to points of the compass had not been decided upon it would have been desirable to have left the name as it stood. As, however, points of the compass names had been accepted, and as this district formed a very large part of the late Southern Division, he thought "Southern or Barnard Castle" would be a very appropriate name.

Amendment proposed, in page 54, line 5, before "Barnard Castle," insert "Southern or."—(*Mr. Dodds.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he should like to say a word or two upon this proposal, because he had no doubt it was one of those which were referred to on a former occasion when he was overruled by the Committee. In his opinion, this name would not be at all applicable to the division. No doubt this would be the southern part of the county if it were divided in two; but, in addition to being the more southerly parts, it was at the same time the more westerly part of the county. It seemed really to be more westerly than southerly, and he therefore thought that Barnard Castle, which was a most respectable name, should be retained as giving a title to this division.

MR. DODDS said, that on reference to the map he could not understand the right hon. Baronet's (Sir Charles W. Dilke's) view as to this not being the southern portion of the county. The fact was, there was one extreme point which was now part of the South-Eastern Division, which extended further to the south than Barnard Castle Division; but for nearly 30 miles the southern part of this division was bounded by the Tees, and was, to all intents and purposes, the southern part of the county. At any rate, he should be very glad to withdraw the Amendment "Southern or," in order that the words "South Western" might be inserted, which the right hon. Baronet seemed inclined to accept.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: No; I do not desire that at all.

Question put, and *negatived.*

COLONEL MAKINS said, he wished to move, as an Amendment, in page 54, line 17, after the word "The," to insert "South Western or." This was the first of a series of Amendments standing in his name which he had put on the Paper with a view to applying the points of the compass—including the word "Mid," which was not a point-of-the-compass name—to the eight divisions of Essex. On the first day of the new Session he put a Question to the right hon. Baronet with regard to an Amendment of this kind. He had asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he would entertain such an Amendment, and the right hon. Gentleman had told him that he would be guided by the feeling of the House. Since then the right hon. Gentleman had shown, with regard to other counties, his willingness to adopt the evident sense of the Committee, and had accepted names chosen from the points of the compass. With regard to the county of Essex, at the inquiry before the Commissioners they had been precluded from raising the points-of-the-compass question, otherwise he had no doubt they would have carried their proposal. He (Colonel Makins) had been spending last week in the county of Essex, and had made inquiries on this subject, and had not found a single person take any objection to his proposal; on the contrary, everyone thought it a desirable change. He did not wish to take up the time of the Committee unnecessarily; therefore, unless arguments were raised on the other side of the House, he should confine himself to simply moving the first Amendment on the Paper in his name, the effect of which would be to add to "Walthamstow" the name "South Western or."

Amendment proposed, in page 54, line 17, after the word "The," to insert the words "South-Western or."—(*Colonel Makins.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, there were a great many divisions in this county. It was a suburban district, and might be said to be very largely in the Metropolis; consequently it was very much more difficult to deal with in the way proposed than was a purely rural county. One of the eight divisions was extremely small in size, smaller even than the Jarrow Division, to which had been affixed a local name instead of a point-of-the-compass name. On the whole, he certainly thought that the names in the Bill were better than those proposed by the hon. and gallant Member. Some of the divisions were almost Metropolitan, and should, therefore, retain their own names; and the Epping Division, generally following, as it did, the old lines of Epping Forest, should be named after that district. Two of the divisions were named after municipal boroughs, and the only difficulty was with regard to the Tilbury Division, as to which there had been a great difference of opinion. He (Sir Charles W. Dilke) should be more inclined to take a compound name in that case than in any other. Tilbury was an ancient name; but the district was certainly not agricultural; it was really a Thames or sea-coast division.

COLONEL MAKINS said, that with regard to the particular division — namely, the Walthamstow Division— now under discussion, he was sure the people of that place were anxious to have this point-of-the-compass name added to the proposed name; otherwise it would appear to be a suburban district of the Metropolis rather than an integral part of Essex. As the right hon. Gentleman had accepted these alternative names in so many cases, he (Colonel Makins) hoped he would not go from the principle on the present occasion. He was sure that in this matter he had the support of every Member for the county of Essex. He saw below him an hon. Member who represented the Western Division of the county (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson), and he trusted that hon. Member would support him on this occasion. He was sure the hon. Member agreed with him in his desire to see this alternative point-of-the-compass name given to the Walthamstow Division. He trusted his proposal would be accepted by the Government.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he agreed with his hon. and gallant Friend who represented the Southern Division of the county (Colonel Makins), and he was convinced that if, at the meeting of the Boundary Commissioners; they had been able to propose points-of-compass names, the Commissioners would have been unanimous in applying those names to this county. Already, these points of the compass names had been introduced in the Bill; and he believed his hon. and gallant Friend had fairly stated the views of the county at large, when he said that the localities would urge upon the right hon. Baronet, if it were possible, the desirability of adopting the principle in the case of Essex, as in the case of other counties. The right hon. Gentleman would not be at all departing from the scheme of the Bill if he permitted these alternative names to be adopted in this case as they had been in the others.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he did not think the matter was worth dividing the Committee about; the question was whether there was a general assent to the proposal of the hon. and gallant Member. He would not divide the Committee against opinions so positively expressed, and therefore he would accept the alternative names, although he did not like them.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

On the Motion of Colonel MAKINS, the following Amendments made:—In page 54, line 19, after "The," insert "Western or;" in line 23, after "The," insert "North Western or;" in line 27, after "The," insert "Northern or;" in page 55, line 1, after "The," insert "North Eastern or;" in line 7, after "The," insert "Eastern or;" and in line 15, after "The," insert "Mid or."

Amendment proposed, in page 55, line 19, after "The," insert "South Eastern or."—(*Colonel Makins.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. WARTON said, that, before the Question was put to the Committee, he

wished to say a few words which were not exactly regular, but which arose from something that had been said by the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke). The right hon. Gentleman had seemed to have it in his mind that it would be desirable to call this "the Thames Division," and there was a great deal of force in that suggestion. There was no such place as Tilbury in the world. There was a Tilbury Fort, but no town of Tilbury or Tilbury village. He (Mr. Warton), therefore, would propose to the Committee that they should call this the Thames Division. They had very few places named after rivers, and seeing how important the Thames was—that it was the river running through the English Metropolis, the greatest City in the world, he thought it would be a very graceful act to call this division after it.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he did not think that Tilbury was a very good name; and if the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel Makins) liked to confer with the Essex Members before Report, and see whether a better name than Tilbury could be obtained, so far as he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) was concerned, he should be glad to agree to the result of their conference. He could not, however, say that he thought "the Thames Division" would be a good name, because the Thames flowed through many divisions in other counties besides this, although no doubt this district ran along the Thames for a greater distance than any other.

MR. STRUTT said, he would urge upon the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) the desirability of calling this the Southend Division. The Commissioners had chosen the name of Tilbury for no reason whatever that he could see; and as the largest town in the division was Southend, and as that place was in the centre of the division, agriculture being the principal industry, he thought it would only be right to adopt that nomenclature.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that no doubt Southend was the largest place in the division; but it was clearly a pleasure resort and a watering place, and he did not know that it was a good place to give a name to a county division. Unless there was very general agreement on the matter, he should be rather disposed to strike out the alternative in this case. At any rate, if that course were proposed, he should not take exception to it.

Amendment proposed, in page 55, line 19, to strike out the word "Tilbury."—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Tilbury' stand part of the Schedule."

MR. TOMLINSON said, it did not appear to him that the fact of Southend being a modern watering place was against its being chosen as the name of a county division. There were places in the county of Lancaster, such as Blackpool and Southport, which gave names to county divisions, and surely these might be taken as a precedent.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That the words 'South Eastern' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES said, he had an Amendment on the Paper, in page 55, line 26, to add to "the Caerphilly Division" the words "Eastern or;" but he thought he had better leave the question in the hands of the hon. Baronet the Member for Glamorganshire (Sir Hussey Vivian).

SIR HUSSEY VIVIAN said, he begged to move the Amendment standing on the Paper in his name—namely, in page 55, line 26, after "The," leave out "Caerphilly," and insert "Eastern." The term "Eastern" distinctly applied to this division of Glamorganshire. Caerphilly was a very small place on the borders of Monmouthshire—in fact, only one mile from Monmouthshire, and containing a very small population indeed. It was quite true that Caerphilly gave the name to a Petty Sessional division; but that, he thought, was the only title which it had to give a name to this Parliamentary division. The name "Eastern" would geographically and distinctly describe the division; and he was able to state that it was the unanimous, or almost the unanimous, wish of the county that this alteration should be made. At any rate, if it was not the unanimous wish of the county, he had heard nothing to the contrary. He would not detain the Committee by going any further into the question, but would simply move the Amendment he had read.

Amendment proposed, in page 55, line 26, after "The," leave out "Caerphilly," and insert "Eastern."—(*Sir Hussey Vivian.*)

Question proposed, "That 'Caerphilly' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would not oppose the Amendment, if it was the general feeling of the Committee that it should be accepted; but, at the same time, he thought that some other Amendments standing on the Paper in the name of the hon. Baronet were of a very doubtful character. For instance, the hon. Baronet proposed to leave out the word "Gower," and to put in its place "Western," and that did not seem to him to be a very desirable alteration. Gower was an extremely well-known name in Wales.

MR. BRYCE said, he would earnestly appeal to the Committee to retain the name "Gower."

MR. WARTON: Not yet; we have not come to Gower yet.

MR. BRYCE said, he knew very well what he was saying; he raised the question at this point for a purpose. He had no objection to the substitution of the name "Eastern" for "Caerphilly," if it was not to be taken as a precedent for the substitution of the name "Western" for "Gower." Gower was a name which he should conceive it a great pity to lose; it was a name of the utmost interest in the earlier history of Wales.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That the word 'Eastern' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

SIR HUSSEY VIVIAN said, he would now move the next Amendment standing in his name on the Paper—namely, after the word "The," in line 29, to leave out "Gower," and insert "Western." He knew the district in question as well as anyone alive, and he had not heard any expression from those who lived in it of a desire that the name "Gower" should be retained. On the other hand, he had presented a Petition to the House praying that the name should be omitted, and that "Western" should be inserted in its place. It was true that Gower was an ancient definition of a portion of Western Glamorganshire; but it had long ceased to occupy an important position in the county. The inhabitants of Gower proper were less than 4,000; whereas the division represented the whole of the populous valley of Swansea, and a large portion of a populous district adjacent to Carmarthenshire, Gower proper did not in reality represent more than a twelfth of the district, and he thought that the term "Western" would distinctly define the division, and that "Gower" would not. Whatever historical value the name "Gower" might have, he thought that in this Bill they ought to adopt such definitions as would distinctly describe the divisions of which they spoke; he knew of no other that would define this division except that he had suggested. He desired to press the name "Western" upon the attention of the Committee.

Amendment proposed, in page 55, line 29, after "The," leave out "Gower" and insert "Western."—(*Sir Hussey Vivian.*)

Question proposed, "That 'Gower' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he thought it would be better to retain the name in the Bill, although it did not exactly represent the whole of the district, as in the case of the Isle of Thanet. As a matter of fact, it only contained half the district; but "Gower" was a very important historical name, and he thought it right that the name should be preserved.

MR. RAIKES said, that he had had an Amendment on the Paper for the purpose of proposing an alternative name; and he would put it to the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) whether it would not be a more prudent course to substitute this alternative name for the Amendment now before the Committee? He quite felt the force of the argument that "Gower" was only a small part of the division; but there was also a great deal to be said in regard to the interest attaching to this very ancient name; therefore, would it not be better that "Western or," should be put before "Gower?"

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I am not opposed to that.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. RAIKES: Then I propose to insert the words "Western or" as I have indicated.

Amendment proposed, in page 55, line 29, after "The," insert "Western or." —(*Mr Raikes.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

SIR HUSSEY VIVIAN moved, as an Amendment in line 1, page 56, to substitute "Mid" for the "Vale of Neath." He was of opinion that the Vale of Neath would not be an appropriate designation to attach to this division. The Vale of Neath was only a strip, about two miles wide, in the western part of the division. The division itself extended along the West Coast of Glamorganshire, and embraced a large and populous district, including the borough of Aberavon. He was of opinion that if they wanted a new name, "Aberavon" would be much better adapted to the district than the "Vale of Neath." It was known before the Commissioners went down that it was intended to move that the definition he now proposed should be adopted. He had received many communications in favour of that name, and not one against it; and he believed it was the general wish that it should be adopted.

Amendment proposed in page 56, line 1, after "The," leave out "Vale of Neath," and insert "Mid."—(*Sir Hussey Vivian.*)

Question, "That the words 'Vale of Neath' stand part of the Schedule," put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That the word 'Mid' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

SIR HUSSEY VIVIAN said, he would next move an Amendment, the object of which was to describe the fifth proposed division as the "South" instead of the "Llandaff Division." He said that Llandaff was undoubtedly a very ancient city, but it was a comparatively small place, and it was situated in the remote eastern corner of a division which would extend for something like 20 miles to the west. A large portion of Llandaff was already included in the borough of Cardiff, and the Eastern portion of the division was almost entirely composed of the southern boundary along the sea coast of Glamorganshire. He did not think that the word "Llandaff" at all appropriately described the division, nor would the word "Eastern;" and he, therefore, moved to substitute the word "Southern." His proposal would receive the support of everyone who was acquainted with the county of Glamorganshire.

Amendment proposed, in page 56, line 6, after "The," leave out "Llandaff," and insert "Southern."—(*Sir Hussey Vivian.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Llandaff' stand part of the Schedule."

MR. WARTON said, he wished to call attention to the curious way in which line 16 had been printed. By the insertion of a comma, the sense of the Schedule was altogether altered. As it appeared in the Bill the present division was to comprise various Sessional Divisions, the municipal borough of Cardiff, and certain parishes in the Sessional Division of Newcastle and Ogmore, and in the Sessional Division of Miskin, Lower, of Llantrissant. On the previous page, page 55, this Sessional Division was described as Miskin Lower, without the comma between the two words. He wished to know which was correct?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that it was a printer's error, which would be rectified.

MR. WARTON said, that it was admitted to be another printer's error added to the numerous other printer's errors which had been pointed out.

SIR HUSSEY VIVIAN said, that no doubt the insertion of the comma after the word Miskin was wrong.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That the word 'Southern' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES said, the Committee had now reached the county of Gloucester, and his next Amendment had reference to the first division of the county—namely, the proposed Stroud Division. Gloucestershire was a county which divided itself more easily into the geographical divisions—North, South, Mid, East, and West, than some others. He proposed, therefore, to constitute the Stroud Division the "Mid" Division, and he would therefore move in line 20 an Amendment to that effect.

Amendment proposed in page 56, line 20, after "The," insert "Mid or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that he was prepared to accept the Amendment as carrying out the alternative plan.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, that he had an Amendment upon the Paper, to insert after "Stroud" the words "and Tetbury." He wished to know whether this was the proper time for moving that Amendment?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that it would not come in here. The Committee had not yet reached the point at which it would be proper to insert the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. STANTON said, he hoped that, so far as Stroud was concerned, no alternative name would be given to the division.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that it was only proposed to describe the division as the "Mid or Stroud Division." It would still be a very short title, seeing that Mid was short and that Stroud was short also. That was a more important point than it seemed to be, because some of the names were extremely long, and they would have to be printed on every page of the register. Perhaps the difficulty would be got over by using either one word or the other, if a provision were inserted in the Bill to that effect; but as the Bill now stood the name of the division, however long, would have to be used.

MR. STANTON said, it was with reluctance that he gave way to the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke); but he thought it very unnecessary, when they had such distinctive names as were proposed to be given to the Gloucestershire divisions, that they should adopt the points of the compass at all. The definition "Mid" in reference to Stroud was no doubt accurate, but unnecessary. But to call Tewkesbury Division "Northern" was wrong, for Cirencester was the most northerly; and to call Berkeley, which was to be part of Tewkesbury, "Northern" was contrary to geography and common sense.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

On the Motion of SIR CHARLES W. DILKE, the following Amendment made:—In page 56, line 22, after "Dursley," insert "except the parish of Slimbridge."

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, the Amendment to which he had now to ask the attention of the Committee for a few minutes was one of rather more importance than the mere insertion of a name, because it dealt with the area of the divisions formed by the Boundary Commissioners. He fully acknowledged the extreme difficulty of the task the Commissioners had been called upon to perform in setting out the different divisions of the county of Gloucester. The peculiar nature of the county made it extremely difficult to divide it into five parts. No doubt, the Commissioners had done their best to arrive at a fair decision in the scheme which they had produced at the local inquiry. But that scheme was based almost entirely upon Petty Sessional divisions, irrespective of natural boundaries, and of the pursuits of the population. One part of it was very strongly objected to on the ground of the difference of local pursuits between Stroud and Cirencester; and when the Commissioners came to revise their scheme by the light of other proposals made to them, they adopted the plan which now appeared in the Bill. He must, however, say, in regard to two of the divisions of the county, that the present Tewkesbury and Cirencester Divisions were laid out in a very inconvenient form, both in regard to shape and means of communication; and the Amendment which he had placed upon the Paper had been devised in order to render them somewhat less inconvenient than they were at present. In regard to one of the divisions—Cirencester—as defined by the Commissioners, it would be more than 50 miles long—a narrow strip of land shaped something like an old-fashioned purse, with two ends almost entirely cut off from the centre. Nor was there any communication whatever between the North and South of the division. As a matter of fact, when the inhabitants desired to have a general meeting, they had been obliged to hold it in some place outside the division, because there was no place of meeting within the division itself that was at all convenient for general access. The object of his Amendment was to make the Cirencester Division more convenient by taking away the Petty Sessional division of Tetbury on the extreme south of it, and adding it to another division to which anybody who looked at the county upon the map

would see that it really belonged. Now, the second division, Tewkesbury, was also a long and narrow strip of something like 35 miles in length; and, as indicated on the plan of the Commissioners before that plan was amended by the right hon. Baronet, one part of it would have been absolutely cut off from the rest. It would still, however, be in one place only one and a-half miles broad. He proposed, by his second Amendment, to leave out two parishes proposed to be included in the Stroud Division—namely, Eastington and Frocester—in order to make the Tewkesbury Division of a somewhat better shape. Those parishes which were in the Sessional Division of Whitminster would then be included in the Tewkesbury Division, and would be excluded, as they were at present excluded, from the borough of Stroud. He did not propose to ask the Committee to divide upon this proposal. All that he was anxious to do was to point out the extreme inconvenience of the two divisions as proposed by the right hon. Baronet. He thought anybody would see how extremely inconvenient in shape the two divisions were; and what he hoped was, that the right hon. Baronet would consent to refer the matter to the Commissioners, in order that they might take it into further consideration, and, if they thought fit, agree to some Amendment to be proposed on the Report. He quite saw the difficulty of asking the Committee to deal with an Amendment of that kind against the opinion of the Commissioners; but as it was a local grievance which ought to be remedied, he thought the matter should be further considered, and if in the opinion of the Commissioners the grievance could be remedied, some change ought to be made in the present proposal. The proposal he had placed upon the Paper could hardly be said to have any Party bearing, because it was identical with that which was submitted to the Commissioners by those who represented the Liberals of Gloucestershire. There was a general feeling that the Commissioners should have accepted it, and have embodied it in their Report. It might be said that he was proposing to unite an agricultural district with Stroud, which was a manufacturing district; but the new district of Stroud would comprise an enormous area of agricultural country precisely similar to that which he proposed to add to it. Therefore, the change would not involve any mingling of dissimilar populations in different parts of the county. The sole reason for regarding the parishes of Eastington and Frocester as a manufacturing district was that Eastington contained one woollen manufactory; but he did not think that that was sufficient to warrant a resistance to the plan he now proposed. If his scheme were accepted, the result would be to equalize the divisions of the county rather more than at present. According to the present form of the divisions the population varied from 59,000 to 48,000, and under his arrangement it would vary from 59,000 to 50,000. He had no wish to detain the Committee at any greater length; but he would ask the right hon. Baronet to consider what he had said, and see whether he could remedy the grievance by an appeal to the Commissioners. He begged to move the Amendment which stood in his name.

Amendment proposed, in page 56, line 22, after "Stroud," insert "Tetbury."—(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Tetbury' be there inserted."

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he should be very glad to meet the views of the right hon. Baronet, and make him the promise he asked for, if he thought he could do so honestly and fairly. The right hon. Gentleman had brought the matter in a very reasonable way before the Committee, and he should have been very anxious to meet the views of the right hon. Gentleman if he could; but he was afraid it would only be misleading the Committee if he were to comply with the proposal the right hon. Gentleman made, and were to refer the matter back again to the Commissioners. The fact was that this point, which had attracted the attention of the right hon. Baronet and of other Gentlemen, had already received very careful consideration at the hands of the Commissioners, and he knew that they were in favour of adhering to their scheme. There would, therefore, be no good result obtained by a further reference, unless it were to be in the form of a direction from the Committee to the Commissioners to give effect to a view that was different from their own.

[*Thirteenth Night.*]

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he did not ask that that should be done.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he quite understood that that was not the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman; but he was afraid that if the matter were referred back to the Commissioners the Committee would only receive the same answer. He knew personally that the matter had been considered over and over again. It was felt that Tetbury was mainly agricultural, and that Stroud was mainly manufacturing, and that to take out the two parishes of Eastington and Frocester would not be a satisfactory arrangement of the two divisions. As a matter of fact, the Commissioners had framed this division strictly in accordance with their instructions. As the right hon. Baronet had stated, the original scheme was not exactly in the form it now assumed in the Bill, and he quite admitted the extreme irregularity of the division, so far as its shape was concerned. Nevertheless, all these points were brought before the Commissioners at their local inquiry; and the Commissioners, having regard to their instructions, felt that it was desirable to include in one division what might be considered the agricultural population, and the manufacturing population in the other. He believed that the arrangement devised by the Commissioners was, generally speaking, approved of everywhere except in Tetbury.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH pointed out that the proposal he now made was made at the local inquiry by the Liberal Representative of the county.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the Boundary Commissioners had given the proposal the most fair consideration, and they had come to the conclusion that Tetbury ought not to be included in the Stroud Division; that, in point of fact, it had a community of interests with the Cirencester Division; while, on the other hand, it had no community of interests at all with the Petty Sessional divisions and parishes proposed to be included in the Stroud Division. Under those circumstances, he did not think it would be necessary to refer the matter back again to the Commissioners, but that Tetbury should remain in the Cotswold District.

MR. STANTON said, it was quite true that this proposal was discussed at the local inquiry at Gloucester. The gist of the Amendment was, that the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) wished to take out from the Cirencester Division the Petty Sessional Division of Tetbury, with a population of 5,500, and insert it in the Stroud Division, and to take away from the Stroud Division two parishes with a population of 1,800. The result would be that the Stroud Division would contain a population of 59,800, as against 56,000; while those of Cirencester and Tewkesbury would consist of 50,000, as against 55,500, and 51,200, as against 49,500. The Tewkesbury Division would, no doubt, be rendered more equal; but, although Tewkesbury had a smaller population than the other divisions, it contained within it the boroughs of Cheltenham and Gloucester; and, no doubt, in both of those boroughs there would be a large number of voters who would have qualifications outside their respective boroughs. Therefore, in all human probability, the influence of the Tewkesbury Division would be quite equal to that of any other division of the county. He should like to say one word to the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), who seemed to think that the pursuits of the population had not been duly regarded in the scheme of the Commissioners. He thought the right hon. Gentleman was mistaken. There was not the slightest doubt that the interests of Tetbury were purely agricultural; and, although it was quite true that no one division could be regarded as strictly so, yet in the district of Stroud generally the places included were principally concerned in manufacturing operations. That was not the case in regard to Tetbury, which was practically an agricultural district; and by including it in the Stroud Division, which contained an essentially manufacturing population, they would diminish the amount of aggregation which was considered desirable in connection with the pursuits of the population. He would also remind the right hon. Gentleman that the people of Cirencester attended before the Boundary Commissioners at their local inquiry, and were highly favourable to the inclusion of Tetbury in the Cirencester Division. Mr. Ellett, who represented the views of Cirencester and its neighbourhood, adverting to the inclusion of Tetbury, said

that the residents of that part of the county were unanimous in their desire that the hill lines should be preserved, and that the entire population of the Cotswold District should form one distinct and an inseparable division, and that this desire could be complied with, in accordance with the Instructions which had been given to the Commissioners. He went on further to say that a more homogeneous district could not have been obtained, and that no one who was at all acquainted with the county would have thought of proposing any scheme which would have divided the hill district, and have taken Tetbury from it, in order to carry it elsewhere. Those remarks applied with the same force to Eastington parish, which contained a manufacturing population of 1,500, and which by its industrial pursuits and geographical position should be attached to the Stroud Division. As regarded the parish of Frocester, which the right hon. Gentleman proposed to take out of the Stroud Division, it was a very small agricultural parish with a population only of 271, situated between other parishes of the division, and through which the main road of their communication passed. It was not desirable, therefore, to disturb the divisions arranged by the Commissioners. The Commissioners throughout their inquiry had displayed the utmost impartiality; and after the attention they had devoted to the county divisions he really thought the Committee ought to be satisfied, and that they should accept their decision. It was quite true, as the right hon. Baronet had pointed out, that the distance of Tetbury from the extreme end of the division was very considerable; but it was essentially a hill district, and there was no communication except by roads. The roads were good, and the fact that there was no railway communication was due to the geographical formation of the county rather than to any other cause. He hoped the Amendment of the right hon. Baronet would not be pressed, but that he would consent to withdraw it. He (Mr. Stanton) was satisfied that, industriously, numerically, and geographically, the division proposed by the Commissioners would be the best and most satisfactory for the county which could possibly be devised.

Mr. J. R. YORKE said, he thought that, after what the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had said, there was very little use in discussing the matter further; but any hon. Member who had any knowledge of the Eastern portion of the county of Gloucester would understand the extraordinary difficulties the people there would labour under in conducting the Parliamentary business in the division under the scheme of the Commissioners. There was no railway communication that would be of the smallest service in getting from one end of the division to the other. If a man started now to go from Tetbury to Stratford-on-Avon, he (Mr. Yorke) hardly knew how he would get there, unless he went round by Cirencester or Didcot. He would have to drive some 50 miles or so, and then continue the rest of his journey by a most circuitous route. He imagined that the Commissioners could not have been in the least aware of what the circumstances of the county were, or they would not have dismissed the matter with what appeared to him (Mr. Yorke) to be the somewhat superficial observation that there was no similarity of interests in the division between Stroud and Tetbury. They were both towns in the same county, and the pursuits conducted in Stroud were very much of the same character as those carried on in Tetbury, and one place was at a very short distance from the other. If Tetbury were added to the Stroud Division, a very considerable improvement would be effected as regarded the symmetry of the division as well as in that of Cirencester, which was at present of extraordinary length and shape. As, however, the right hon. Baronet was not disposed to give way to the wishes of the locality in the matter, there was no further use in discussing the question. At the same time, he believed that hereafter those who were interested in the matter would very much lament the refusal to make this alteration.

Mr. ACKERS said, he was inclined to think the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill was in favour of the alteration the right hon. Baronet the Member for East Gloucestershire (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) proposed to make; but he resisted it, because he felt himself bound by the opinion expressed by the Boundary Commissioners. In regard to the observations of the hon. Member for

Stroud (Mr. Stanton) in reference to the population of the district, he did not think that was an important matter, because they would have in the county, as the hon. Member perfectly well knew, another division—namely, that of Thornbury—which would be identical with that of Stroud if this alteration were made. He was surprised at the assertion of the hon. Member that the Petty Sessional Division of Tetbury was a very hilly one, and therefore ought not to be included in the borough of Stroud.

MR. STANTON said, he had spoken of the district of Stroud.

MR. ACKERS said, he knew every part of the borough of Stroud, including that in which the hon. Member himself lived; and he would ask the hon. Member if it was not far more hilly than any portion of the Tetbury district? Then, again, the hon. Member said that this was purely an agricultural district. There were no cloth mills in the district of Tetbury at the present moment; but in a large portion of the Stroud district there were no cloth mills. There were parts of the borough of Stroud, five miles in extent, in which there was not a single cloth factory; and they were going to add to the borough of Stroud a district which would make more than six miles in which no manufacturing operations were carried on. Any hon. Member who would look at the map would see at once that Tetbury belonged to Stroud, and that it was altogether cut off from Cirencester, and that, therefore, there was good reason for asking the Government to reconsider the matter. The Cirencester Division, as at present proposed, was not only of enormous extent, but would be an exceedingly unworkable division, seeing that there was no real communication in it from one end to the other. It contained no place for a public meeting, and when it was considered necessary to hold a public meeting the people were obliged to go to Cheltenham, or to some other place outside the district. But Tetbury was within an easy walk of Stroud, and actually belonged to it. As the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill had consented to so much, he (Mr. Ackers) hoped the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider his decision upon this question, and be prepared to deal with it upon the merits of the case. He sincerely trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would not hold the Committee too strictly to the arrangement proposed by the Boundary Commissioners. It was not a Party question in any respect, seeing that the inclusion of Tetbury in the Stroud Division was supported by the Liberal Party at the inquiry at Gloucester, just as much as by the Conservatives.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he had never had any desire to ask the Committee to overrule the decision of the Boundary Commissioners. He had, therefore, no intention of pressing the Amendment to a division, and after the discussion which had taken place he would withdraw it.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH moved, as an Amendment, to omit from the Stroud Division the parishes of Eastington and Frocester in the Sessional Division of Whitminster. This Amendment, he said, related to a point which the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) might probably consider without reference to the larger question of the Petty Sessional district of Tetbury. The right hon. Baronet had refused to insert the Sessional Division of Tetbury in the Stroud Division, on the ground that it would involve the introduction of a community with entirely different interests. With the exception of one woollen manufactory, the two parishes comprising the district of Eastington and Frocester were purely agricultural. They had always been contained in the county of Gloucester; because, from their nature, they had never been considered to be manufacturing in their character, and, consequently, they were not included in the borough of Stroud when that borough was formed under the Reform Act of 1832. He asked the right hon. Baronet whether, looking to the physical character of the country in this district, and the fact that these places had never hitherto been included in Stroud, he would allow the Boundary Commissioners to re-open this point, and place these parishes in the Tewkesbury Division of the county of Gloucester? By so doing he would materially improve the proportionate population of the Tewkesbury Division. At present the population of that division was 48,000; but the addition of these two parishes would increase it to 51,250,

while that of Stroud, instead of being 57,000, would be reduced to 54,345. By that means the population of the two divisions would be rendered more equal, and the parishes of Eastington and Frocester would be represented not only in accordance with the agricultural pursuits they followed, but in the division to which they properly belonged.

Amendment proposed, in page 56, line 24, leave out "Eastington, Frocester."—(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had intended to cover this case in his reply to the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman opposite in moving the first Amendment. He had thought it convenient to take them together, although, perhaps, he was not strictly in order in adopting that course. As a matter of fact, the Boundary Commissioners had referred to this Amendment as well as to the former one, and he was bound to say, from the information he had received, that the case of the right hon. Baronet was not so strong upon this point as it was upon the other. Frocester was on the high road from one part of Stroud to the other—namely, between Stonehouse and Stroud, and he believed there were other parishes intervening which would also remain in the Stroud Division. The right hon. Baronet would probably be better acquainted with the fact than he was; but, at any rate, the Boundary Commissioners had a strong opinion upon the matter, and, therefore, he did not think it was desirable to ask them to reconsider their decision.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, that he would withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. RAIKES moved an Amendment, the object of which was to describe the second division of the county of Gloucester as the "Northern or Tewkesbury Division."

Amendment proposed, in page 56, line 26, after "The," insert "Northern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, that, while not opposing the Amendment, he wished to point out that this division did not comprise the northernmost parts of the county, and, therefore, to call it "Northern" might be somewhat anomalous. He could not say that the points of the compass, considering the curious shaped divisions which were provided for this county, were altgether applicable. He, therefore, asked the right hon. Baronet (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) to consider whether it would be proper to apply the term "Northern" to the Tewkesbury Division.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, the right hon. Gentleman was quite right in saying that there was a part of the county of Gloucester which was north of this division; but there was not very much, he thought.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, that was so. It was a very small portion.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he was anxious that the names of "Eastern" and "Western," which now applied to the two divisions of Gloucester, should still be retained; and, therefore, as it was impossible to call this division "Southern," the only alternative was to designate it "Northern." He hoped that at some future time the boundary would be rectified; but at present he approved of the Amendment.

Mr. J. R. YORKE thought the division ought to be named in accordance with the actual fact, and with due regard to the convenience of the population. He thought, also, that for the sake of simplicity in the issue of Writs, and in regard to the naming of Members by the Speaker, and other hon. Members, Tewkesbury would have been a better name without an alternative. He thought it would be difficult to find a more Northern Division of Gloucester than the fifth division.

Mr. RAIKES said, he thought his hon. Friend the Member for East Gloucestershire (Mr. Yorke) was labouring under a misapprehension. He did not propose to take away the name of Tewkesbury, but merely to give an alternative name, in accordance with the arrangement which had been generally adopted in regard to other counties. The hypothesis that there was a part of a district north of this division was true; but it extended into Worcestershire, and barely

touched the county of Gloucester. Leaving that small portion out of this division, it included the whole of the northern part of Gloucestershire; and he did not know any case that was stronger for a name taken from one of the points of the compass. He therefore saw no necessity for departing from the rule which the Committee, in almost every case, had laid down for other counties up to the present moment. This was a new division in a somewhat irregular-shaped county. He quite appreciated the conciliatory manner in which he had been met upon the subject; but he could not see any difficulty in adopting the alternative name in this case, similar to that which had been adopted in other counties.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE remarked, that the Members for the county did not appear to agree among themselves.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: As to the alternative?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Yes, as to the alternative. He understood the hon. Member for East Gloucestershire (Mr. Yorke) to prefer "Tewkesbury" without "Northern."

MR. STANTON said, that there were parts of the proposed division which were certainly not in the northern portion of the county of Gloucester.

MR. WARTON said, he thought it would have been desirable, in the first instance, to have adhered to the points of the compass; but that proposition had not been adopted, and the names of places well known from their antiquity and associations had been, in many instances, retained. That was proposed to be done in this case; and it would, therefore, be impossible to secure anything like a symmetrical arrangement if, in one case, they were to retain the name of the borough, and in others were to adopt the plan of naming the divisions after the points of the compass. They had already adopted "Mid" in regard to the first division—namely, that of Stroud; and, although the whole of this division was not, strictly speaking, in the northern part of the county, it might be termed "the Northern or Tewkesbury Division." They came next to the Cirencester and Forest of Dean Divisions, both of which were well-known names. But he could not say the same with regard to the Thornbury Division, which was the fifth in the list.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE thought the best course would be to maintain the compass divisions. It was said that the Tewkesbury Division was more northerly; but as Berkeley was in the division it would be difficult to call it Northern. As to Thornbury, he believed that was the place where the Mayor of Bristol formerly did homage.

MR. ACKERS said, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would accept what had been practically the rule of the Committee in regard to this Bill, and not altogether yield to the suggestion of his hon. Friend the Member for East Gloucestershire (Mr. Yorke). It must not be forgotten that the hon. Member, some years ago, represented the ancient borough of Tewkesbury; and it was quite natural, therefore, that he should cling to old associations, and should desire to preserve the name of that borough. But anyone who lived in the district would be aware that great dissatisfaction had been occasioned in consequence of the proposal to call this the Tewkesbury Division.

MR. J. R. YORKE said, he thought his hon. Friend (Mr. Ackers) was mistaken. There was certainly nothing like general dissatisfaction.

MR. ACKERS said, that might be so in regard to those who lived in the Tewkesbury District; but there were in the division the ancient City of Gloucester and the flourishing borough of Cheltenham, who would not consider themselves very much magnified by being absorbed in the name of Tewkesbury. In point of fact, there was a considerable part of the division in the northern portion of the county. He should be sorry to hear that there was any idea of giving up the name of "Western" for the Forest of Dean Division. That was a part of the county in which he was considerably interested; and he hoped the word "Northern" would be retained in the present case, and "Western" would be the alternative name for the Forest of Dean Division. If it were a question between "Northern" and "Tewkesbury," he might prefer Tewkesbury; but as it was only an alternative, and would give satisfaction to a large portion of the constituency, he hoped the word "Northern" would be accepted.

Mr. STANTON expressed a hope that, for the sake of simplicity, the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would not find it necessary to adopt either "Northern," "Eastern," or "Western," except as an alternative. He was, however, quite certain that the Forest of Dean, Tewkesbury, and Stroud would be perfectly well known without the cardinal points of the compass being attached to them.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he did not know upon what ground the hon. Member for Stroud (Mr. Stanton) spoke on behalf of the Forest of Dean, or of Tewkesbury, seeing that he had nothing to do with either of those places. It was almost absurd to talk of the town of Tewkesbury in competition with the other towns which had been attached to the Gloucester Division; but he did not see why the Western Division should not be adopted as an alternative name for the Forest of Dean, because it was really in that division now. The new division comprised a large tract of country altogether outside the Forest of Dean, and known by the name of West Gloucestershire. They were in precisely the same position as Glamorganshire. In that case, the Committee had decided that there should be the alternative name of "West Glamorganshire" or "Gower." He could not see why the name of "Northern" should not be applied to the Tewkesbury Division, seeing that Tewkesbury was only a very small town compared with Gloucester and Cheltenham, which were both now in the same division.

Mr. STANTON said, the observations he had made were founded upon what took place before the Boundary Commissioners, and the views which seemed to prevail there as to the names which were proposed to be given to the divisions. If the cardinal points of the compass were not introduced, there certainly would be more simplicity arrived at in the designation of the different divisions.

Mr. ACKERS said, that he was not present at the inquiry before the Boundary Commissioner; but he had heard all through the division since what the opinion of the people was, and he knew that there was a strong feeling in favour of the alternative name being accepted.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he thought the matter had now been sufficiently discussed, and that it ought to be brought to an end. He trusted that it would not be necessary to divide the Committee. He thought that, on the whole, the words "Northern or" might be accepted.

Question put, and *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

On the Motion of Sir Charles W. Dilke, the following Amendment made:—In page 56, line 32, after "Tewkesbury," insert, "and the parish of Slimbridge."

Mr. RAIKES moved a further Amendment to describe the third division as the "Eastern or Cirencester Division."

Amendment proposed, in page 56, line 33, after "The," insert "Eastern or." —(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had no objection to the Amendment.

Question put, and *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

Mr. RAIKES said, he now came to the Forest of Dean Division, and he still ventured to hope that he might persuade the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir Charles W. Dilke) to allow an alternative name in regard to that division. No doubt, it was an interesting and well-known locality; but the Forest of Dean did not constitute the whole of the division. The district included in the division at the present moment formed part of West Gloucestershire; and there was a great desire on the part of the sub-divided district to retain the name of the division which had hitherto been attached to it. This part of the county formed, at the present time, the greater part of the Western Division of Gloucestershire, the boundary being the River Severn. No doubt, there were cases like the New Forest where it might be desirable to keep up the name, because it was rather difficult to assign the division to any point of the compass. But, in this case, the division was altogether free from the objection which had been urged against the Tewkesbury Division. In the case of Tewkesbury, there was some force in the objection, because the Tewkesbury Division would ramble all over Gloucestershire, although there was

probably a considerable part of it in the northern portion of the county. But in the case of the Forest of Dean it was purely and essentially western; and, as far as he (Mr. Raikes) could gather, there was no feeling in Gloucestershire against the name of "Western" being attached to it. He, therefore, hoped the right hon. Gentleman would accept the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, in page 56, line 38, after "The," insert "Western or." —(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he thought a strong argument had been raised against the insertion of the compass names on account of the confusion it might create between the existing divisions of a county and the new divisions. The argument now used was that the alteration ought to be made, because there was a similarity of name between the new division and an existing division. He congratulated his right hon. Friend (Mr. Raikes) on thus confirming the view which he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had originally expressed. As to the New Forest, which was proposed as the name of one of the new divisions of Hampshire, there was a great similarity between that case and the present. The New Forest, no more than the Forest of Dean, comprised the whole of the division; but each locality was very well known by the name it bore.

LORD MORETON said, he opposed the Amendment on the ground that the voters themselves would prefer being included in the Forest of Dean Division rather than in the Western Division. The Forest proper did not certainly cover the whole of the division; but the bulk of the population were in the Forest.

MR. ACKERS said, he supported the Amendment on behalf of himself and of his constituents. It was quite true that the noble Lord who had just spoken (Lord Moreton) was also one of the Representatives of the division; but he was more connected with the other side of the division, divided by the River Severn. On the other hand, he (Mr. Ackers) had his property in the Western Division, pure and simple—in the very division which it was now proposed to call either by the name of the Forest of Dean Division, or the Western or Forest of Dean Division. The larger portion of the division was not in the Forest of Dean. This was the case in the district in which he happened to live, so that he was perfectly satisfied as to what the opinion of the inhabitants of the district was. They were almost unanimously of opinion that this Amendment should be adopted; and he trusted that the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill would accept it.

Question put, and *negatived.*

On the Motion of MR. RAIKES, the following Amendment made:—In page 57, line 1, after "The," insert "Southern or."

On the Motion of SIR CHARLES W. DILKE, the following Amendment made:—In page 57, line 6, after "Hants," insert "exclusive of the Isle of Wight."

MR. RAIKES said, the county of Hampshire, under the arrangement in the Bill, roughly speaking, consisted of two squares, the larger square, which was the object of the series of Amendments he proposed to move, being divided into North, South, East, and West Divisions, and the smaller square, forming a separate division—the Lymington Division—to which he should ask the Committee to give the alternative name of "New Forest Division." The particular Amendment which he had risen to move was that of inserting the words "Northern or" before "Basingstoke Division." Although he was aware that it might more accurately be called the "North-Eastern Division," yet, as it included the northernmost portion of the county, he considered that the most appropriate style would be that of "the Northern or," which he begged to move.

Amendment proposed, in page 57, line 9, after "The," insert "Northern or." —(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

SIR FREDERICK FITZ-WYGRAM said, that there was a strong feeling in favour of giving the name of "Aldershot" as the alternative in the case of the first division of the county. Yet, although he thought the name not unsuitable, and had given Notice of an Amendment in the direction indicated,

he believed the inhabitants of the Aldershot District would, on the whole, be satisfied with the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge which the Committee had just agreed to; and he should not, therefore, move the next Amendment on the Paper.

On the Motion of Mr. RAIKES, the following Amendments made:—In page 57, line 13, after "The," insert "Western or;" and in line 21, after "The," insert "Eastern or."

SIR FREDERICK FITZ-WYGRAM, in moving, as an Amendment, in page 57, to leave out lines 29 and 30, said, it was proposed by the present Bill to place the three south-eastern parishes of the Fareham Division, bordering on the sea, in the Mid Division of the county. Now, the case he had to lay before the Committee in support of his Amendment was a very simple one. The southern portion of the county was divided from the other divisions by a line of hills called the South Downs; the people living on the south side of these hills were engaged in commercial and seafaring pursuits; whereas those on the north side were people of an entirely different class, who were engaged in agricultural pursuits, and had no interest whatever in trade or commerce; and he might mention that there was a line of railway which ran entirely along the sea coast. The question had been treated by the Commissioners as purely a question of numbers, and under the arrangement in the Bill one division would contain 49,000, and the other 48,000 inhabitants. The number of inhabitants living in the parishes to which he referred was about 4,800; and, therefore, he admitted there would be a disparity if the proposal he made were carried out. But he gathered that the Commissioners were to look to community of interest rather than numbers. Now, the community of interest was very strong all along the south coast of the county. The towns of Fareham and Gosport were mere annexes of the great borough of Portsmouth; there was a direct community of interest and trade with them and the people living on the south side of the hills, whilst there was no connection with those living on the north side of the hills; and therefore he said that in the scheme of the Commissioners community of interest should have been considered rather than the mere abstract principle of numbers. The right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had told him a few days ago, that if there were a general wish in its favour, and if he could obtain the consent of the representative bodies in the three parishes he would probably accede to the alteration he was now urging upon the Committee. He had obtained the consent of the vestries to the present proposal, all of whom wished that they might retain their connection with the Western Division in the future, as they had in the past. He believed that the only objection that could be raised was on the ground of numbers; but he ventured to hope that regard would be had to community of interest, and that it would not, in this instance, be overridden by the numerical difficulty.

Amendment proposed, in page 57, leave out lines 29 and 30.—(*Sir Frederick Fitz-Wygram.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he did not feel justified in accepting the Amendment. He admitted the truth of all the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Sir Frederick Fitz-Wygram) had said with regard to means of communication; indeed, the hon. and gallant Gentleman had made out a very strong case. But the Commissioners had distinctly considered this matter, and the population of the divisions, as proposed by the Bill, would be very nearly equal; whereas under the Amendment there would be a pretty considerable disparity, amounting to as many as 9,000 or 10,000 people. Looking to the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition (Sir Stafford Northcote) last night, in which he strongly impressed upon the Committee the importance of following the recommendations of the Commissioners generally, he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) felt bound to oppose the Amendment.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS said, that in the absence of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition (Sir Stafford Northcote) he was bound to say he should have with great regret to oppose this Amendment on the grounds the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W.

Dilke) had just put forward. The right hon. Baronet's, and, indeed, his (Sir R. Assheton Cross's) opinion was very strong, that they ought—at this period, at all events, of the Bill—to maintain all that the Boundary Commissioners had put down. He should certainly support the right hon. Baronet in upholding the recommendations of the Boundary Commissioners in all these county matters. Although he felt the force of the observations made by his hon. and gallant Friend (Sir Frederick Fitz-Wygram) he should be bound, if a division were taken, to support the view of the Government.

MR. WARTON said, that after the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross) it might be well to ask a question of the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) in charge of the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said it was important that they should, at that stage of the Bill, at all events, support the recommendations of the Commissioners on this subject. What length of time would elapse between the Committee and the Report stage? Was it the intention of the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) to allow several days to transpire between Committee and Report? If it was the intention of the right hon. Baronet to allow several days to transpire between Committee and Report, and then to give his attention to a great number of matters, he might conciliate opposition, which otherwise would be raised now, and therefore facilitate the progress of the Bill.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he thought he would be more in Order if he reserved his statement of the intentions of the Government on the points raised by the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Warton) until the concluding minutes of the Committee stage. He would try between Committee and Report to meet the views of the House generally as to the best time to fix for Report. He thought the general desire was to make rapid progress with the Bill, and, therefore, he should propose as short a time as was reasonable between Committee and Report; and, at the same time, a sufficient time to enable hon. Members to put down any Amendments they considered desirable.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Sir R. Assheton Cross

On the Motion of MR. RAIKES, the following Amendment made:—In page 57, line 31, after "The," insert "Southern or."

MR. HORACE DAVEY said, he had put down an Amendment, to insert after "The," on page 57, line 35, "New Forest or," so that the Lymington Division would read, "The New Forest or Lymington Division." He did not propose to move the Amendment in the exact form in which it appeared on the Paper unless his right hon. Friend (Sir Charles W. Dilke) preferred that form. Personally, he (Mr. Davey) should prefer to substitute the words "New Forest" for the word "Lymington."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would accept the alteration in the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, in page 57, line 36, to leave out the word "Lymington," and insert the words "New Forest."—(*Mr. Horace Davey.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Lymington' stand part of the Schedule."

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he understood that his right hon. Friend (Mr. Raikes) intended to propose the insertion of the words "New Forest or," after the word "Lymington."

MR. RAIKES said, that the Amendment before the Committee was that of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Christchurch (Mr. Horace Davey), which came before his (Mr. Raikes's) Amendment.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Horace Davey) had moved his Amendment in an amended form.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he was sorry he was not in the House when the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Horace Davey) rose. He (Mr. Sclater-Booth) understood that it was intended to give an alternative name to the division—that the division should be called the Lymington or New Forest Division. He did not understand why that course should not be followed.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Question before the Committee is, "That the word 'Lymington' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that if the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Sclater-

Booth) preferred that course, he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had no doubt his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Horace Davey) would move it in that form, which was his original proposal. The points of the compass had been adopted with regard to the rest of the county; but there was no exact analogy in this case.

MR. HORACE DAVEY said, that his reason for moving the Amendment in the amended form was that the most appropriate name should be given to the division. In this case there was no need of keeping up the alternative name—indeed, it would be out of place, because Lymington was, in fact, part of the New Forest. This was the reason why he preferred New Forest to Lymington, taking the analogy of the Forest of Dean.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That the words 'New Forest' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

MR. WARTON said, he had an Amendment to propose which he had not had an opportunity of placing on the Paper. It was to insert after the word "and," in line 43, page 57, the words "in the Sessional Division of." He pointed out that the words were adopted in the other divisions of the county; but that in the case of this division they did not find anything to identify the parishes of Chilworth and North Stoneham. It was only by going through a long process that they arrived at the idea that these parishes must be in the Sessional Divisions. There was an absolute necessity of preserving similarity of expression, and therefore he begged to move the insertion of the words he had read.

Amendment proposed, in page 57, line 43, after the word "and," to insert the words "in the Sessional Division of."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he did not like to accept Amendments of this kind when they were not on the Paper, because they very frequently involved points one did not see. He therefore begged the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Warton) to place his Amendment on the Paper, so that he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) might have an opportunity of considering it before Report. He had no doubt that on Report he would be able to accept the Amendment, because he was inclined to think that the hon. and learned Gentleman was right on this point.

MR. WARTON said, that there could be no mistake about the desirability of inserting the words. He had, however, no objection to put the Amendment down for Report; but he hoped that they would not have too short an interval allowed between Committee stage and Report.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that if the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Warton) would give him a note of one of the cases covered by Amendments such as this, he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would undertake that the matter was considered in advance of Report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. and learned Gentleman withdraw his Amendment?

MR. WARTON: I will do so if I am pressed.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE preferred that the hon. and learned Gentleman would adopt the course he had suggested.

MR. WARTON said, that his Amendment was a very proper one, and therefore he should like to have it negatived.

Question put, and *negatived.*

MR. RANKIN said, that in the unavoidable absence of the hon. Baronet the Member for Herefordshire (Sir Joseph Bailey), and at his special request, he (Mr. Rankin) rose to move the Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Baronet, which was, in effect, to change the word "two" which stood in the Bill to the word "three," or, in other words, to allow the county of Hereford to retain its three Members. He thought it might be fairly said that the county of Hereford was rather hardly used by this Bill, because it was the only county, except Rutland, which lost a Member at all; and the number of Members for the county, including boroughs, would be by this Bill only half the number which now existed—namely, three, instead of six. The City of Hereford lost a Member, and the borough of Leominster lost a Member, and one Member was proposed to be

taken from the county; therefore, he thought they might very fairly ask the Committee to reconsider the question as regarded the county. If they looked at the case of some of the other counties, they had a very strong case indeed. He found, for instance, the county of Rutland had only an area of 94,000 acres.

MR. WARTON rose to Order. He submitted that under the very stringent words of the 9th clause of the Bill they could not raise the question of special representation.

MR. RANKIN said, that his Amendment was to the second line on page 58, where the words "two Members, two Divisions" appeared. The Amendment he had to move was that the word "two" be left out, and the word "three" inserted.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE, on the point of Order, submitted that the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) was wrong, and that the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Rankin) was right. He apprehended there could be no doubt it was competent for the hon. Member to move the Amendment.

MR. RANKIN said, he was obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for his intervention, for he could hardly believe that he was out of Order in moving the Amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN said, he thought the hon. Member (Mr. Rankin) was in Order in seeking to amend the Schedule by the substitution of one word for another; but, at the same time, the Amendment was in flat contradiction to one of the clauses of the Bill.

MR. RANKIN: Do I understand, Mr. Chairman, you will allow me to proceed?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes; the hon. Member is in Order.

MR. RANKIN said, that when interrupted by the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Warton) he was calling the attention of the Committee to the fact that there were several counties which had an undue representation compared with Hereford. The county of Rutland, for instance, had only 94,889 acres, and a population of 21,000; and Huntingdon, with 57,000 population, retained its two Members; whereas Herefordshire, with a population of 101,241 and an acreage of 519,000, was to be deprived of one of its Members. It might be said that the argument with regard to the acreage did not go for much; but he thought, when it was considered that the new voters in a great number of instances were persons who could not come great distances owing to their occupation, and that it would be necessary for Members to go greater distances to them, the argument of acreage did apply with some force. He also begged the Committee to observe that if the county of Huntingdon was allowed to retain its two Members, with a population of only 57,000, surely Hereford, with a population of 101,000, might be allowed to retain its three Members. He also begged to point out to the Committee that as there were 79 boroughs thrown into the counties, the purely agricultural interests would not be represented in the new Parliament as well as now, although there would be a greater number of county Members than at present. He thought, therefore, that a county which was purely agricultural, such as Hereford, should be favourably considered in this matter. The county might easily and naturally be divided into three instead of two divisions; and, of course, if the present Amendment were carried, a consequential Amendment would be submitted to this effect—there could be the Eastern, Northern, and Southern Divisions. The Eastern Division was one celebrated for its fruit growing, and they had the authority of the Prime Minister that fruit-growing and jam-making would form an important part of the agriculture of the future. The Northern Division was celebrated for its breed of cattle, and the Southern Division celebrated for its sheep and corn; it would, therefore, be seen that there might be three very simple and natural divisions of the county. If the Committee agreed to the retention by the county of its three Members, he would like it to remain exactly as at present—namely, a minority clause county with three Members, each elector having two votes. As he did not desire to take up any further time, he would merely add that the people of Hereford thought they had been rather hardly dealt with in this Bill, and he thought the adoption of this Amendment would only be a graceful concession to them. He begged to move the Amendment which stood on

the Paper in the name of his hon. Friend (Sir Joseph Bailey).

Amendment proposed, in page 58, line 2, to leave out the first word "two," and insert "three."—(*Mr. Rankin.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'two' stand part of the Schedule."

THE CHAIRMAN desired to point out that the 9th clause provided that the number of Members for the different localities should be those mentioned in the Schedule. Of course, it was competent for the hon. Member to amend the Schedule, and to alter the number of Members allowed to Hereford. In that respect, he (the Chairman) wished to modify the opinion he had expressed on the point of Order.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that this Amendment was like many others that had been proposed with regard to boroughs; and he thought county Members had shown great self-restraint in not making similar Motions with regard to counties. This Amendment was certainly not more defensible than those put forward with regard to boroughs. The low-scale counties were treated in the same way as boroughs; and the hon. Member (Mr. Rankin) had altogether omitted to tell the Committee what was the true position of the county of Hereford. The county was a little better off than the average at the present moment; not worse off, but better than some counties. It was by no means a hard case, like the cases of the Isle of Wight or Cardiganshire. [MR. RANKIN: It loses half its Members.] The Isle of Wight lost its only borough Member, and Cardiganshire was treated in the same way; and, therefore, he could hardly agree that the case of Hereford was exceptionally hard. The population of the county amounted to 101,000; it was not an increasing, but rather a decreasing population. The average population per Member was between 50,000 and 51,000; but if the county had three Members, as proposed by the hon. Member, the population would only be between 33,000 and 34,000 per Member. The average population per Member throughout all England was 53,400, so that the county was considerably better off than the average; and he thought it would be impossible to rob a county which was in a worse position of a Member, in order to give an additional Representative to Hereford. This case could not stand by itself; if they gave three Members to Hereford, they would have to give other Members to other counties standing in a similar position. He must remind the Committee of the exact balance of the number of Members allotted to boroughs and counties by the Bill; if any seat were to be taken for this county it must be a county seat, and according to the agreement between the two Parties in the House, the seat would have to be obtained by taking a Member from one of the counties which had received an increase of Members. He thought the hon. Member would have great difficulty in persuading the Committee to do that.

MR. BIDDULPH said, he felt bound, in justification of the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Rankin), to say that this question had caused the most lively interest in the county he (Mr. Biddulph) had the honour to represent; and, therefore, he felt his hon. Friend (Sir Joseph Bailey) was fully justified in putting the Amendment on the Paper. In Herefordshire it was felt to be very hard that they were to be deprived by this Bill of one-half of their representation. He was fully of opinion that the county was entitled to a third Representative, although he did not quite know where the additional Member was to come from; it was the business of the promoters of the Bill to settle that difficulty. He entirely agreed with his hon. Friend (Mr. Rankin) as to the desirability of maintaining the minority vote in the county. The minority vote system had worked remarkably well in Hereford; so far from its deadening political life, as had been stated by one Cabinet Minister, who evidently did not understand the question at all, it had stimulated the political life of the county to a very great degree. He (Mr. Biddulph) had no difficulty in supporting the Amendment.

MR. WARTON said, the question had been asked where the additional Member was to come from. Now, he thought that one of the great defects of the Bill was that it had no principle, and the course pursued in the Bill with regard to this county fully proved it.

MR. DUCKHAM said, the hon. Member for Leominster (Mr. Rankin) had

quite represented the feeling that existed throughout Herefordshire on this question. At the recent Quarter Sessions there had been a very strong feeling expressed with regard to it. Hon. Members had been urged to use their best efforts to persuade the Committee to allow the county to be divided as proposed in the Amendment. He (Mr. Duckham) was very sorry that they had not to-night the attendance of their senior Member (Sir Joseph Bailey); and if the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) could see his way to carrying out the wishes of the county Members, he was sure the concession would be received with great pleasure by the inhabitants of both the County and City of Hereford. They all felt they were placed at considerable disadvantage by losing half their representation.

Question put, and *agreed to*.

On the Motion of Mr. RAIKES, the following Amendments made:—In page 58, line 4, after "The," insert "Northern or;" and in line 9, after "The," insert "Southern or."

MR. DUCKHAM said, he rose to propose the Amendment of which he had given Notice—namely, that the word "Ross" be inserted after the word "The" in line 9 of page 58. The Committee had, however, agreed to the insertion of the words "Southern or," to follow the word "The;" and he now, therefore, proposed that the word "Ross" should follow the words "Southern or."

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. Member is in error in this matter.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: No; he is quite right.

MR. DUCKHAM said, that if the Committee would look at the map of the county, they would see that Ross was almost at the southern extreme of the county. Ledbury, which was the name the Commissioners had decided to give the division, and for which he (Mr. Duckham) wished to substitute Ross, was in the eastern part of the district, almost at the extreme end of the division. If it was intended in the working of this Bill that the ballot boxes should be conveyed, after an election, to the town giving its name to the division, it would prove extremely awkward to take them to Ledbury. It would be much more awkward and much more expensive, at an election, to convey the ballot boxes in this division to Ledbury than to Ross. If they looked at the present population of these two towns, they would see that they were very similar; but they must bear in mind that the population of Ross was increasing, and that the population of Ledbury was not—in fact, that it had absolutely decreased during recent years. He thought, therefore, it would be a much better arrangement, and a great improvement in the Bill, to give to this division the name of Ross, instead of Ledbury. In the neighbourhood of the town of Ross a very strong feeling prevailed on the subject; a Petition had been presented by the Town Commissioners and the inhabitants of the district, in favour of the proposal he was now making. The town of Ross was very nearly in the centre of this great division. He thought the Committee would see the correctness of the view he had laid before them; and he was sure it would be in accordance with the general feeling of the district that his Amendment should be accepted.

Amendment proposed, in page 58, line 9, after the word "or," to leave out "Ledbury," and insert "Ross,"—(*Mr. Duckham,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'Ledbury' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he thought the chief objection to the name "Ross" was one that was less tenable than the objection he had taken previously—namely, the fact that there was another Ross in Scotland. In addition to that, the name "Ross" was familiar to them in connection with the fable of "the Man of Ross." Therefore, if Ledbury had no special claims on the Committee he should agree to the Amendment.

MR. RANKIN said, he hoped the Committee would accede to the Amendment. There could be no doubt that Ross was the more important town, and he believed now that the only name that could clash with that proposed was New Ross in Ireland, which was no longer a borough. Ross had three railway lines running into it, whereas Ledbury had only two; Ross was an increasing town,

and Ledbury was not likely to do very much in that line.

MR. BIDDULPH said, he did not intend to take part in this controversy; for the reason that he happened to know there had been a good deal of local jealousy excited with regard to these names; and, further, he hoped one day to represent this division in the House. His hon. Colleague (Mr. Duckham) had urged that if Ledbury were chosen for the name of the division, the ballot boxes would have to be taken a long way in some cases. That was not necessarily the case, because if the hon. Member would inform himself upon the subject, he would find that the authorities had power to fix whatever place they liked in the district for the opening of the ballot boxes. That argument, therefore, had nothing to do with the question before the Committee.

MR. DUCKHAM: I said that if Ledbury were fixed upon as the place where the ballot boxes were to be opened great inconvenience would be felt.

MR. ECROYD said, that as a newcomer in the county of Hereford, but as one feeling an interest in it, he should like to say that if there had been a proposal made to divide Hereford into East and West, they could not have proposed a better name for the Western Division than Ledbury; but as the proposal was to divide the county into North and South, he thought Ross was undoubtedly the right name for the Southern Division. Ross was an important town; and there was nothing very alarming to future candidates in the suggestion of the right hon. Baronet that the hon. Member representing the division would, if this title were adopted, be known as "The Man of Ross."

Question put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That 'Ross' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES said, that the next Amendment had reference to the county of Hertford, and it was in line 17 of page 58 to insert after the word "The," "Northern or." Those familiar with the map of Hertfordshire would see that it was of a polygonal shape; but that there was a large abutment upon an adjoining county to the Northern end which, under the scheme of the Commissioners, was in the Hitchin Division. The southern portion was divided into three nearly equal strips attached to Hertford, St. Albans, and Watford. He did not think there could be any objection to the adoption of the arrangement he proposed. The division in question was the largest of the four, and occupied a more northern position than any of them.

Amendment proposed, in page 58, line 17, after "The," insert "Northern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had no objection to make to the proposed Amendment.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

MR. HALSEY said, that in line 8, page 59, he wished to move to leave out the word "Caddington" for the purpose of inserting it lower down, because the place was in two counties. The county boundary went right through the middle of the parish of Caddington; the village church was in one county and the rest of the parish in another.

Amendment proposed, in page 59, line 8, leave out "Caddington."—(*Mr. Halsey.*)

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had a map before him which did not agree with the statement the Committee had just heard from the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Halsey). His (Sir Charles W. Dilke's) impression was that the detached district in question had been conveyed to the county of Hertfordshire by statute. He would agree to the Amendment at present; but if he found that the hon. Member was wrong in his view the matter could be amended on Report.

Question put, and *negatived;* word *left out* accordingly.

On the Motion of SIR CHARLES W. DILKE, the following Amendment made:—In page 59, line 10, leave out "Whipswade" and insert "Whipsnade."

MR. HALSEY said, he quite agreed with the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Charles W. Dilke) with regard to the last Amendment, as its object was simply to correct a mis-spelling; but he

certainly could not agree to what had fallen from him with regard to the insertion of "Whipsnade" elsewhere, because the whole of the place was in the county of Bedford, and none of it in Hertfordshire. He (Mr. Halsey) was a magistrate of the district, and therefore thought that he ought to know the place pretty well. He thought that "Whipsnade" should be left out.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that, as a matter of fact, he believed that if an Amendment in the sense of the hon. Member's observations were adopted, the effect would be to take "Whipsnade" out of all the divisions.

MR. HALSEY said, that the place had to do with Bedford—it had nothing whatever to do with Hertfordshire.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: That is not my view; I believe that "Whipsnade" parish is in the county of Hertfordshire.

MR. HALSEY: No, no!

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, it was, therefore, a question of fact. As he had not the Ordnance Boundary Survey in his hand, perhaps the Committee would allow him to keep the name as he proposed; and then, if the hon. Member would confer with him, and proved him to be wrong, he should be glad to make any alteration necessary on Report. He had already been proved in the wrong by the hon. Member for East Worcestershire (Mr. Hastings), and what had happened before might happen again. He was told that the detached portion of this place was in Hertfordshire, having been transferred there by Section 26 of 2 & 3 *Will.* IV., c. 64, and also by a Statute of Victoria.

Amendment proposed, in page 59, line 10, leave out "Whipsnade," and insert "Caddington."—(*Mr. Halsey.*)

Question, "That 'Whipsnade' stand part of the Schedule," put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That 'Caddington' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

On the Motion of MR. RAIKES, the following Amendment made:—In page 59, line 12, after "The," insert "Western or."

MR. RAIKES said, that the next Amendment in his name had reference to the county of Huntingdon, which, as the Committee was aware, was to have only two divisions which stood entirely to the North and South. His Amendment, as it stood on the Paper, was to leave out "Huntingdon" in line 20, and insert "Southern." He was told, however, that there was a strong feeling in the district in favour of an alternative name as against a point-of-the-compass name; although it would be rather awkward to speak of the Member for this division as the Member for the Huntingdon Division of the county of Huntingdon. In deference to that public opinion, therefore, he should move his Amendment in the alternative form—namely, after the word "The," to insert the words "Southern or."

Amendment proposed, in page 59, line 20, after the word "The," to insert the words "Southern or." - (*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he should have been rather inclined to think that it would have been better to have taken the points of the compass absolutely in this matter. There were many counties which had boroughs of the same name as the county, and that would be in no way unique. There was some difficulty in finding a good name for this division of the county, and the right hon. Gentleman himself was suffering under the difficulty. Ramsey had been adopted as a name in the other division; but it was a very small place, and St. Ives might have been taken; but that had been given to a division of Cornwall. In this case one of the two names was not that of an important place, and the other was that of the county. He thought it would be best here to take an absolutely county division. He was, however, willing to abide by the general sense of the Committee in the matter.

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, that in the interests of his constituents, who had requested him to oppose the Amendment placed on the Paper by his right hon. Friend (Mr. Raikes), he wished to say that of course it made a great difference when the right hon. Gentleman proposed to call it the Southern or Huntingdon Division. In the Amendment brought forward the right hon. Gentleman had proposed originally to strike out "Huntingdon" altogether, and that would have been a departure from

the suggestion formerly made by those in charge of the Bill by the Letter of Instruction issued to the Boundary Commissioners under the authority of the Home Secretary. [Sir Charles W. Dilke: Hear, hear!] In those Instructions it was stated that merged boroughs should have the preference in giving their names to the division of the county in which they were situated. Surely Huntingdon was an illustrious borough, which was, at all events, deserving of some recognition. It was understood that, where boroughs were absolutely disfranchised, their names should, if possible, be retained as a compliment to their Parliamentary existence in the past. If the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Charles W. Dilke) agreed to the Amendment of his right hon. Friend (Mr. Raikes) he had not another word to say; but he had felt bound, in the interest of his constituents, who were much interested in this matter, to state that they were anxious that the original Instructions issued by the Home Secretary to the Boundary Commissioners should be adhered to.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, the right hon. Baronet (Sir Robert Peel) had not been present all through the Sitting, and was not aware that he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had said on some previous occasions that his own preference would have been for the scheme of the Bill. But considerable alterations had been made by the Committee, after strenuous resistance on his part. He had more than once been obliged to yield to the general sense of the Committee on the question of naming the divisions of counties. In the present case, as he had said, he would take whatever course the Committee thought best, and he was not at all inclined to waste much time over this matter.

Sir ROBERT PEEL: I trust the right hon. Gentleman will adhere to "The Southern" or "Huntingdon Division."

Mr. RAIKES: That is what I propose.

Sir ROBERT PEEL sincerely trusted that the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would not endeavour to abolish Huntingdon altogether. The borough was to be disfranchised, therefore he (Sir Robert Peel) could have no further connection with it; but he did hope that in the interests of the people of Huntingdon the name would not be altogether abolished.

Mr. RAIKES said, that was what he was aiming at; he was endeavouring to preserve the name of Huntingdon as an alternative name in consideration of its ancient character. He would ask the Committee to adopt the alternative name.

Question put, and *agreed to*; words *inserted* accordingly.

On the Motion of Mr. Raikes, the following Amendment made:—In page 59, line 23, after "The," insert "Northern or."

Mr. RAIKES said, that they now came to the county of Kent. This had a great number of divisions—namely, eight; and it would be very difficult to apply points-of-the-compass names to them; but he found a strong feeling in favour of this course being taken, and as it was possible to deal with the Isle of Thanet by not attaching it to any point of the compass, he had ventured to put his Amendments on the Paper dealing with the other seven divisions. His first Amendment had reference to the Western Division in line 30 of page 59. He proposed to insert, after the word "The," the words "Western or," which would mean "The Western or Sevenoaks Division." There was no doubt that that would be the most westerly part of Kent. He did not know whether the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) intended to accept these Kentish Amendments. If he did, it might be convenient that he (Mr. Raikes) should speak generally upon the question. The three Western Divisions of Kent were, Dartford, which he proposed to call North-West, and below it Sevenoaks, which he proposed to call West, and Tunbridge, below that again, which he proposed to call South-West. Then the Medway Division, which was entirely Mid Kent, he proposed to give that name to. Faversham fell to the North-East, Ashford to the South, and the St. Augustine's Division to the South-East. In passing he could not refrain from complimenting the right hon. Baronet on his assumption of a more than Papal prerogative, because he had canonzied St. Augustine. Augustine, he believed, as a matter of fact, never had been canonized by the Court of Rome; but it had been reserved for his right hon. Friend

to bestow that honour upon him now with an electoral district. St. Augustine was not the Augustine who was the first Archbishop of Canterbury. He ventured to submit, as to the Sevenoaks Division, that the term "Western" might most appropriately be applied to it. He begged to move to insert the words "Western or" in page 59, line 30, after the word "The."

Amendment proposed, in page 59, line 30, after "The," insert "Western or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he could only assure the right hon. Gentleman that, according to the best information he had been able to obtain, St. Augustine was a Petty Sessional and not a Governmental Saint. The Petty Sessional division that contained Canterbury itself had the alternative name of St. Augustine's. He disagreed with the last statement of the right hon. Gentleman, and would point out that the present case constituted one of the greatest difficulties in applying the points of the compass by way of nomenclature to so many divisions. He was willing, however, to abide by the general sense of the Committee on the subject.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said, he was glad to hear that the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) was prepared to accept the Amendment proposed by his right hon. Friend (Mr. Raikes); and, as one who had taken a great deal of trouble in the inquiry, he might be allowed to say a word or two. The name of this division was selected by the Boundary Commissioners after considerable discussion. It was the best name they could find, though, perhaps, not a good one. The towns in that division were situated on the outskirts, and one of the most important was the disfranchised borough of Sandwich, and the county was not willing to accept the name of a constituency which had been so unfortunate in its career. No doubt the proposal to retain the name of the Isle of Thanet would be most popular in the county.

Question put, and *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

Mr. Raikes

On the Motion of Mr. Raikes, the following Amendments made:—In page 60, line 1, after "The," insert "North Western or;" in line 6, after "The," insert "South Western or;" in line 11, after "The," insert "Mid or;" in line 19, after "The," insert "South Eastern or;" in line 23, after "The," insert "South Eastern or;" and in line 30, after "The," insert "Eastern or."

MR. RAIKES said, his next Amendment was on page 61, line 6, after the word "The," to leave out the words "North Lonsdale," in order to insert the word "Furness." He did not intend to divide the Committee on this and other Amendments unless he received some encouragement from the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill. North Londsdale was, no doubt, known to those who lived in those parts; but many were not aware that North Lonsdale formed part of Lancashire. However, he believed Lonsdale was a popular name in that and in another district called South Londsdale; and it appeared to him that if the name North Lonsdale were retained, the adjoining division ought to be called South Lonsdale, although in the Bill it was proposed to be called the Lancaster Division. Perhaps hon. Members would have made themselves aware of the fact that the district in which North Lonsdale was situate contained the very much more celebrated district of Furness. Everybody had heard of Furness—of Barrow-in-Furness, Broughton-in-Furness, and Dalton-in-Furness—in that part of the peninsula of Lancashire which lay on the extreme north-west. Then there was the Furness Railway. In point of fact, Furness was probably as well-known as any part of Her Majesty's Dominions. True, it was not co-extensive with the proposed division; but no more was North Lonsdale. He had endeavoured to put his case before the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke), and he should be content with his decision; but he thought it rather absurd that the occasion should pass without a protest on behalf of a district more famous, and containing the great bulk of the population of the new division it was proposed to constitute. If the right hon. Gentleman thought the Commissioners had exercised a right

judgment in adopting the name in the Bill, he would accept his decision; but, in the meantime, he would move his Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

In page 61, line 6, after the word "The," to leave out the words "North Lonsdale," and insert the word "Furness."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'North Lonsdale' stand part of the Schedule."

MR. HIBBERT said, he was glad to hear that the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Raikes) did not intend to divide the Committee on this Amendment; but he was sorry he had ever brought it forward, because there was no name which had been proposed for any county which had given more satisfaction to all the people interested than this name of North Lonsdale. In the first place, it had been settled by a Committee of Conservatives and Liberals as being the proper name, and it had been received as a satisfactory name by all the people who lived in the district, and to change it to the name of Furness would not be acceptable. He had himself lived in North Lonsdale, but not in Furness; and to change it from the more celebrated name to that of Furness would be to give it the name of a district which did not include the bulk of the constituency. North Lonsdale also contained a small portion of South Lonsdale; but the great portion of the division would be composed of North Lonsdale, and as it was one of the well-known portions of the county of Lancaster he trusted it would be allowed to remain.

COLONEL STANLEY observed that, as representing the division of which North Lonsdale formed part, he wished to say there was only one feeling throughout the whole district, and that was in favour of the name of North Lonsdale. His right hon. Friend the Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Raikes) had proposed many Amendments and had met with great success, many of his proposals being accepted as real Amendments to the Bill. But in this case he thought his right hon. Friend stood almost alone; and it was hardly necessary, after what the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hibbert) had said, for him (Colonel Stanley) to repeat that this question was gone into thoroughly when the Commissioners visited the locality, where they found only one feeling expressed—namely, in favour of the name of North Lonsdale. It was true that this division took in a portion of South Lonsdale; but that was not considered objectionable, and the other district assumed its natural name of Lancaster, now a merged borough. He hoped the name of North Lonsdale would be retained.

MR. ECROYD said, he was one of those Lancashire men who very much regretted the disappearance of the ancient names of the hundreds. The name Furness applied to the district north of the sands, and to apply to it the comparatively modern name of North Lonsdale was ridiculous. If Lonsdale meant anything, it meant the Valley of the Lune. He could therefore quite understand why the country above Kirkby Lonsdale should be called North Lonsdale, and the country below South Lonsdale. But why the country beyond the intervening Valley of the Kent should be called Lonsdale had always appeared to him incomprehensible. In consequence of this and of the disappearance of other ancient names coming down from a period considerably anterior to the Conquest, he very much regretted the proposed nomenclature.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he could not allow the observation of his hon. Friend behind him (Mr. Ecroyd) that the name North Lonsdale was not applicable to the proposed division. North Lonsdale was one of the old names, and marked the division between North and South, which were divided, as the hon. Member (Mr. Ecroyd) said, not by the Lune, but by the Valley of the Kent. It was one of the old hundreds of the county, and was perfectly well known. He therefore sincerely hoped, living as he did in the district, and knowing the unanimous feeling of the inhabitants on both sides in politics, that the name of North Lonsdale would be retained.

Amendment *negatived.*

MR. ECROYD moved, in page 62, line 2, to leave out "Four Members—Four Divisions," and insert "Five Members—Five Divisions." It might, perhaps, save the time of the Committee if he were allowed, on this the first of a series of Amendments, to state the case

generally, as all the other Amendments except one were consequential. It might seem somewhat presumptuous to raise an Amendment of such great importance as this upon the Schedule; but he believed this case to be unique, and he thought he should be able to show the Committee that whether Her Majesty's Government were able or not to afford a remedy, a great and grievous injustice had been done to North-East Lancashire in the allotment of representation. The division of North-East Lancashire was now represented by two Members, and he thought those hon. Gentlemen could not but sympathize with the step he was now taking. This division would now, under the arrangements which had been made of territory and population, contain about 259,176 inhabitants, according to the Census of 1881. The first grievance which he had to allege was that since the division of this region into four constituencies, and the allotment of four Members, no fewer than 12,751 inhabitants had been added; 9,743 in that portion of the borough of Bacup which hitherto had been in South-East Lancashire, and 3,008 by the recommendation of the Commissioners—a recommendation which was approved by the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke)—not to include the ecclesiastical district of St. Leonard's, Walton-le-Dale, in Preston, as at first suggested. The reasons against that inclusion did not need to be here repeated. It was quite enough to say that both political Parties in Preston and St. Leonards, Walton-le-Dale, entirely objected to the inclusion of this rural district within the borough of Preston. In comparing the representation of North-East Lancashire with other county divisions of a similar character, he would leave out of the reckoning altogether those rural county divisions which had, under this Bill, lost some share of their representation, or which on account of their sparse population had been thought to be entitled to special consideration. But comparing it only with other county divisions of similar character in regard to size and population, and containing both urban and rural populations, his task was easy. There was no Party motive whatever in the Motion he had to make; it was founded only on common justice and on the great importance of adopting some more convenient arrangement of the constituencies than that which had been forced on the Commissioners by the limitation of the representation of this district to four Members, when on every principle of justice it was entitled to five. He did not ask that any remedy should be given at the expense of surrounding districts, nor did he desire that any of their population should be taken away and given to other county divisions, for the sufficient reason that all those county divisions had been very fairly and reasonably treated in the Bill, and none of them were over-represented. What he complained of was that 259,000 inhabitants in North-East Lancashire had been allotted four Members; whilst Worcestershire, for instance, with 245,000 inhabitants—that was 14,000 fewer—had been allotted five. He could give several other instances of county divisions, none of which could be considered to be over-represented, but in all of which, if one Member was taken away, the representation would still be more liberal than that allotted to North-East Lancashire. Take, for example, the county of Chester. If one Member were taken away, each Member would then represent 62,137 inhabitants; whereas in North-East Lancashire each Member would represent 64,794 inhabitants. If a Member were taken away from Cornwall, each Member would still represent 2,000 inhabitants fewer than in North-East Lancashire. In Derbyshire, South-East Lancashire, Leicestershire, Staffordshire, Warwickshire, the Eastern Division of the West Riding, and Glamorganshire, it would be the same. In every one of these, all of them combining urban and rural districts, if one Member fewer were given, they would still be more liberally represented than North-East Lancashire. But he would not rest there. Let them look at this matter from the other point of view. If North-East Lancashire had five Members allotted to it, each Member would still have to represent about 3,000 more inhabitants than the Members for Cumberland, or the four Members for Northamptonshire, or the four Members for Nottinghamshire; and these could not be regarded as counties which had been too liberally treated in the present Bill. So that, whichever way they made the comparison, North-East Lancashire was invidiously and unjustly treated, and

Mr. Ecroyd

that was precisely the complaint he made. There were 12 or 15 counties of a similar class and of average magnitude; and instead of arranging that that which contained the largest population should have five Members, they had selected others having a smaller population to have five, and had alloted only four to North-East Lancashire, the most populous of the group. He complained that the principles laid down and embodied in the Instructions to the Commissioners had not been followed in the case of North-East Lancashire; and he wished to hear some solid reason alleged for their having been treated in a manner so remarkable. He did not wish to refer to the special case of the county of Warwick, and the fusion of Warwick and Leamington; but if Accrington had been treated in the same manner as Leamington, and abstracted from the county and created a Parliamentary borough, with as large a population as that of Barrow-in-Furness, there would still have remained in North-East Lancashire more than 212,000 inhabitants, which if represented by four Members would give 53,019 for representation by each Member, after the abstraction of that large and important town, which, as he believed, was entitled to become a Parliamentary borough. The case would not be so bad if there were anything in the borough representation of North-East Lancashire to give them consolation. But the borough Members in that division would each represent more than the average number of inhabitants. That, therefore, rather added to the grievance than diminished it. The case was very different in some of the other instances he had named. In the case of Cumberland, besides a very superior county representation, the two boroughs of Carlisle and Whitehaven, containing 36,000 and 19,000 inhabitants respectively, were considerably over-represented. North-East Lancashire, therefore, in whatever aspect they looked at it, was grievously under-represented. Again, looking at the matter on the ground of prescription — and the Prime Minister attached considerable importance to the consideration of prescription—they lost the ancient borough of Clitheroe for the want of a few hundred inhabitants. That was one of the most ancient boroughs in the Kingdom, in the centre of an extensive rural and pastoral district; and yet for its extinction they received no consideration whatever, and the county in which that borough was merged was allotted the most meagre and inadequate representation. Again, he thought that where an arrangement was made which gave so serious an under-representation to a large and populous division, the grievance was greater when it could be shown that it was perhaps the most rapidly-growing division outside the Metropolitan district. He would give an instance from his own immediate neighbourhood, in which he had lived all his life, and with which he was intimately acquainted. He had ascertained from the Clerk of the Burnley Union and other officials connected with the Local Government Boards of the two principal urban centres of the Clitheroe Division that those two Local Government districts, which in 1881 contained 21,000 inhabitants, had increased by 5,410 during four years, or 25 per cent since the last Census, on the assumption that there was an average of five inhabitants to each house. Now, another consideration might fairly be brought into play with regard to this matter. Here was a population, growing not so much in consequence of the general growth of the trade in which it was engaged, as in consequence of its exceptional energy and industrial capacity; and there were some features in connection with that growth in every respect remarkable. He supposed there was no district in the Kingdom where employment was more steady and secure, and to which large numbers had been attracted from other districts, with the result of so great and permanent an improvement of this condition, as in the case of North-East Lancashire. He believed that no labouring population in the Kingdom was so well and substantially housed, and none more efficiently educated. Therefore, in whatever way they regarded this vast and increasing population, it was entitled to its full share of representation in that House under the present re-arrangement. Now, the population at that moment in these four divisions was undoubtedly more than 280,000, and probably more that 290,000. The population of the great borough of Burnley, which was almost in the centre of this division, although only represented by one Member,

amounted at that moment to considerably over 70,000. It was not his business to say where the additional Member demanded was to come from. He only pointed out that the Government, which had had to consider the case of 10 or 15 county divisions of similar magnitude and character, had treated them in the exceptional manner he had just described. Therefore, he said it was for the Government to remedy the injustice that was being done to them, although he wished it to be understood that they did not wish it remedied at the expense of their neighbours. They said that one Member ought in common justice to be added to the number which the Government proposed to give them; and that the arrangement arrived at between the two Parties ought not to be the cause of a gross and indefensible injustice being done in an individual case of this kind. He now passed to the consideration of the great inconvenience resulting from the arrangement of divisions which this inadequate representation had rendered inevitable. Burnley contained 70,000 inhabitants. In the Clitheroe Division, in which his interest lay, and in which he resided, the arrangement was as inconvenient and distasteful as it could be made. The populous Calder Valley on the East was linked in one division with the wide pastoral area round Clitheroe on the West, the two being separated by the mountain range of Pendle, nearly 2,000 feet high, and having no railway communication without making a long and circuitous journey round by Blackburn. The representation of the inconveniences which this arrangement would entail was entirely lost upon the Commissioners, whose only answer was that they had no power to alter either the number of Members or the number of divisions. He regretted to have been obliged to occupy so much of the time of the Committee; but he was obliged to state the case fully, because there was, he felt satisfied, none parallel to it in all the counties of England and Wales. The only case which could at all compare with it were the very exceptional one of the Isle of Wight, and that of the County of Bedford. In the latter, however, the excess of borough representation fully compensated the defect of county representation—the average of the borough and county together being, he believed, one Member to only 49,000; while the average representation of each borough and county division in North-East Lancashire was one Member to 61,000, although an enormous increase of population had since 1881 taken place in this most important district. Finally, he believed that he had shown that this claim was in every respect and from every point of view founded on justice; and he had only to express an earnest hope that no arrangement between the two Parties in that House would prevent a remedy being found for the wrong that would otherwise be done.

Amendment proposed,

In page 62, line 2, to leave out the words "Four Members—Four Divisions," and insert the words "Five Members—Five Divisions."—(*Mr. Ecroyd.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that the hon. Gentleman had placed this case in a very excellent manner before the Committee. The hon. Member had shown that there had been a very large accession of population in the case of the North-East Division of the county. Even if the hon. Member's proposal were agreed to, there would remain the question as to whence the additional Member was to come. The Clitheroe and Accrington Divisions were not above the average divisions of Lancashire; but one of the four divisions of North-East Lancashire was very large indeed. The ratio of representation in North-East Lancashire was under the arrangement proposed in the Bill—one in 54,000; and if the hon. Member's proposal were agreed to, and there were five Members allotted to it instead of four, the ratio would be one in 51,000. But there were divisions in various parts of the country considerably larger than the division in question; for instance, there were two divisions in Kent larger, and one in Surrey. Supposing they were to give another Member to this division, where was such Member to be found? In looking through the county scale he found that the county most favoured by that scale was Wiltshire; and, accordingly, he had considered this question as between the two counties. No doubt, the latter

county, before the framing of this Bill, had been the most over-represented county in the Kingdom; but it had been very severely dealt with in this measure. Looking at the fact that the grievance complained of was concentrated in the one division of Rossendale, a compact Petty Sessional division which did not wish to be intersected, and looking at the fact that although it was a large county division it was not so large as many borough divisions, he thought it would be preferable to maintain the Bill as it stood.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS said, his hon. Friend the Member for Preston (Mr. Ecroyd) had said everything that could be said in behalf of the division of North-East Lancashire. His hon. Friend had urged that the division was treated with great hardship; but, on the other hand, the right hon. Baronet had pointed out that the real hardship was in respect of one division, and that all the others were satisfied. Then, with regard to the additional Member, the right hon. Baronet had said that if they took that Member from any county they must look to Wiltshire. But he would point out that that was entering upon a wide sphere, and that if the discussion were to be continued in that direction the whole question of the representation of counties would be re-opened. Representations had been made to him on this subject; and if the right hon. Baronet were to give way upon the point he would find a number of applications would come upon him from other directions which it would be quite impossible for him to meet. It was stated that the increase of population in this division of the county was due to the influx of people which took place from Bacup; and then, again, it was said that it was due to the fact that a district had been included which had no right to be included. It was evident, therefore, that there was some mistake about the matter, and accordingly he would not pursue that part of the subject. With regard to the present population, however, he could give an instance in which there had been a much greater increase of population than in the present case, and where more representation was wanted —namely, the borough of Bootle, in which the population had almost doubled since the last Census, a fact that was sufficient to show how necessary it was not rashly to interfere with the scheme of the Bill. He was convinced that if the right hon. Baronet gave way on this point such a flood of Amendments would be brought forward on the Report that it would be impossible to get through them in any reasonable time. The inhabitants in the North-East Division of Lancashire would be perfectly satisfied with the way in which his hon. Friend had placed their case before the Committee and the Government. His hon. Friend had undoubtedly shown that a grievance had existed; but he (Sir R. Assheton Cross) thought he had shown how difficult it would be to remedy that grievance. He would remind his hon. Friend that they were passing this Bill under a certain amount of difficulty, because there had been an agreement entered into with respect to its passage through the House; were it not so, he should, of course, have had more to say than he thought it desirable to say under the circumstances.

MR. ECROYD said, that both right hon. Gentlemen laboured under a great misapprehension. It was true that the grievance of excessive population was confined to the district of Rossendale; but it was also true that the grievance of inconvenient arrangement was concentrated in the Northern Division of Clitheroe. Both those grievances resulted from the inadequate representation which had been given to North-East Lancashire as a whole. He felt, under the circumstances, that it was his duty to take a division on his Amendment.

MR. TOMLINSON said, he rose to support his hon. Friend in his endeavour to deal with the insufficient representation given to the North-East Division of Lancashire. It appeared to him that the answer given to the proposal was no answer at all. Right hon. Gentlemen had simply concentrated their minds upon one part of the case; and, having admitted that that constituted an exceptional hardship, they left the other part of the complaint out of sight altogether. The right hon. Gentleman had pointed to the South-East Division of Lancashire as being also inadequately represented; but his hon. Friend had shown that the North-East Division suffered, in addition, from inconvenient arrangement. He (Mr. Tomlinson) could not avoid the conclusion that the whole scheme provided an

inadequate representation of the whole county. The right hon. Baronet then asked where the additional Member was to come from, and suggested Wiltshire as the only county to which he could look. But it seemed to him that there was a much easier way out of the difficulty; and he would suggest that the extra Member to which Wolverhampton was not entitled should be given to North-East Lancashire.

MR. GORST said, he considered the Committee were indebted to the hon. Member for Preston (Mr. Ecroyd) for having brought forward this question, because it was clear that the Bill could not be regarded as final in view of the circumstances to which their attention had been called. It was evident that the hardship suffered by North-East Lancashire from inadequate representation, seeing that the population was rapidly growing, would become every year more intolerable. It was said that the additional representation could not be given after the decision arrived at by the Commissioners. But he would point out that the hon. Gentleman was not making any appeal against the decision of the Commissioners, which was not called in question, but against the plan of the Government, and not even that, because the original plan was not to make the division so large as it was now. His hon. Friend had said fairly that the grievance brought forward had been caused by the influx of population from the borough of Bacup, and by the original intentions of the Government not having been carried out. This was an important question; for here was the case of an anomaly being created since the Bill was originally favoured by the Government; and this was an appeal by the hon. Member to redress a wrong which had come about not by any fault of the Commissioners, but owing to a change which had been forced upon them by the Government. While he had always supported the proposal of the Government, and while he should be very sorry to do anything which would in any way throw the Bill again on the House, he was bound to say that he regretted extremely that the right hon. Baronet could not see a way in which to remove the anomaly that had been created, and which every year must become greater. There was also one point referred to by the hon. Member for Preston which required an answer—namely, that where there was inadequate representation of any county it ought to be redressed at the expense of the boroughs which had more extensive representation. But in North-East Lancashire the boroughs had a right to complain of insufficient representation — the boroughs of Burnley and Blackburn, for instance. The population of Blackburn was one which at the very least required two Members; and it could not be said that the borough population of North-East Lancashire was at all over-represented. Therefore the Committee had before them a case in which the county was under-represented, and the boroughs which it contained adequately represented. Finally, he hoped that a remedy would be applied to the condition of things proposed to be created by the Bill in respect of North-East Lancashire, because he was convinced that no case could be produced in which there was a greater anomaly.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the hon. and learned Gentleman had spoken of this as an extreme case of under-representation as compared with the country generally; but he would remark that language of that kind was in the nature of exaggeration, because there were many stronger cases than that of Rossendale. The Isle of Wight, for instance, was a county in which the population was rapidly increasing, and it had one Member to 73,560 inhabitants. Cardigan was also worse off than Rossendale. The same, again, in the case of the county of Clare, where there was one Member for every 71,000 persons; and turning to Scotland, the counties of Stirling and Mid Lothian had one Member to 78,000 and 79,000 inhabitants respectively, and the population there was very rapidly increasing.

MR. LEAKE said, he thought the case of Rossendale was not so very bad—there were much grosser cases in South-East Lancashire which ought to be very differently dealt with if the same proportion of representation which the hon. Member for Preston (Mr. Ecroyd) claimed for North-East Lancashire were to be allowed. If the hon. Member rested his case upon the fact that the boroughs were under-represented, the case for South-East Lancashire was three times stronger. There were in South-East Lancashire six borough constituencies

each of which one Member would represent a population of more than 68,000, and there would be two Members representing more than 80,000 each. There was no class of the people more deserving of consideration and representation than the householders of North-East Lancashire; but in comparison with other parts of the county they were not unfairly treated in the Bill.

Amendment *negatived.*

MR. ECROYD proposed to correct a mis-spelt word in the Schedule, and moved to substitute "Leagram" for "Leagrin" in line 11, page 62.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. A. F. EGERTON moved an Amendment to insert in page 63, line 9, after "The," the words "Farnworth cum." As the Schedule stood at present, it was proposed to give to this division the name of Radcliffe; but his proposal was that it should also bear the name of the town of Farnworth. This was one of the divisions of South-East Lancashire, and it was one of a very peculiar character. Radcliffe was an important town, and so was Farnworth. They were both headquarters of the cotton manufacturing industry, and important places in their way. He believed the Boundary Commissioners, in naming the division, might have given it the name of Radcliffe from a remembrance of the fact that Radcliffe was mentioned in the Domesday Book; but perhaps they had not been informed that the Manor of Farnworth was created by Charter in the Reign of King John, so that it had a long antiquity as well as Radcliffe. The two centres were quite apart from each other; and Farnworth would be greatly gratified if the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill could see his way to join the name of Farnworth with that of Radcliffe. If he wanted a precedent for such a double name, he would find one in Ireland, where one of the county divisions had been called "Bandon and Kinsale."

Amendment proposed,

In page 63, line 9, after the word "The," to insert the words "Farnworth cum."—(*Mr. A. F. Egerton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the Committee were now dealing with a part of the Bill which related to England; and he thought there was only one exception in the Bill—an exception in the case of Ireland—where a double name had been given to a division. Under those circumstances, he would like the Committee to consider whether the proposed change should be made. If any change should be made at all in the direction proposed, no doubt this would be a good case, because here were two places which were very fairly equal. The actual town of Farnworth was rather larger than the town of Radcliffe; but the district which was known as Farnworth district was not quite so large as the Radcliffe district. Still the two places were very fairly equal; and if the Committee wished to insert double names, this was a very fair case for it. But it was a very doubtful matter in his mind whether it would be wise to make the alteration. There were, practically, no double names at present, and if they once began giving them a good many local jealousies in other places which had now died away might at once be revived.

MR. AGNEW said, he had placed an Amendment on the Paper to change the name to "Radcliffe cum Farnworth;" but he was quite prepared to accept the Amendment of the hon. Member for Wigan (Mr. A. F. Egerton) if the Committee should think fit. There could be no doubt whatever that in South-East Lancashire Farnworth occupied a very prominent position as a manufacturing centre; and the Committee might learn, not without interest perhaps, that when the Commissioners sat in the Assize Court in Manchester, and the naming of these districts was under consideration, there was a general feeling that this particular division should be called either "Radcliffe cum Farnworth" or "Farnworth cum Radcliffe." If the Committee should accept the Amendment of his hon. Friend, he (Mr. Agnew) would, of course, be very glad to withdraw his own; but if the Committee declined to accept that Amendment, he should be bound to press his own. He thought the people interested would be perfectly satisfied if the two names were incorporated in the designation of the division.

MR. THOROLD ROGERS would rather like to know how long the Committee were to be delayed by these ridi-

culous questions? It seemed to him that every sensible man in the Committee would come to the conclusion which Gallio came to—"If it be a question of names or of your law, I will have none of it." It really was a pity that their time should be wasted in discussions upon pseudo-antiquities which were ludicrously irrelative and absolutely pitiable. He hoped the Committee would, in an emphatic way, negative all this heap of rubbish.

COLONEL NOLAN said, he would not detain the Committee by remarks upon the two particular places concerned in this Amendment, or upon the advisability of adopting two names for a division as a general rule. But in his own constituency (Galway) there had been a great jealousy between two towns as to which of them it should be named after; and he would suggest, if the hon. Member for Southwark (Mr. Thorold Rogers) was right about these discussions being a great waste of time, that there was a very simple way of getting rid of all this bother about naming the districts—they should allow the Members for the constituencies to give the names. He would not, of course, allow them to interfere with the boundaries—that was a national question—but he thought they might fairly be trusted to give the names.

MR. LEAKE said, this was not so insignificant a question as the hon. Member for Southwark (Mr. Thorold Rogers) seemed to imagine. When they put into one Parliamentary division two such equal political entities as these two, it might easily be imagined what would be the feelings of Farnworth or Radcliffe if the name of the one place was given and the name of the other was not. He admitted, with his right hon. Friend who had charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke), that it was not desirable to multiply these cases of double naming; but he maintained that each particular case should be judged on its own merits. It was in consequence of the necessity for subdividing South-East Lancashire into so many constituencies that these two very important and equal towns were united as they had never been united before; and, inasmuch as each of them had a fair claim to name the division, it was felt to be a matter of considerable consequence to both—and who should judge between them? Who were the best judges? The Boundary Commissioners, or the House, or those who lived on the spot? He claimed from the Committee a lenient consideration for a union of the two names in designating this division, which was advocated by both Parties, and which was necessary for its identification. If it should be conceded, he could not imagine that it would lead to conferring a similar distinction in other cases unless equally worthy of such treatment.

MR. WHITWORTH said, he knew both places very well, and he could say with confidence that the name of Farnworth ought to be given to the division. He hoped the Committee would agree to the Amendment.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. LYULPH STANLEY moved, in page 63, line 29, after "the," to leave out "Prestwich," and insert "Failsworth." He thought that Failsworth was a far more proper place to give its name to the division than was Prestwich; and Failsworth was, in the first instance, selected by the Commissioners to give the name, only when they came back to London they received private communications from the Local Board of Prestwich which induced them to alter their minds. Failsworth was the larger place, and the more central. It was the better fitted for railway communication. On the other hand, Prestwich was the seat of the County Lunatic Asylum, and no less than 2,000 of the people of the district were, unfortunately, inmates of that Institution. If Prestwich returned a Member to that House there would be very serious doubts as to his sanity. He hoped the Government would give a favourable consideration to this Amendment, and thus endeavour to meet the wishes of the saner portion of the constituency; but if not he would not trouble the Committee to divide.

Amendment proposed,

In page 63, line 29, after the word "the," to leave out "Prestwich," and insert the word "Failsworth."—(*Mr. Lyulph Stanley.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Prestwich' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he thought he must concede the Amendment—["No, no!"]—as there was no

very strong reason for preferring Prestwich, and population was the only argument he had to go upon. Prestwich was the old name, no doubt, but Failsworth was, perhaps, a better name for the future.

MR. AGNEW said, he thought this was a case on all fours with the one just decided—the case of Farnworth and Radcliffe. It would be very unfair to the people of Prestwich, who had been living of late under the expectation that they would give their name to the division, if they were to have this cold *douche* thrown on them now. If the President of the Local Government Board meant the district to have the name of Failsworth, he should at least extend his grace so as to permit the division to be called Failsworth-cum-Prestwich or Prestwich-cum-Failsworth.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS hoped the old name of Prestwich would be retained.

MR. LYULPH STANLEY said, he would not press the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. RAIKES moved, in page 64, line 39, after "The," to insert "Northern or," in describing the Melton Division of the county of Leicester.

Amendment *agreed to.*

LORD JOHN MANNERS moved, in page 64, line 41, to leave out "East Norton." It had been arranged that Belgrave should be taken out of the borough of Leicester and added to the Melton Division, where it would increase the population which was already rather large for a division by some 7,000. In order to compensate for the increase of population in one direction there ought to be a corresponding diminution in another, and he therefore proposed that the district taken out of the old Southern Division of the county and running right down to the borders of Northamptonshire should be placed in the new division, to which it would seem naturally to belong, and in that way the population of the two divisions would be equalized to a very large extent. If this suggestion were adopted, the population of the new Eastern or Melton Division would be 51,780, and the Market Harborough Division would have 51,000, which would put them as nearly upon an equality as conveniently could be done.

Amendment proposed, in page 64, line 41, to leave out the words "East Norton."—(*Lord John Manners*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the change with regard to Belgrave was made by general consent. It perhaps involved the necessity of making another change, for an extreme disproportion of population between 45,000 and 54,000 was very considerable. But the change now proposed did not appear to be the subject of any local agreement, and there was a good deal of difference of opinion on the subject in the locality. A local suggestion had been made which no Member of the House had as yet consented to father, but which was strongly pressed locally, and that was, instead of dividing the Petty Sessional divisions to keep them intact. That did not do much to equalize the population, which was no doubt a drawback. It still left a certain disparity between the largest and the smallest divisions; but he had consulted the Boundary Commissioners as to which scheme they thought best, and they were rather in favour of the local scheme. That being so, he would rather leave the matter open for further consideration during the next two or three days to see whether any local agreement could be arrived at.

MR. PELL said, he did not quite understand what was meant by the Petty Sessional divisions—he did not know in which of the divisions of the county the right hon. Gentleman would place them.

LORD JOHN MANNERS pointed out that his proposal would leave the Petty Sessional division of East Norton exactly as it was now.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he he had no present opinion against the proposal of the noble Lord; but he would endeavour to ascertain the local feeling, if the noble Lord would refrain from pressing the Amendment until the Report.

MR. PELL said, there was a very strong feeling in favour of the Amendment. His experience in the House did not lead him to place much confidence in putting matters of this kind off until Report. He hoped the Committee

would be able to come to some immediate decision, especially as he saw a disposition on the part of the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill to concur in the view of the noble Lord (Lord John Manners).

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he was afraid he could not make any suggestion now, as he would be going against the decision of the Boundary Commissioners. He had no personal objection to the proposal of the noble Lord, and would do what he could with the Commissioners in the matter.

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, he should not press the Amendment. Probably the Commissioners would see that the Amendment would suit the whole of the division better than the proposal of the Bill.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, it was true that the proposal in the Bill was not arrived at by local agreement. It had been made by the Boundary Commissioners.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

On the Motion of Mr. RAIKES, the following Amendments made: — Page 65, line 1, after "The," insert "Mid or;" line 12, after "The," insert "Western or;" line 17, after "The," insert "Southern or."

MR. RAIKES said, they now came to the county of Lincoln, and he wished to place himself very much in the hands of the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill. He had given Notice of four Amendments relating to the Northern portion of the county, reviving the old name of Lindsey. He could himself remember that in former days, before the Reform Act of 1867, Writs used to issue in the names of Lindsey and Kesteven. Therefore, these places had some Parliamentary significance. He was informed by those qualified to form an opinion upon the subject that the four Northern Divisions of the county should be West, North, East, and South Lindsey. The division of West Lindsey would be the division styled Gainsborough, and if the Amendment were adopted, the name would be "West Lindsey or Gainsborough." His proposal was, he thought, better than the proposal in the Bill, and had the advantage of being approved of by the Lincolnshire Members—or, at any rate, by some of them. If the right hon. Baronet desired it, he would propose to give the points of the compass names to the county divisions, without reference to Lindsey and Kesteven. He imagined, however, that it would be more acceptable to Lincolnshire itself if they were to divide the county as proposed. Certainly, the balance of convenience and propriety leaned towards the Amendments on the Paper. He would now move to insert "West Lindsey or," in line 26, and would leave what he had to say with regard to Kesteven and Holland until they came to South Lincolnshire.

Amendment proposed, in page 65, line 26, after the word "The," to insert the words "West Lindsey or." — (*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'West Lindsey or' be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had no objection to the proposed changes of name, or to those changes which affected the Northern and Western parts of the county; but he must not mislead the Committee. He should have to object to changes which would be proposed subsequently—for instance, to Amendments to substitute Spalding for Holland. He should have to use arguments similar to those he had used yesterday with reference to the Isle of Ely.

Question put, and *agreed to*.

On the Motion of Mr. RAIKES, the following Amendments made:—Pages 65 and 66, line 31, after "The," insert "North Lindsey or;" line 1, after "The," insert "East Lindsey or;" and line 18, after "The," insert "South Lindsey or."

Amendment proposed, in page 66, line 24, leave out from "Spilsby" to end of line 25.—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That 'Spilsby' stand part of the Schedule."

MR. WARTON: Will the right hon. Baronet explain how this crops up?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: It is a small change made in the borough of Boston.

MR. WARTON said, he must protest against the loose manner in which the Bill had been drawn. This was another and a good example of that which had occurred again and again in this Bill.

MR. E. STANHOPE said, that if the hon. and learned Member would glance

over the various parishes, he would see that this would be the most convenient way of dealing with the matter.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES said, he now proposed, in line 26, after "The," to insert "North Kesteven or." The district of Kesteven was not, he knew, absolutely identical with the divisions of Sleaford and Stamford, but it was much more so than was North Lonsdale with the Northern Division of Lancaster; therefore, he thought it was entitled to rank as a better name. No doubt there was a small fragment of Holland in the Sleaford Division; but it did not amount to more than a 10th or 12th part of the division, and a still smaller portion was proposed to be annexed to the Stamford Division. Practically, the Sleaford and Stamford Divisions, taken together, constituted the whole district of Kesteven with an extremely small part of Holland. He thought the district was entitled to have the name he proposed. It would be very acceptable to the county, and one familiar to students of Parliamentary records. Stamford was a town of great importance, and it might claim to give its name to the division; but he did not think the same applied to Sleaford, which, though a rising town, had never had a Parliamentary history. There could be no doubt that in Lincolnshire "North Kesteven" would be as well known, if not much better known, than "Sleaford" could be. He, therefore, begged to move the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

Amendment proposed, in page 66, line 26, after the word "The," to insert the words "North Kesteven or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That 'North Kesteven or' be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he was in the hands of the Lincolnshire Members with regard to this Amendment. If those hon. Gentlemen wished now to effect a change of name, even if they did not intend to be bound by it in the future, he should be willing to agree to what they asked. He could not admit that the present case was on a par with that of North Lonsdale.

MR. FINCH-HATTON said, that as one of the Members referred to, and living as he did in the neighbourhood of North Kesteven, he wished to say that, for his own part, he accepted the offer of the right hon. Baronet, and was not unsanguine that he and his hon. and learned Colleague (Mr. Compton Lawrance) might be able to give such reasons to the Commissioners as would enable them to accept a somewhat slight modification of the boundary. The change he would propose would be a very small one.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Provided the present Amendment is not made an argument for the acceptance of the proposal the hon. Member now alludes to, I shall be glad to accept it.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

MR. COMPTON LAWRANCE said, he wished to move the Amendment standing in his name, in page 66, to leave out lines 30, 31, and 32. The object of this Amendment, and of one that stood on the Paper in his name a little lower down, was to restore to the division of Holland certain places which had been taken away to be added to North and South Kesteven for the purpose of making the population more equal. The population, as it now stood in the proposed divisions, was about 48,000 odd in Sleaford, 49,000 odd in Stamford, and 53,000 in Spalding. He brought forward this Amendment because Holland was really a division in itself. It had a separate Commission of the Peace, and was a Petty Sessional division, and beyond that it had a Court of Suer of its own. The boundaries of the Poor Law Unions were contained in Holland, with one exception—namely, that of the parish of Crowland, which did not come at all into it, but was a part of Kesteven, and he believed went into the Poor Law Union of Peterborough. Then, again, Holland had, under different Acts of Parliament, control of the drainage. The interests of Holland were entirely distinct, especially as to drainage, from those of Kesteven. He had had very good reason to find that out, having the honour to represent a large part of Kesteven and Holland at this moment. When the drainage legislation of a few years ago was before the House, it had become plain to him that the interests of this place were entirely distinct. He had found that nearly the whole of Kesteven consisted of uplands, and

nearly the whole of Holland of fen lands. These were the main reasons why it seemed to him that it would be of great advantage to have Holland kept by itself. There were other reasons for his proposal with regard to Crowland. That place contained some 3,000 or 4,000 inhabitants; but in order to get into it from parts of Kesteven, it was necessary to go by rail through the Spalding Division, a distance of some 15 or 16 miles. They were in the division four miles from the railway at the present time. There was a desire on the part of the people of Holland to be kept to themselves, and the only objection which could be taken, so far as he could gather, was to the change which would be made in the population. But the population here would never be as great as in some county divisions, or as small as in many others. His proposal would raise the Spalding Division to something like 62,000, and leave the Sleaford Division at something like 44,000 or 45,000, and the Stamford Division at about 45,000. That was the only objection, as he had said, which could be taken to his proposal. The Boundary Commissioners did their duty when the matter was brought before them, but the point he was raising had not been very strongly submitted to them. Those gentlemen had done all that seemed to them necessary when they equalized the districts. He hoped the Committee would see its way to accept this and the following Amendment.

Amendment proposed, in page 66, leave out lines 30, 31, and 32.—(*Mr. Compton Lawrance.*)

Question proposed, "That lines 30, 31, and 32 stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had argued against an Amendment of this kind last night from the Boundary Commissioners' rather than from his own opinion. His own view would be rather in favour of giving the hon. and learned Member his own division; but that was not the view of the Commissioners. The Boundary Commissioners did not like to be parties to the creation of such a disparity between county divisions as would happen in the case of the construction of a division of 62,000, and another of 43,000. But the case had been so thoroughly stated by the hon. and learned Member that he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) need not add anything to what he had said. The matter was one purely for the consideration of the Committee, and they now, having this question of the disparity of population before them, could themselves decide as to what they should do. He would ask the Commissioners to prepare a fresh Report to the House on the matter. He would ask them whether they had any stronger reason than that they had given for the proposal they had made, and their reply could be considered at a later stage of the Bill.

MR. FINCH-HATTON asked whether he might use one argument which he thought would have great weight with the right hon. Baronet? It was an argument which the right hon. Gentleman had used himself in a somewhat similarc ase—namely, the case of Rossendale in North-East Lancashire. Rossendale, though it had a population of something like 70,000 persons, was still kept in one division, and the right hon. Gentleman had used his argument in that case three times over, in order to impress it on hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House. He spoke against the division proposed, because he had said it was a compact Petty Sessional division, and because the people had interests in common, and did not wish the district to be divided. Now, if that was an argument which weighed—and he considered that it had weighed very materially with the Committee in the case in which the right hon. Baronet brought it forward—the case for the present proposal was even a stronger one. The population were strongly opposed to an arbitrary division of the district, and were unanimously in favour of retaining the ancient county boundaries of Holland, and that without distinction of Party, or anything of that kind, otherwise he would not have identified himself with the matter at all. If he had been rightly informed, the right hon. Baronet had received a communication from the Quarter Sessions upon this matter; and as the right hon. Gentleman had used in another case arguments similar to those which were to be advanced in this case, he thought that if some concession were now made the Commisioners would take it as an intimation to assist in ar-

riving at some satisfactory amendment of their proposal.

MR. E. STANHOPE said, he had listened with great satisfaction to what had fallen from the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke), and, to his mind, the case had been met by him very fairly. The right hon. Gentleman fully admitted that there was a strong case to be made out for the Amendment, and that, so far as regarded the feeling in the county itself, both on the one side and the other, it was absolutely unanimous. He (Mr. Stanhope) trusted that the right hon. Baronet would do that which he had so courteously suggested—namely, let the matter now stand over, and remit it to the Commissioners with an intimation that there was a very strong feeling in the House upon the point.

MR. HENEAGE said, he hoped that the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would take a favourable view of the proposal of the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Compton Lawrance). He believed there was an unanimous wish on the part of people of all shades of politics that the three districts, Kesteven, Holland, and Lindsey should be kept intact. He would remind the right hon. Baronet that if there was a certain disproportion with regard to the population of the three divisions, as proposed by the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (Mr. Compton Lawrance), there was not half the disproportion there was between their population and that of the adjoining county of Rutland, and that for all legal purposes Lincolnshire was practically divided into three counties.

MR. LYULPH STANLEY said, he did not wish to meddle in Lincolnshire matters; but it was proper to point out that if this point be conceded to Lincolnshire, the same question would be raised with regard to Sussex.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, there were several instances in which the same point could be raised. He was bound to say that Lincolnshire had as a general rule, for Parliamentary purposes, been treated as a separate county.

MR. COMPTON LAWRANCE asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. RAIKES moved, in page 66, line 33, after "The," to insert "South Kesteven or," so that the Stamford Division would read the South Kesteven or the Stamford Division.

Amendment proposed, in page 66, line 33, after the word "The," to insert the words, "South Kesteven or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. FINCH-HATTON moved, in page 66, line 39, to leave out "Spalding," and insert "Holland." He said, the same arguments might be used with regard to this change that had been used with regard to the boundaries. There was an unanimous desire on the part of the people of the division that the name of the division should be Holland, and not Spalding. He did not see any advantage in their being an alternative name. Spalding was acknowledged to be the capital of Holland, and the Spalding people were willing to believe that the less was included in the greater. He ventured to hope that, after what had fallen from the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) with regard to the other Amendments proposed in regard to Lincolnshire, that this Amendment would meet with no opposition.

Amendment proposed, in page 66, line 39, to leave out the word "Spalding," and insert the word "Holland."—(*Mr. Finch-Hatton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Spalding' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had no personal feeling in the matter; and on the understanding that the people of Spalding were in favour of the change, he would not oppose the Amendment.

Amendment *agreed to.*

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE proposed to omit from the Spalding Division the following words:—

"And so much of the Sessional Division of Spilsby as is included in the Parliamentary Borough of Boston."

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. WARTON said, that as they were about to enter upon the consideration of the division of the county of Middlesex, he wished to propose *pro formâ* the omission of certain words. The right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would remember that when they were going through the last Schedule they struck out "Mile End." He believed he was right in saying that that

was in consequence of some new arrangement which was made in order that justice might be done to Westminster—in order that Westminster should have four Members instead of three. He believed he understood rightly that Westminster would in some way be affected by Mile End Old Town, and that in the last Schedule those words were struck out. He saw no Notice, however, of a similar alteration in this page. Of course, he could not tell what was in the mind of the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke), and, therefore, he begged to move *pro formâ* that the words "Mile End Old Town" be struck out of this page.

Amendment proposed, in page 67, line 10, to leave out the words "Mile End Old Town."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the hon. and learned Gentleman was quite right in saying that a change would have to be made here; but the mere striking out of these words would not be a sufficient change. They must express their meaning in another way; and until they knew what to put in, they had better not strike anything out. The matter had better be left over until Report.

MR. WARTON reminded the right hon. Baronet that the words were struck out of the last Schedule.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that in the last Schedule it was easy and simple; but here it was a complicated matter.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. RAIKES said, that the next Amendment was on page 68, and dealt with the county of Monmouthshire. The county of Monmouth was divided into three divisions under this Bill, which grouped them very naturally as Northern, Western, and Southern. He now proposed, in page 68, line 4, after "The," to insert "Northern or," so that the Abergavenny Division would read "the Northern or the Abergavenny Division."

Amendment proposed, in page 68, line 4, after the word "The," to insert the words "Northern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE asked if the right hon. Gentleman preferred to give alternative titles in the case of Monmouthshire?

MR. RAIKES said, he thought he was rather bound, generally speaking, to follow the alternative system right through. Of course, upon this subject he would be bound by the opinions of the hon. Gentlemen the Members for Monmouthshire.

MR. ROLLS said, he was in a position to say that the people of Monmouthshire would be quite satisfied with the adoption of the points of the compass in regard to their county.

MR. RAIKES observed that, in that case, he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment, and afterwards to propose to leave out Abergavenny," and insert "Northern."

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed, in page 68, line 4, to leave out the word "Abergavenny," and insert the word "Northern."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES said, that, in the same way, he begged now to propose that the word "Bedwellty" Division be called the Western Division.

Amendment proposed, in page 68, line 7, to leave out the word "Bedwellty," and insert the word "Western."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES proposed to leave out "Chepstow," in page 68, line 7, and insert "Southern."

Amendment proposed, in page 68, line 7, to leave out the word "Chepstow," and insert the word "Southern."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. BIRKBECK said, that he had a series of Amendments upon the Paper to give alternative titles to the divisions of Norfolk; but he did not propose to move his Amendments in the exact form in which they appeared. Originally he intended to propose naming the divisions of Norfolk after the points of the compass, and it was only yesterday evening that he altered them to the alternative form, believing that this form was in accordance with the wishes of the right

hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke). He now, however, wished to move that the "Freebridge" Division of Norfolk be called the "North-Western" Division, because he understood that that would be in accordance with the present wishes of the right hon. Baronet. His Amendments had been down on the Paper three or four weeks, and their purport was thoroughly well known to the people of the county, and no objection had been raised to them.

Amendment proposed, in page 68, line 20, to leave out the word "Freebridge," and insert "North-Western."—(*Mr. Birkbeck.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Freebridge' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he should offer no opposition to the adoption of the points of the compass in Norfolk. The merged boroughs had no strong claim to give their names to the new divisions, and therefore he should offer no objection to the Amendments of the hon. Gentleman.

Amendment *agreed to.*

On the Motion of MR. BIRKBECK, the following Amendments made:—Page 68, line 25, after "The," insert "South-Western or;" line 31, after "The," insert "Northern or;" page 69, line 1, after "The," insert "Eastern or;" line 10, after "The," insert "Mid or;" line 14, after "The," insert "Southern or."

MR. RAIKES said, that the next Amendment stood in his name, and had reference to the county of Northamptonshire, which was in four divisions, and which was not difficult to divide. He begged to propose that the Oundle Division be known by the alternative name of the Northern or Oundle Division.

Amendment proposed, in page 69, line 21, after the word "The," to insert the words "Northern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, that none of the places whose names had been given to the divisions of Northampton were of importance, and therefore he begged to move that the word "or" be omitted from the proposed Amendment.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE assented to the suggested Amendment.

MR. RAIKES asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. RAIKES proposed to omit the word "Oundle," and insert the word "Northern."

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES proposed that the 2nd division of Northampton be called the Eastern Division, instead of the Wellingboro, Division.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES proposed that the 3rd division of the county be called the Western Division, instead of the Brixworth Division.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE suggested that it would be better to call the division the "Mid" Division.

MR. RAIKES assented.

Amendment, as amended, *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES proposed that the Towcester Division be called the Southern Division.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES said, his next Amendments had reference to the county of Northumberland, and the first of them related to the division which was described in the Bill as the Wansbeck Division. By his Amendment, as it appeared on the Paper, he proposed to call the division the Mid or Wansbeck Division; but if there was any feeling in favour of omitting the local name altogether, he should be quite content to move his Amendment in that form. He thought the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had a preference for single names.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he was certainly in favour of single names where there were no local names chosen. He was told that in Northumberland there was some preference for local names.

MR. RAIKES observed that, under the circumstances, he would move the Amendments as they appeared on the Paper.

Amendment proposed, in page 70, line 9, after the word "The," to insert the words "Mid or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES proposed, in page 70, line 24, after "The," insert "Southern or," so that No. 2 Division would read the "Southern or Tyneside Division."

Amendment proposed, in page 70, line 24, after the word "The," to insert the words "Southern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, there was a great deal of objection to this Amendment. Tyneside was so well known as a local designation that he should have thought that it was desirable to leave the name by itself. Perhaps it would be well if the right hon. Gentleman were to leave over this question until Report, in order that inquiries might be made in the locality.

MR. RAIKES said, he was quite content to withdraw the Amendment for the present, reserving to himself the right, of course, to re-introduce it.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. RAIKES proposed, in page 70, line 29, after "The," to insert "Western or," so that the Hexham Division would read the "Western or Hexham Division."

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES proposed, in page 70, line 33, to leave out "Berwick-upon-Tweed," and insert "Northern or Tweedside." He was not particular which words—Northern or Tweedside—were chosen; but he thought that as the Southern Division of the county had been called Tyneside, there was some appropriateness, as this division was bounded to some extent by the Tweed, that it should be called Tweedside. If, however, a better name could be suggested, he would be quite willing to adopt it. In some quarters it had been suggested that the division be called the Cheviot Division, because the Cheviot Hills formed a boundary for some distance. He should have no objection to that name. All he was anxious to do was to induce the Committee to abandon the name of Berwick-upon-Tweed as the name of a division in the county of Northumberland, because on the other side of the river there was the county of Berwick. Hon. Gentlemen, of course, knew that until a very recent Act the town of Berwick was neither, strictly speaking, in England or Scotland. He thought it was by an Act passed in 1868 or 1869 that the town had been statutorily added to the Kingdom of England. At all events, he thought it very undesirable that Berwick should be made the name of a division of the county of Northumberland, because Berwick was the name of another county. He was desirous of leaving out "Berwick-upon-Tweed," and substituting "Northern or Tweedside," or Cheviot, or whatever other appropriate name might be chosen.

Amendment proposed,

In page 70, line 33, to leave out the words "Berwick-upon-Tweed," and insert the words "Northern or Tweedside."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'Berwick-upon-Tweed' stand part of the Schedule."

MR. T. RUSSELL said, he thought it would be very undesirable that the name "Tweedside" should be given to the division, however desirable it might be to substitute another name for Berwick-upon-Tweed. Tweedside was a well-known and historical name for the Valley of the Tweed in Selkirkshire, and confusion would undoubtedly arise if it were applied to this more Southern part of the county.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would like time to consider the Amendment. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would, for the present, withdraw his proposition.

MR. RAIKES said, he had found that there was a very strong feeling in Berwick-on-Tweed against his proposal to omit the name of that town and insert the words "The Northern or Tweedside;" and if the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board objected to the Amendment, he (Mr. Raikes) would not persevere with it.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE intimated that he did object.

MR. RAIKES said, in that case he would ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment made, by inserting the words "Northern or" before the words "Berwick-upon-Tweed."

Mr. RAIKES said, the next Amendment he had upon the Paper related to the County of Nottingham, and the proposal was, in page 71, line 4, after "The," insert "Northern or." This was based on the same principle as had been adopted in so many other cases. The County of Nottingham had been partitioned by the Commissioners into four Divisions, and those divisions fell quite naturally into those of North, East, South, and West. The Amendment had relation to the proposed division of Bassetlaw, which he was glad to see had been adopted by the Commissioners. As he should be very sorry to lose that name, he merely proposed to add to it the point of the compass by which it ought to be distinguished, as Bassetlaw was distinctly within the division of North Nottinghamshire. He, therefore, begged to submit his Amendment.

Amendment proposed, in page 71, line 4, after the word "The," to insert the words "Northern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. MAPPIN said, he now wished to move the Amendment which stood on the Paper in his name. It was, that in page 71, line 4, the word "Bassetlaw" should be omitted, and the words "East Retford" inserted in its stead. It was hardly necessary to point out to the Committee that East Retford was a very ancient borough, which had returned Members to Parliament for the last 300 or 400 years. With regard to the action taken by the Commissioners in giving the name of Bassetlaw to the division, he ought to state that when those gentlemen went down to that district they were not aware that there would be any objection to the course they proposed. No deputation had been sent to make any representation to them on the subject, as no notice was given of the intention to use the name of Bassetlaw instead of that of East Retford, and he trusted that under those circumstances the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill would see his way to the substitution of East Retford for the name of the division recommended by the Commissioners. He found that Members of Parliament had been returned to represent that borough ever since the year 1572; and now, as the division in which it stood was only to return one Member, instead of two as formerly, he trusted the Committee would take these things into account, and would agree to the Amendment he proposed.

Amendment proposed,

In page 71, line 4, after the word "The," to leave out the word "Bassetlaw," and insert the words "East Retford."—(*Mr. Mappin.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Bassetlaw' stand part of the Schedule."

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he could understand the feeling of the hon. Gentleman who had moved the Amendment; but he felt bound to point out that the borough of East Retford was part of the Hundred of Bassetlaw, and that this was one of the ancient names of the borough. Under those circumstances, he was inclined to adopt the view expressed by the Mayor of East Retford, who had attended the inquiry held by the Commissioners, and who had himself proposed that the name of Bassetlaw should be given to the division. He would, therefore, suggest that the Committee should adhere to the name of Bassetlaw.

Mr. MAPPIN said, the right hon. Gentleman had implied that the name of East Retford had been added to that of Bassetlaw, whereas Bassetlaw had been added to East Retford in 1832. East Retford was, as he had stated, the ancient name of the Parliamentary borough, and he trusted the Committee would not assent to its being obliterated by the substitution of Bassetlaw.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON said, it appeared to him that if they were to employ the names of different localities in designating the divisions into which the counties were to be apportioned, the course the Committee ought to pursue should be to bestow such names as were well known throughout the country. Who, he asked, outside the locality itself, had ever heard of Bassetlaw? ["Oh!"] Hon. Members seemed to express surprise that he should have put this question, and it might be that he was one of the ignorant individuals; but he must confess that he had never heard of Bassetlaw; while, on the other hand, East Retford had been a Parliamentary designation well known to the country for hundreds of years, and he did not see why they should now be called upon to alter it.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he thought that if any further reason were

needed than those already advanced for calling the division now under the consideration of the Committee by the name of Bassetlaw, as proposed by the Commissioners, it would be found in the fact that the circumstances under which Bassetlaw had been added to East Retford were more creditable to Bassetlaw than to the borough of East Retford.

MR. MAPPIN said, under all the circumstances, and seeing that the Amendment he had proposed did not receive the assent of the right hon. Gentleman, he would ask leave to withdraw it.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. RAIKES said, he had now to move the insertion, in regard to the proposed Newark Division, in page 71, line 11, after "The," of the words "Eastern or."

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES said, he had next to move the introduction of the words "Southern or," as the geographical description of the Rushcliffe Division of Nottinghamshire, these words to be inserted after the word "The," in page 71, line 18.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES said, in order to complete the geographical designation of the Nottinghamshire Divisions, he begged to move, in relation to the Mansfied Division, the insertion, in page 71, line 21, after the word "The," of the words "Western or."

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES said, the next Amendment had reference to the county of Oxford, with regard to the 1st, or Banbury, Division of which he begged to move, in page 71, line 29, after the word "The," the insertion of the words "Northern or." The county of Oxford fell naturally into three divisions, and there could be no doubt about the Banbury portion being the Northern Division.

Amendment *agreed to.*

SIR BERNHARD SAMUELSON said, he had an Amendment to propose to the Schedule that would enable the Parliamentary borough of Banbury to be retained. If that borough were treated as was proposed by the Bill, it would undergo a process of vivisection, and it was a fact that there was no natural boundary between the two portions into which it was proposed to divide the borough. He knew it might be said that, in order to carry out his Amendment, all portions of the county of Northampton that were in the borough of Banbury would for Parliamentary purposes have to be made a portion of the county of Oxford; but he did not regard that as any real objection to his proposal, because the shape of the county at that particular point was such that he had not the least doubt that, by any readjustment of county boundaries in a County Government Bill the county boundary would be so drawn as to include that portion of Northamptonshire in the county of Oxford. He would not, however, detain the Committee by discussing the question at greater length, and would simply content himself with moving his Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

In page 71, line 30, after the word "The," to insert the words "Parliamentary borough of Banbury and the."—(*Sir Bernhard Samuelson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

COLONEL NORTH said, the hon. Member who had moved the Amendment could hardly be award that he was proposing to deal with a portion of the borough of Banbury that had already been included in one of the divisions of Northamptonshire.

SIR BERNHARD SAMUELSON said, he should, if his Amendment were carried, propose to amend what had been referred to by the hon. and gallant Member on the Report.

MR. RAIKES ventured to put it to the Chairman of the Committee whether it was competent to the Committee to entertain an Amendment which was contrary to a part of the Schedule already agreed to? The Committee had already passed that part of the Schedule which dealt with the county of Northampton, and had attached a portion of the borough of Banbury now proposed to be dealt with to one of the divisions of that county; so that if the Amendment should happen to be agreed to, that part of the borough which had been so apportioned would also be attached to the county of Oxford.

THE CHAIRMAN said, he was not aware that what was stated by the right

hon. Gentleman (Mr. Raikes) was the case. Did the right hon. Gentleman assert that the question had been already disposed of?

MR. RAIKES said, it was the fact that the Committee had already defined the Towcester Division as consisting of Brackley, Daventry, and Towcester.

COLONEL NORTH said, Grimsbury was in the county of Northampton; but the hon Baronet (Sir Bernhard Samuelson) wished to bring it into the county of Oxford.

THE CHAIRMAN said, he had before him the Bill and the Paper of Amendments; but neither in the Bill nor the Amendments did he see any mention of Grimsbury.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the Chairman could not understand from the sources of information before him the point which had just been submitted by hon. Gentlemen opposite, because all the names mentioned were not included in the Schedule; but the fact was as it had been stated. The question was one which had to be dealt with on its merits, and as the principle which his hon. Friend (Sir Bernhard Samuelson) proposed to apply in the present instance differed from that which had been applied to other Amendments which had been previously agreed to, he did not think the Committee ought to agree to this proposal.

SIR BERNHARD SAMUELSON said, after what had been said by his right Friend (Sir Charles W. Dilke), he would ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

On the Motion of MR. RAIKES, the following Amendments made:—Page 72, line 1, after "The," insert "Mid or;" line 15, after "The," insert "Southern or."

MR. RAIKES said, his next Amendment had relation to Shropshire, which was not a county that could be very easily divided. He thought, however, the convenience of the county would be best studied by giving the designation of "Western" to the proposed Oswestry Division, and calling the Newport Division the Northern Division, in addition to the names in the Schedule.

Amendment proposed,

In page 72, line 28, after the word "The," to insert the words "Western or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH asked whether the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had any objection to the Amendment?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he did not object to the Oswestry Division being called the Western or Oswestry Division, but he did not thereby admit that this was necessarily to govern the other cases.

MR. RAIKES said, he did not know whether the hon. Member for North Shropshire (Mr. Stanley Leighton) was present; but if he were, he would probably confirm the statement that the designation proposed by the Amendment was that which was preferred in the district.

Amendment *agreed to.*

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the hon. Member (Mr. Forester) who had put down the next Amendment was not present; but if the hon. and learned Member opposite (Mr. Elton), who had a proposal to make upon the same question, would move it, he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would move that the Chairman report Progress, and the matter could be discussed to-morrow.

MR. ELTON said, his Amendment was an Amendment to that of the hon. Member (Mr. Forester); and, if that course were desired, he had no objection to move his own at once as a substantive Amendment.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, as the Amendment of the hon. Member (Mr. Forester) had not been moved, he had thought the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite might have moved it as a substantive Amendment, upon which Progress could be reported.

MR. ELTON said, he would ask leave to put his Amendment as a substantive Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

In page 73, line 14, to leave out the word "Wellington," in order to insert the word "Broseley,"—(*Mr. Elton,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'Wellington' stand part of the Schedule."

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

[*Thirteenth Night.*]

MOTIONS.

—o—

EDUCATION (MUIR'S SCHOOL, &c. SCHEME).

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.

DR. CAMERON, in rising to move—

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to withhold Her consent from section 3 of the Scheme, now lying upon the Table of the House, for the management of the Endowments known as Muir's School Fund, Millar's and Peadie's School, Wilson's Charity School, M'Lachlan's Free School, and Graham's Free School, all in the county of Lanark and burgh of Glasgow,"

said, he had two Amendments on the Paper, and the first of these, which he now brought under the consideration of the House, related to a scheme involving the application for educational purposes of a sum of money amounting to between £50,000 and £60,000. It was proposed that the Governing Body under that scheme should consist of 17 members, and those 17 Governors were to be elected partly by the magistrates, partly by the School Board, and partly by the Trades' and Merchants' Houses. Those Bodies represented all classes of the community and all the religious sections of the population of the district; but in addition to the Governing Body to be elected in this way, the proposed scheme provided that five out of the 17 should be elected by the city ministers, and Kirk Sessions, and managers of the Established Church; so that five out of the 17 composing the entire Governing Body were to be elected by the Church. It was originally proposed by the scheme that no fewer than seven of the total number of Governors should be elected in this way; but, out of deference to the very strong remonstrances made to the Commissioners, that number was eventually cut down to the five now embodied in the scheme. The Commissioners asserted that they had no option but to do what they had done in placing upon the list of the Governing Body the number of Church representatives they had recommended, and that in doing so they were only obeying the Act of Parliament. In support of this allegation, they quoted Section 15 of the Act, which set forth that—

"In framing schemes, it shall be the duty of the Commissioners, with respect alike to the constitution of the Governing Body and the educational provisions, to have regard to the spirit of the founder's intentions."

He (Dr. Cameron) did not at all dispute the *dictum* thus cited from the Act of Parliament; but he wished to point out to the House that the Commissioners were to have, under that Act, only the same respect to the intentions of the founders in the constitution of the Governing Body as they were to have to the educational provisions the Act contained; and it would be seen that, in drawing up these schemes, the Commissioners had adopted a very different latitude when dealing with the educational provisions to that which they had laid down for themselves in dealing with the constitution of the Governing Body. The first Amendment he had placed upon the Paper, and which he was now about to move, applied to the scheme relating to the educational endowments named therein, all of them being of comparatively modern date; but at the same time, with but one exception, they all belonged to a period before the Disruption, and before the extension of the parochial system in Scotland and the institution of popular public education. At the time the sums of money to be dealt with under the scheme were left, nothing was more natural than that those who bequeathed their property for educational purposes should have so bequeathed it as to have left it under the supervision of the Kirk Session of the Established Church; because in the days when the majority of these bequests were made the Kirk Session of the Established Church constituted the authority for administering the education of the country; but since that time the whole system had been entirely changed. In dealing with the educational provisions, the Commissioners had been apparently actuated by a motive which had led them to make such arrangements as would enable the district to which the endowments belonged to derive the greatest possible amount of benefit from the money thus bequeathed for educational purposes. Actuated by that motive, they had disregarded, in all cases, the letter and spirit of the founders' intentions. Dr. Bell's Bequest to Glasgow contained a scheme for the purpose of encouraging, amongst others, the Madras system of instruction; but they had

bolished all obligations to keep the Madras system of education. There had also been a bequest for the benefit of poor Highlanders; but the Commissioners had dropped the poor Highlanders. In dealing with the other Churches, they had exercised the same latitude with regard to the members intrusted with the administration of the endowments. One of the endowments was Maxwell's, and he contended that they should apply the same measure to the ministers of one Church as they did to the ministers of another. If they got rid of the Episcopalians and burghers, they ought not to have retained the Established Church clergymen. He entirely controverted the statement in one of the schemes on this point, and he said that any reason for getting rid of the Episcopalians, burghers, and clergymen existed equally with respect to the Established Church. The Established Church was well represented in the various Institutions of Glasgow; in the School Board, the University, and in the Trades House and the Merchants' House; and he could not see why matters should not be allowed to adjust themselves, and why, if it was desired to have clergymen on these Governing Bodies, they should not be elected like other citizens. That was his point; he objected altogether to their being elected as clergymen. They were told that clergymen were not elected; but he said that clergymen would be *ex officio* members of the Governing Bodies. The Vice President of the Council said that he had not had a statement of reasons in the Petition placed before him. That might be technically correct; but he would point out that in 1883 a public meeting was held in Glasgow, at which a protest was made against the constitution of the Governing Body under this scheme, and a long and elaborate Memorial to that effect had been signed. Another meeting was also held, and a further protest made and embodied in a Resolution which he had read to the House a few days ago. That Resolution did not crave for a representation of other Religious Bodies on the Governing Boards of the Trusts; but it objected altogether to clergymen, as clergymen, being placed as members of the Governing Bodies under these schemes, or clerical bodies, as such, being intrusted with the right of electing members. Out of a Board of 17, it appeared that no fewer than five were representatives of the Established Church.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to withhold Her consent from section 3 of the Scheme, now lying upon the Table of the House, for the management of the Endowments known as Muir's School Fund, Millar's and Peadie's School, Wilson's Charity School, M'Lachlan's Free School, and Graham's Free School, all in the county of Lanark and burgh of Glasgow."—(*Dr. Cameron.*)

MR. T. RUSSELL said, that, in making the new arrangements for these educational endowments, the people of Scotland had made up their minds that the education should be national and not denominational. It might be said that the founders' intentions were being respected; but he did not think it would be found that secondary or technical education was assigned a very prominent place in the original bequests. If the purposes of the founders were altered in order to suit modern ideas, he thought the Governing Bodies should also be rendered suitable to modern ideas and modern necessities. It was the intention of the Educational Endowments Act to secure that these endowments should be made available for the purpose of secondary or technical education. It might be true that when the endowments were established, there were only clergymen to take charge of them; but that was no longer the case. The endowments themselves and their object having become national, there were now plenty of philanthropic people other than clergymen well qualified to see that the funds were disposed to the best national advantage.

MR. MUNDELLA said, he was obliged to his hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow for the way in which he had spoken on this subject. He believed that no body connected with education had ever discharged their work so efficiently and with greater impartiality and fairness towards all parties concerned than this unpaid body of Commissioners. He believed it would be found that unpaid Commissioners could and would do excellent service in matters of this kind, and do it more ably perhaps than Commissioners who occupied a different position. But he was sorry that his hon. Friend had thought it necessary to

challenge the two schemes now before the House, and in saying that he expressed his opinion that there never was a scheme challenged in that House on grounds of so little substance as in the present instance. There was hardly any substantial ground at all for challenging the schemes of the Commissioners. He did not say because the Commissioners had done their work well that therefore their schemes should not be inquired into or challenged; but he did think it necessary to point out that these two schemes had proceeded from a body entirely above suspicion, which had endeavoured to meet the wishes of those interested in Glasgow, and he thought that it was a little hard that their schemes should be challenged in that House upon such unsubstantial grounds as his hon. Friend had put forward. Under the Educational Endowments Act there was power to amalgamate a number of small schemes, making them into one considerable scheme, and forming them under one Governing Body. His hon. Friend had spoken of the antiquity of some of these endowments; but he had not told them that the principal endowment—Muir's—amounted to £800 a-year, and the total income from all the funds to £2,660 a-year. Mr. Muir, the donor in the case of the principal endowment, died in 1865; but his will did not come into operation until 1868, and under it £800 a-year was left to a Governing Body composed of 22 ministers and elders and three magistrates of the City of Glasgow. Then there were four other endowments amounting to £1,400, governed by ministers and laymen. Now, what was the scheme of the Commissioners? They had formed a new Governing Body of 17 members, of whom three were members of the Town Council, three of the School Board, two were magistrates, two were members of the University of Glasgow, two were members of the Merchants' and Trades' Houses, and one member was elected by the ministers of St. Columba Church. Now, that scheme had received the general approval of the citizens, although he knew that some objections had been raised to it by Nonconformists in Glasgow. It was thought that, having changed the Madras system of teaching to technical teaching, they might get rid altogether of the ministers. But the 15th section of the Act said that in framing schemes, it should be the duty of the Commissioners, with respect to the constitution of the Governing Bodies and to the educational requirements, to have regard to the spirit of the founders' intentions." It was one thing to change the method of teaching, and another thing entirely to ignore the persons into whose hands the founders committed the trusts. He did not think there could be any objection to the Governing Body as was now proposed, of which six members belonged to the Town Council and School Board, two to the Senatus of the University, and two to the Trades' and Merchants' Houses—in fact, 12 out of the 17 were laymen and persons deriving their qualifications from membership of public bodies. No representation whatever had been received from Glasgow in reference to this scheme, nor had any objection been lodged at the Educational Department with regard to it. He hoped his hon. Friend would not persevere with his Motion.

Mr. J. A. CAMPBELL said, that the hon. Member for Glasgow had brought a charge against the Commissioners of partiality towards the Established Church of Scotland; but if the composition of the Commission were taken into account, he thought that no one would ever suspect them of any partiality of that kind. As he had the honour of being a Member of the Commission, he wished to say that the Commissioners were not in the habit of inquiring into each other's ecclesiastical tendencies; but, so far as he knew, there were on the Commission only two members of the Established Church, and certainly the other five were quite capable of looking after the interests of other denominations. The work intrusted to the Commissioners was the re-organization of educational endowments in Scotland; and that had been described more fully as extending the usefulness of educational endowments in Scotland, and carrying out more fully than was done at present the spirit of the founders' intentions. As had been stated, the Commissioners were enjoined by the Act of Parliament to have respect to the spirit of the intentions of the founders, not only in the educational provisions which they should make, but also in the constitution of new Governing Bodies. Now, it had been said that they were not dealing with these endowments in the same way as education was

dealt with under the Act of 1872, in which the religious element was neither prescribed nor proscribed. But they were not to be guided by the lines of the Education Act. Parliament had given them a special Act for their guidance, and in doing so it had in view the difference between rate-supported schools and endowments provided by the beneficence of individuals. In the construction of the Governing Bodies for these endowments, the Commissioners had been instructed by the Act that, except under special circumstances, a certain number of Governors should be appointed from Town Councils and other public bodies, and with regard to the remainder of the Governors they were left to consider who would most properly represent the founders' intentions. In that way they were thrown back on the object of the trusts as declared by the founders, and on the composition of the original body of trustees. That was their duty with regard to any new Governing Body which they had to devise. Then as to the schemes which were brought before the House in this Motion, it had been found expedient to amalgamate certain endowments and treat them as a single scheme. That, he was bound to say, was not an idea of the Commissioners only, but it had been recommended to them by those in Glasgow who were interested in these trusts. They had also received a large amount of assistance from the trustees of these different endowments in constructing the Governing Bodies. It might be asked why they had presented two schemes for the endowments enumerated in the two Motions of the hon. Member, and why they had not one scheme for the whole of these endowments? The reason was simply this—that there was not only a certain difference in the destination of the endowments as expressed by the founders, but also a marked difference in the original Governing Bodies named by the founders. In the first group of endowments mentioned by the hon. Member the City ministers had the principal share in the management, and in the second group the Town Council was principally represented. It was unnecessary to repeat what had been already stated by the right hon. Gentleman as to the composition of these Governing Bodies as proposed in the schemes; but he would point out that the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) had made a mistake in his reference to Muir's Trust. It was true that the money was given to the Lord Provost and other functionaries of Glasgow to hold; but who were to be managers of the trust? Those who were to have charge of it were to be City ministers and elders. It was thoroughly a Church trust, although, as he had said, the money was to be held by the Lord Provost and two magistrates. Muir's was the most important endowment of the group. The other endowments were all more or less connected with the Church, with the single exception of the last one named—namely, Graham's Free School—and with regard to this there was special representation given on the Governing Body. The hon. Member for Glasgow had passed from that group to a second, called the City group, and had brought objections against the scheme with respect to which he thought it necessary, notwithstanding the late hour, that he should offer a few words of explanation. It was said that the Commissioners had been blameable in not giving representation in the new Governing Body to two Episcopalian and two Burgher ministers who were members of the M'Lachlan Trust and the Maxwell Trust. It would be a serious charge against the Commissioners, he admitted, if they had done any injustice to those reverend gentlemen; but, as a matter of fact, these two trustees, in each case, represented one-seventh only of the original body of trustees. Again, the two trusts named represented only one-seventh part of the group of endowments in which they were now merged by the scheme, so that the complaint was that representation had not been given to one-seventh of one-seventh—or to one 49th part. But the entire Governing Body only numbered 21, and the Commissioners were obliged to assign 14 of the 21 members to the Town Council and School Board. Then, again, objection had been taken to Bell's Bequest being treated in the scheme. Now, in regard to Bell's Bequest, an arrangement was made by the Town Council in 1833, and confirmed in the following year by Parliament, by which the sum of £381 was paid every year among 10 schools—to a school in each of the 10 parishes of Glasgow—and

all that the Commissioners proposed was, that so far as these schools were still in operation, and still under Government inspection, the small grant of £33 to each of them should be continued.

MR. MUNDELLA: We do not object to that.

MR. J. A. CAMPBELL understood that that was part of the objection of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron). On the whole, he (Mr. J. A. Campbell) hoped that the House would be satisfied that there was really nothing in the hon. Member's objection. It was founded on the idea that the Commissioners had not been dealing equal justice to all parties. That was an entire mistake.

MR. RAMSAY said, he should not, at that time of the morning (1.35), occupy the House more than a few minutes. His hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron), who had submitted this Motion to the House, could not have reflected upon the precise terms of the Educational Endowments Act, or he would not have brought this Motion forward. He (Mr. Ramsay) had acted as a Member of the Commission from the first moment of its existence. Now, he was a Nonconformist; but he did not consider it his duty to endeavour to secure religious equality—as it was termed—in all the new Governing Bodies that had been formed. The object of the Act was very briefly stated in the Preamble. The Act was passed for the purpose of carrying out more fully than at present, the spirit of the founder's intention, and it was required that with respect to the constitution of the Governing Body the Commissioners should have regard to the spirit of the founder's intentions. He would like to ask any Member of the House how, when funds were left to be administered by clergymen of the Church of Scotland, it would be possible to carry out the spirit of the founder's intention with regard to the constitution of the Governing Body if they neglected to consider the claims of ministers of that Church to form part of the Governing Body? If, in consequence of their own personal feeling against the Church of Scotland, the Commissioners had prevented the clergy of that Church having any voice in the administration of such funds, he felt that they would have acted very improperly. It was essential when any one was appointed to adminster an Act, that they should have regard to the provisions of the Act, and to that Act only. It was said that the Commissioners were bound to give heed to religious equality. The Commissioners, however, were appointed to administer the Educational Endowments Acts, and to that they were bound to confine themselves. He failed to see, therefore, any advantage that could accrue from the House throwing over this scheme. Although he was an advocate for religious equality, he certainly did not feel, when he accepted the position of a Member of the Commission, that he was to act upon his own religious or political opinions. He hoped the House would not assent to the Motion of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron).

SIR. EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, that he was Chairman of the preceding Commission to the one which had brought forward this scheme; and this subject underwent inquiry by himself and Colleagues, including the hon. Gentleman who had just addressed the House (Mr. Ramsay). The Commissioners were pleased to record their opinion, that in putting ministers upon these trusts, the founders had in view some security for the religious education according to the use and mode in Scotland. He thought that the present Commissioners had done nothing more than their bare duty in carrying out the Act of Parliament, in keeping a certain proportion of ministers upon the trust; and he thought it was particularly the case with regard to the foundations in Glasgow, where ministers had been put on foundations in a very large proportion. No doubt it was the case with regard to many of the local trusts, that ministers had been selected as public men, and not with any regard to a particular religion. This, however, was not the case with regard to a large number of the trusts, and especially with regard to the important trust with which the House was now concerned. In his opinion, the Commissioners would have failed in their duty if they had not kept the desire of the founders in view. He might have his opinion that there would be every security for religious education just as much if ministers were not on the trusts, as there would if they were. No doubt, to some extent, this might be the case; but it was not in the

eyes of the public. He did not think that in the eyes of the public of Glasgow there was the same security for religious education when ministers were not upon the trust as when they were. He considered that the intentions of the founders had been very properly carried out; and therefore he trusted the House would reject the Motion of his hon. Friend (Dr. Cameron).

MR. J. W. BARCLAY said, he was bound to point out to the House that the complaint made by his hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) was not that any injustice had been done to any of the Churches who had not been included in the Governing Bodies under the new scheme. What the hon. Gentleman complained of was, that this Act should be made a means of continuing sectarian differences in Scotland, and maintaining the ascendancy of the Established Church. It was quite true that possibly ministers of the Episcopal Church would not be entitled, in every case, to have representatives on the Governing Bodies; but that was not the point. What the people of Scotland desired to have was religious equality, and they were disappointed that this Act should be made the means of continuing sectarian differences and sectarian privileges, especially when the objects of the founders could be equally obtained by a purely representative body. That was the apprehension which some Gentlemen entertained when the Bill was passing through the House, and they stated their views very distinctly on the question. What had taken place was that the clerical element had received a greater amount of consideration, in many cases, than the people of Scotland desired it should have. Now, he found that the two principal objects of Muir's Trusts were the education and clothing of boys, and the assistance of parents having boys in the school. That intention of the pious founder had been disregarded; and he maintained that the clerical element had received a much greater amount of consideration than the objects warranted. In his opinion, his hon. Friend was entitled to make this protest against the continuance of religious distinctions under a recent Act of Parliament. He trusted that his hon. Friend would go to a division.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 8; Noes 50: Majority 42.—(Div. List, No. 100.)

GAS PROVISIONAL ORDERS (NO. 1) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HOLMS, Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under "The Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870," relating to Dovor Gas, Grays Gas, Middlewich Gas, Rickmansworth Gas, and Shelley and Shepley Gas, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HOLMS and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 126.]

House adjourned at a quarter before Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 15th April, 1885.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS — *Ordered—First Reading*—Rating of Machinery * [127].

Second Reading—Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Provisional Order * [124]; Burial Boards (Contested Elections) * [106].

Committee—Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) (*re-comm.*) [49] — R.P. [*Fourteenth Night*].

Considered as amended—Royal Irish Constabulary Redistribution * [105].

Third Reading—Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 2) * [107], and *passed*

MOTION.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

On Motion of Mr. NORWOOD, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Rating of Machinery, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BRINTON, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. SLAGG.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 127.]

ORDER OF THE DAY.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (REDISTRIBUTION) (*re-committed*) BILL.—[BILL 49.]

(*Mr. Gladstone, The Marquess of Hartington, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Attorney General, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 14th April.*]

[FOURTEENTH NIGHT.]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

SEVENTH SCHEDULE.

COUNTIES AT LARGE.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS AND NAMES AND CONTENTS OF DIVISIONS.

PART I.

ENGLAND.

Amendment proposed,

In page 73, line 14, to leave out the word "Wellington," in order to insert the word "Broseley,"—(*Mr. Elton,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'Wellington' stand part of the Schedule."

MR. ELTON said, that he had proposed the Amendment which had just been put from the Chair formally last night, and he would now explain what its object was. He had no wish to interfere with the views of hon. Members for Shropshire, or to cast any stigma upon any district under the Wrekin which the Commissioners had chosen to place within the division of Wellington in Shropshire. His only reason for moving the Amendment was to secure the use of another name for this division of Shropshire. Hon. Members would be aware that there were several Amendments on the Paper which proposed to confer the name of "Wellington" upon one of the Somersetshire divisions —namely, the seventh, which was described in the Bill as the Williton Division; and he, therefore, thought it was undesirable to pass by the use of the name in Shropshire. It was quite clear that, as the Bill now stood, either by carelessness on the part of the Boundary Commissioners, or from the accident of Shropshire coming alphabetically before Somersetshire, distinct priority was given to the name of "Wellington" for the Shropshire Division; and if the proposal were adopted it might interfere with that which it was intended to make when the proper time arrived for dealing with the divisions of the county of Somerset. The point in question, however, was the propriety of applying an alternative name, instead of using that of one of the points of the compass in the case of a particular locality in Somersetshire which had always been associated with the name of a great and distinguished man. That principle appeared by some accident to have been altogether ignored in this particular instance, and the consequence was that if the Schedule were accepted as it now stood, Shropshire would be left in a position of superiority; and subsequently, in all probability, the people of Somersetshire would be told that the name of "Wellington" had been already appropriated as the name of another division, and that the rule had already been departed from of designating the divisions of Shropshire by the names of the points of the compass by giving one of them this coveted name of "Wellington" pure and simple; and, therefore, that it would be impossible to confer the same name upon a division of any other county. The discussion which took place last evening was certainly of a complex and confused character; and he had felt himself obliged to move this Amendment before they came to the proper place for raising the question of the Somersetshire Wellington. However that might be, he thought some particulars should be given to the Committee, in order to ascertain whether they ought to make this extraordinary exception on behalf of Wellington in the Shropshire Division, which to his mind it was perfectly clear ought to be an alternative division—either Wellington Shropshire or Mid Shropshire. He had selected in his Amendment as the name of the division the town of Broseley, a place that was distinguished for the manufacture of pipes. He did not profess to have any local knowledge with regard to Shropshire; but he wished to make sure that the county he had the honour to represent (West Somerset) should not, by an accident, be placed in an unfair position. He was quite certain that the Commissioners had given this name to the new division of Shropshire, instead of making it applicable to the Wellington Division of Somerset, by mere accident. When the Commissioners came down to Somersetshire this name was suggested to them; but, owing to the local pronunciation, the Commissioners appeared to have selected a name that was very similar—namely, Williton. There must have been some carelessness in the matter, because the only reason given by the Commissioners for adopting the name of Wellington for one of the divisions of Shropshire was that it was a large urban district; whereas, if the Committee would look at Somersetshire,

they would find that the urban district of Wellington in that county was considerably larger than the urban district they had selected in Shropshire. There appeared to have been a somewhat ridiculous sort of happy carelessness on the part of the Commissioners in connection with this incident; and as the Commissioners had displayed some indifference in the matter, he thought it was absolutely necessary that a discussion should be raised now for the purpose of securing fair play to the county of Somerset. Of course, where there were two places enjoying the same famous name, one of them was bound to come before the other alphabetically. But the Commissioners had had a full opportunity of considering both, and certainly the alphabetical principle ought to be disregarded. The Duke of Wellington was Lord of the Manor of Wellington in Somersetshire; and when he was rewarded with a Peerage, after his distinguished victories in the Peninsula, he selected that place as the name of his Barony and of his subsequent Viscountcy, Earldom, and Dukedom. To make that perfectly certain it was only necessary to call attention to the patents under which these distinctions were granted. They were all of them in the same terms. In the first Sir Arthur Wellesley was described as Baron Wellington, of Wellington in Somerset, the next as Viscount Wellington of Talavera and Wellington in Somersetshire; then as Earl of Wellington in Somersetshire; and, lastly, as Duke of Wellington of "Wellington in our county of Somerset." Now, the main point he had to urge was that the Somersetshire people were very proud of the Duke of Wellington, and they were now asked to give up all the local dignity and superiority which had been conferred upon them by the connection of the Duke of Wellington to Wellington in Shropshire, which was considered by the Commissioners to be the more important urban district. The principle of taking into account this element of human interest and of hero worship had already been accepted by the House; and in deference to the wish of the Leader of the Opposition the name of a consituency had been preserved in order to do honour to the memory of one of the right hon. Baronet's distinguished ancestors who had represented that constituency. The same principle was to be brought into play in the case of the constituency so long represented by Sir Robert Peel, and the name of Tamworth was to be preserved. The right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill had done honour to that sentiment or feeling in a marked and exceptional manner; and he (Mr. Elton) thought that, under these circumstances, and knowing that it must have been by some accident that the alternative name had been given in this instance, and not having any particular interest in inserting the name of "Broseley," except to afford an opportunity for discussion, he would, if he obtained the permission of the Committee, withdraw his Amendment with the object of allowing the words "Mid or" to be inserted.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that before the Amendment was by leave of the Committee withdrawn it would, perhaps, be convenient that he should state the views of the Government in regard to both of these cases. He certainly did not think that the name of "Broseley" would suit the division now under discussion. Broseley was at the edge of the division, and he did not think there would be any general agreement in favour of that name; and it must, therefore, be set aside. In regard to the two Wellingtons, he might point out that the population of Wellington in Shropshire was almost exactly the same as that of Wellington in Somersetshire; but he believed that the boundaries of the urban district in Shropshire were more close, and the town, as a town, had undoubtedly a larger population than Wellington in Somersetshire. It was one of the principal Petty Sessional divisions in Shropshire, containing four times the population of that in Somersetshire; and, therefore, he thought the Commissioners had made out a case for preferring it in connection with the county of Salop. No doubt a great deal of indignation had been excited by the proposal, and he had received more communications on this subject than upon any other part of the Bill. He thought there were really two practical suggestions which might guide the Committee in the choice they had to make, either to have Wellington as a second name in each case, and call the present division "the Mid" or "Wellington" Division of Shropshire, while they called the Somersetshire Division the "Wes-

tern" or "Wellington" Division of Somersetshire, or they might call them "the Mid Division of Shropshire" and "the Western Division of Somersetshire." Those were the best suggestions he could make in the matter. He would not object to preserve the name of Wellington as a second name in each case. It was a very distinguished and respectable name in each county apart from the associations connected with Wellington in Somersetshire. He did not think there would be as great a risk of error or confusion between the Mid or Wellington Division of Shropshire, and the Western or Wellington Division of Somersetshire, as there would be between Newcastle-on-Tyne and Newcastle-under-Lyme; or in the case of Ross in Herefordshire, which they had agreed last night to take, although there was the chance of confusing it with New Ross in Ireland, and Rossshire in Scotland. He did not think that this was so bad a case as that; and in speaking of the Member, in all probability he would be spoken of as the Member for Mid Shropshire, or the Member for West Somersetshire. If the Committee had any strong opinion either way he would be prepared to accept it, and would not divide against either proposal.

MR. RAIKES said, he thought the suggestions put forward by the right hon. Baronet were both of a very practical character, and it was exceedingly difficult to say which was the preferable one. It seemed to him that the general balance of convenience would be on the side of omitting the name of Wellington in both cases. By preserving these names in both instances they would be creating an unnecessary amount of confusion for themselves. No doubt there were two Newcastles, but there was a clear distinction between Newcastle-on-Tyne and Newcastle-under-Lyme; in addition to which both of them were well-known places. The same might be said also of Ross, the new division of Herefordshire. And in regard to Scotland the name was not "Ross," but "Ross-shire," and the constituency in Ireland was "New Ross," so that there was an actual distinction of name in both instances. In the case of the two Wellingtons there was no distinction of name whatever, and both would be new constituencies with which the House would be unfamiliar, and considerable confusion would probably arise in consequence. Looking at Shropshire, with which county he was well acquainted, he thought there would be considerable difficulty in finding another name for this division. He had thought at one time that the name might be taken from the River Severn, which flowed through it; and it had been proposed also to name it after the far-famed Wrekin, which was in the centre of the division. Both of those proposals had been objected to; and, following the analogy upon which the Committee had already proceeded, he believed that the balance of convenience would be found to lie on the side of adopting the names of "Mid Shropshire" and "Western Somersetshire," without the alternative name of "Wellington." He should be glad to learn if his hon. and learned Friend the Member for West Somersetshire (Mr. Elton) would accept that suggestion?

MR. ELTON said, he was unable to accept it.

MR. RAIKES said, that under those circumstances he should vote with the hon. and learned Member in favour of leaving out the name of "Wellington" in Shropshire, and he should vote against him when the proposal was made to insert "Broseley."

MR. A. H. BROWN said, he could not support the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman. His hon. and learned Friend the Member for West Somersetshire (Mr. Elton) claimed for Wellington in that county a larger urban population than that of Wellington in Shropshire; but he had not given the actual figures. As a matter of fact, Wellington, Somerset, had only 156 people more; so that, as far as population was concerned, the difference between the two was very small indeed. But there was one fact which his hon. and learned Friend did not appear to be acquainted with — namely, that Wellington in Shropshire had now overgrown the boundaries formed in 1854, when it was first constituted a Local Government area. If they were to take now what was really the parish of Wellington in Shropshire it would be found that it had a population of 14,199, as against 6,360 for Wellington in Somersetshire. Following what had been done in other cases, he would suggest a compromise in the matter—

namely, that they should call one division "Mid or Wellington Division of Shropshire," and the other "West or Wellington Division of Somersetshire."

MR. STAVELEY HILL said, he had devoted some amount of consideration to the question of the proper name to attach to this division; and as he had been acquainted with this part of the country for more than half a century, he was able to bring some local knowledge to bear upon it. He quite agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board that the name of "Broseley" would not do at all. It was on the edge of the division, and certainly ought not to give its name to the division. He then came to the suggestion which was contained in an Amendment upon the Paper in the name of the hon. and learned Member for Christchurch (Mr. Horace Davey) —namely, to leave out "Wellington" and insert "Wenlock." But the borough of Wenlock was not in this division, neither was Bridgnorth nor Ludlow; but Little Wenlock was. The next proposal was to call it "the Wrekin Division;" but in regard to that suggestion he thought the Wrekin would have far too wide a significance. In the phrase of "Friends round the Wrekin" were comprised not only those living within a small division of this character, but it included all those who had that prominent hill to look at every morning. He then came to the question what ought really to be the name, and if it was not to be Wellington there could not be a better name than "Mid Shropshire." The people of the district had no particular desire to have the name of Wellington. It was not a large place, and in speaking of it it would probably not be called the Wellington District. He thought that all persons living in the neighbourhood would be quite satisfied if the division were called "Mid Shropshire."

MR. HORACE DAVEY said, the Amendment of his which had been alluded to by the hon. and learned Member was one in the same sense as an Amendment which stood in the name of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton). He was bound to say that like his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Staveley Hill) he was more interested in Somersetshire than he was in Shropshire, and he had placed this Amendment upon the Paper with a view of doing something for Wellington in Somersetshire. It was stated by the Boundary Commissioners that they had adopted the name of Wellington in this division, because, as a Petty Sessional division, it was larger than Wellington in Somersetshire; but if hon. Members would examine the map, judging by the eye, not more than one-half of the Petty Sessional division was in this division at all, the other half being in another division. As, however, he was only interested in the Somersetshire division, he was ready to accept the suggestion of his right hon. Friend the President of the Local Government Board, and retain the name of Wellington in each division—calling the Shropshire Division by the name of the Mid or Wellington Division of Shropshire, and the Somersetshire Division by the the name of the Wellington or Western Division of Somersetshire. From communications which he had had with gentlemen residing in Wellington in Somersetshire he was quite confident they would regret very much if the name of Wellington were not in some way or other associated with that division. If, however, the Committee added the alternative name in each case, and made it the Mid or Wellington Division in Shropshire, and the Western or Wellington Division in Somersetshire, he did not think there would be much chance of any future confusion arising. If hon. Members who were interested in Shropshire would consent to that course he was quite sure that those who took an interest in Wellington in Somersetshire would be prepared to meet them.

MR. WARTON rose to Order. He believed at the present moment that the only Question before the Committee was that the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for West Somersetshire (Mr. Elton) should be withdrawn.

THE CHAIRMAN said, he did not understand that the hon. and learned Member had as yet asked leave to withdraw the Amendment. Therefore, the Question before the Committee was the Motion which the hon. and learned Member had moved by way of amending the Schedule.

MR. RYLANDS said, he ought to explain to the Committee that he had some

personal connection with this division of Shropshire, which was a justification for his intervention in regard to the selection of a name for the Shropshire Division. His hon. and learned Friend had said with perfect accuracy that in the neighbourhood of the division itself there could be no doubt whatever of the importance of Wellington as a large and increasing place in connection with the iron and other industries. It might be said to be increasing largely, and it certainly appeared in every sense to be the most appropriate name that could be adopted for the division, acting in accordance with the rule which had been adopted in connection with the nomenclature of the Bill—namely, that where there was a large and populous town, that town should give its name to the division in which it was situated. He thought, considering the very great importance of Wellington in the locality, that this name should not be altogether ignored in the present instance. There was a strong feeling in the division itself that the name of Wellington should be selected. He could not accept the alternative suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Raikes) that they should give the alternative name of Wellington both to the division of Mid Shropshire and of Western Somersetshire. At the same time, he was quite prepared to support the adoption of the name of Wellington without any reference whatever to Somersetshire. He thought the Committee ought to deal with the matter on its own merits, and he was clearly of opinion that the name of Wellington ought to be included as an alternative name for this division of Shropshire. He had no wish to anticipate the discussion upon Wellington in Somersetshire. Of course, if hon. Members from Somersetshire were willing to accept the suggestion of his right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Raikes) he should be sorry to stand in the way; but pending that discussion he certainly hoped that no disposition would be manifested on the part of hon. Members connected with Shropshire to give way in regard to the name of Wellington.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES) urged on the Committee that the time had now come when they should arrive at a decision upon the question; and he hoped that the compromise which had been suggested by his right hon. Friend (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would be accepted. It appeared to be a struggle between Shropshire and Somersetshire, and the only point at issue was which county was entitled to use the name of Wellington. In the one case Shropshire was anxious to retain the name, and in the other Somersetshire desired to make use of it in connection with that county. As nobody objected to the application of "Mid" to Shropshire and "Western" to Somersetshire, he thought the Committee had better come to a decision at once.

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON said, that as one of the Representatives of Shropshire he could not accept the proposal of the Government. The people of Wellington were determined to retain, if they could, what the Boundary Commissioners had decided they ought to have. The same Commissioner went to Shropshire and to Somersetshire, and after hearing the merits of both cases argued he declared for Wellington in Shropshire as the place which ought to take the name. His hon. and learned Friend the Member for West Somersetshire (Mr. Elton) had drawn a comparison between Wellington in Shropshire and Wellington in Somersetshire; he would follow up that comparison. Wellington in Shropshire had a population of 12,000, or exactly double the number of Wellington in Somersetshire. Then let them take the test of letters sent through the Post Office. If any letter were addressed simply to Wellington, where would it be sent? It would be sent to Wellington in Shropshire. Then, again, how was this small village governed in Somersetshire? It was governed by what is called a court leet and port reeve—all the roughs were governed by a reeve—a sort of petticoat government he supposed. It was essentially an agricultural town. It had not even a Town Hall of its own, for its Town Hall belonged to the Duke of Wellington and not to the town itself. He objected, moreover, to any place having a double representation—a representation in the House of Lords, and a representation in the House of Commons. The Somersetshire town was represented in the House of Lords by the Duke of Wellington. Why should they run the

risk of creating unnecessary confusion by needlessly using identical names? Their object should be to simplify, and not to confuse. He would take another test of the relative importance of the two towns. Wellington, in Shropshire, had four railways; whereas this little place in Somersetshire had only one. Wellington, in Somersetshire, had a market only once a month; Wellington, in Shropshire, had one once a week. The rateable value of this Somersetshire village was £20,000; the rateable value of Wellington, in Shropshire, was £50,000. Wellington, in Shropshire, was the head of a great iron district, and iron used for the armour of their iron-clads was supplied from that part of the country. The people who lived there were prepared to do all they could to induce the Committee to accept the Report of the Boundary Commissioners; and, therefore, if he could get anyone in the House to act with him—and he certainly trusted that the hon. Member for Wenlock (Mr. A. H. Brown) would support him, seeing that the hon. Member desired to be more intimately associated with the political representation of Wellington—he would be prepared to divide the Committee on this point. He thought that Wellington, in Shropshire, had some claim even upon the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill, because he could assure the right hon. Gentleman that there were a great many supporters of Her Majesty's Government in that part of the world. He, therefore, maintained that the Government ought to adhere to the decision, which the Commissioners, after full inquiry, had decided upon. He sincerely trusted that the name of "Mid Shropshire or Wellington" would be retained as the name of the division for this part of the country.

MR. MELLOR said, that he was an inhabitant of the district of Somersetshire which had just been attacked by the hon. Member for North Shropshire (Mr. Stanley Leighton); and all he wished to say was that the compromise suggested by his right hon. Friend the President of the Local Government Board, and supported by the Attorney General, would give universal satisfaction to the district, and to the people among whom he lived. The present was a struggle between two divisions in different counties to retain the name of a very distinguished man; and, as far as he was able to speak for the people of Somersetshire, they would be extremely unwilling to surrender the name of Wellington. Although, perhaps, some people might think the matter was not one of very great importance, the people of the locality were most anxious to retain the name. He thought the compromise which had been suggested was a very fair one.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he understood that the hon. and learned Member for West Somersetshire (Mr. Elton) was prepared to withdraw the Amendment.

MR. ELTON: Yes.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the facts were thoroughly in the possession of the Committee; and he would, therefore, simply move to insert the words "Mid or" before the Wellington Division.

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON asked if he was to understand that the word "Wellington" would still be retained?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Yes; it will be the "Mid or Wellington Division."

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON presumed that he would be in a position to fight the other question, in regard to Somersetshire, when that county was reached.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that was so.

Amendment proposed, in page 73, line 14, after the word "The," to insert the words "Mid or."—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES said, his next Amendmen on the Paper was in line 21, to leave out "Ludlow" and insert "Wenlock." He did not intend to move that Amendment; but he would move in the same line to insert the words "Southern or," which would describe the division as the Southern or Ludlow Division. It would be observed that there were two other boroughs—namely, Bridgnorth and Wenlock, included in this division, both of which he believed claimed to be considered even before so ancient a place as Ludlow. Bridgnorth had about the same population, but the borough of Wenlock was more populous either than

Ludlow or Bridgnorth. He thought it would be confusing to give any other alternative name; and, therefore, he would simply move the insertion of the words "Southern or."

Amendment proposed, in page 73, line 21, after the word "The," to insert the words "Southern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES said, they had now reached the county of Somerset; and his next Amendment had reference to the proposed division of Long Ashton. He did not think that Long Ashton was a place of such paramount importance as to entitle it to give its name to an important division; and he almost thought that this was a case for substituting "Northern" for "Long Ashton." If it was considered desirable to retain some local designation as well as a point of the compass, he would leave the Committee to decide what it should be. He would now move the Amendment in the form in which it stood on the Paper—namely, to insert the words "Northern or."

Amendment proposed, in page 73, line 32, after the word "The," to insert the words "Northern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. R. H. PAGET said, he was entirely indifferent as to how the matter was settled. He was much more interested in the fact of who would represent the division. He would, however, suggest, merely for the sake of simplicity, that this was a case in which the alternative name might be omitted. If the right hon. Baronet would look at the map he would see that Somersetshire readily lent itself to an arrangement. North, South, East, and West, and the Frome, Wells, and Bridgwater Divisions would complete the county. The use of the points of the compass would introduce extreme simplicity in the nomenclature.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the hon. Member would leave in the name of Wells.

MR. R. H. PAGET: Yes; he would retain Frome, Wells, and Bridgwater, as they were names which had already been known in connection with Parliamentary representation.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said he had already intimated his readiness to agree in the case of Wells, and he had no strong objection to the other names.

MR. R. H. PAGET said, it would be necessary to strike out the word "or" from the Amendment.

MR. RAIKES said, he felt no difficulty, as far as the Amendment was concerned, in withdrawing it, and substituting another to provide—as, in fact, he had suggested in the first instance—that the word "Northern" only should be inserted. He did not, however, wish to bind himself as to any particular course in regard to the other parts of the county, because he should certainly have something to say in regard to the Bridgwater Division.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE asked if the right hon. Gentleman would propose to keep in Wells, Bridgwater, and Frome?

MR. RAIKES said, he was prepared to retain Wells and Frome; but there might be considerable objection to that course in regard to Bridgwater. He had no wish, in moving that the Long Ashton Division should be called the Northern Division, to exclude himself from opposing Bridgwater subsequently.

MR. GREGORY said, that before the Amendment was withdrawn he wished to call attention to the fact that there would be no large town in the district; but he presumed that Long Ashton would be the principal polling place for Parliamentary elections.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. RAIKES moved to leave out the words "Long Ashton" in order to insert the word "Northern."

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. ACLAND proposed, in line 35, to omit the parish of "Binegar" from the Sessional Division of Wells. His object was to take that parish out of the Long Ashton District and put it in that of Wells, for this reason—that although it looked exceedingly well on the map, and he was not finding fault with the Commissioners for what they had done, the fact was that the parish of Binegar was cut off from the rest of this division of Long Ashton by the Mendip range of hills, along which the roads were exceedingly bad and the slopes extremely steep. That circumstance was recognized when the East Somersetshire Division was drawn, and also in the

arrangement of the Petty Sessional divisions; so that if the Boundary Commissioners had intended to act upon Petty Sessional arrangements, and for the convenience of the district and of the inhabitants of Binegar, there was a strong case for presuming that this proposal would have been recognized by the Boundary Commissioners. He quite admitted that he could not ask the President of the Local Government Board to take the case for granted upon his mere statement, and he also admitted that the alteration he proposed would look somewhat odd upon the map. But the appearance of the map was not the point; the real point was the convenience of the inhabitants of the district; and, considering that that convenience had been recognized in the important matter of forming the Petty Sessional divisions, and also in the present division of the Parliamentary boundaries, he must say he thought there was good ground for this application, that the same lines should be adhered to in the new county division. He hoped, if the President of the Local Government Board could not accept the Amendment now, that he would at least agree to refer the point to the Boundary Commissioners on the grounds he had stated, and that the Commissioners would reconsider the matter before the Report stage of the Bill. There was no political importance whatever attached to this alteration, and he believed that the original action of the Commissioners was founded to a certain extent on a misapprehension of the effect the inclusion of Binegar in the Long Ashton Division would have, and upon some slight inaccuracy in regard to the population of the various parts of the district. He believed there was no objection to his proposal on the part of the Members for the county. He had been applied to by the inhabitants of the district to represent the case to the House; he had undertaken to do the best he could, and he hoped the President of the Local Government Board would take into consideration the facts he had stated.

Amendment proposed,

In page 73, lines 35 and 36, to leave out the words "in the Sessional Division of Wells of Binegar, and."—(*Mr. Acland.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE remarked, that even if there were a universal vote of acceptance in regard to this Amendment, he feared that he could not take it, knowing, as he did, the opinion of the Boundary Commissioners in reference to it. His hon. Friend admitted that the present arrangement looked well on the map, and certainly it looked better on the map than the division which would be substituted if this Amendment were adopted, seeing that the shape of the division would then be like that of a comet with a very long tail. The Boundary Commissioners had put the parishes of Binegar and Midsomer-Norton into the Long Ashton Division after a local inquiry; and he was bound to say that he did not think his hon. Friend's proposition would be an improvement from any point of view. That being so, he could not accept the Amendment.

MR. R. H. PAGET thanked the hon. Member for East Cornwall (Mr. Acland) for the interest he appeared to take in this particular part of the county of Somerset; and he believed if the proposed alteration were made it would be advantageous to himself (Mr. Paget) personally. At the same time he was bound to say that, although for general convenience the Petty Sessional division had been differently arranged, he had not been invited to press this matter upon the attention of the Committee, and he did not find himself at liberty to take the action which the hon. Member invited him to take. If hon. Members would study the figures they would find that the present Wells Division, into which it was proposed to throw the parish of Binegar, was already sufficiently large, and it was not desirable to make it still larger. He was, therefore, not in a position to press the Amendment upon the general acceptance of the Committee; and he had certainly heard no complaint of the arrangement proposed by the Boundary Commissioners.

Amendment *negatived.*

MR. RAIKES said, the next Amendment had reference to the Wells Division in the County of Somerset. The Committee had determined to accept, positively and absolutely, the word "Northern" with regard to the division styled Long Ashton in the Bill, and it was

further suggested that the word "Eastern" should be substituted for the words "Shepton Mallet," "Southern" for "Yeovil," and "Western" for "Williton." He did not propose to enter into that question now; but if they got the four points of the compass in the county it was only reasonable that they should proceed on the same kind of nomenclature, although it was not absolutely necessary. There would be no geographical inconvenience as to the division of Wells, because it was naturally North-Western, and the division of Frome was naturally North-Eastern. There could be no question about those two divisions geographically; and having regard to the constituency which his hon. Friend (Mr. R. H. Paget) so ably represented, he had no doubt that his hon. Friend would prefer being spoken of as the Member for North-West Somersetshire rather than as the Member for so small and decaying a place as Wells. He believed there was a danger, in the case of these alternative names, of the county title dropping out altogether, and of the Member coming up and being known merely as the Representative of a particular place. But after the course they had already taken he thought it would be better to adhere to the alternative proposal; and he would therefore move to insert in connection with the Wells Division the words "North-Western or."

Amendment proposed, in page 73, line 35, after the word "The," to insert the words "North-Western or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he should offer no opposition.

MR. R. H. PAGET said, a suggestion had been made which he thought the right hon. Baronet had accepted solely for the sake of simplicity—that four of the divisons of the county should receive compass names, and that the three divisions of Wells, Frome, and Bridgwater, having the names of distinct boroughs, should in future be designated by those names. He had no opinion that the dignity of a county Member was likely to be injured by his being called the Member for the Wells Division, or for the North-Western or the Wells Division; but he did not think in this case, or in the other cases which had been mentioned, that there was any necessity for inserting North-Western, North-Eastern, or South-Western. In this particular instance the name of Wells was quite enough.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE asked whether the right hon. Gentleman proposed to insist upon his Amendment?

MR. RAIKES said, he had moved it partly in the hope of giving his hon. Friend an opportunity of making a speech. He thought that when once they introduced the points of the compass into a county there was no reason why they should not continue to do so in conjunction with the alternative proposals. Certainly, whenever any proposal was made to depart from that rule, as in the case of Shropshire, he found that the Committee had to go back to it in the long run. He was not proposing to get rid of the name of Wells; but merely to introduce the words "North-Western" before Wells.

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER said, he had formerly represented Wells, and was still acquainted with that part of the country. The name of Wells was pretty well known; but they would be entirely at sea in talking of the North-Western Division of Somerset. Wells was a Cathedral city, was still the seat of a Court of Quarter Sessions, and had for centuries been represented in the House. If hon. Members would glance at the map they would see that the whole of the Long Ashton District was North of the Wells Division, and practically this was not a North-Western district at all. Of course, there was something to be said for historical associations; and, therefore, he would be glad if the name of North-Western could be dropped; but, to whatever conclusion they arrived in this House, the division would certainly continue to be known in the county as the Wells Division.

MR. RAIKES intimated that, under the circumstances, he would not press the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. RAIKES said, he thought he would best consult the convenience of the Committee by not moving, at that stage at all events, the next Amendment, which related to the Frome Division, the object of the Amendment being to give to that division the alternative

ame of "North-Eastern." He would, herefore, go on to the next Amendment, line 10, which proposed to describe he Shepton Mallet Division as the South-Eastern" or "Shepton Mallet ivision." He begged to move that mendment.

Amendment proposed, in page 74, ne 10, after the word "The," to insert e words "South-Eastern or."—(*Mr. aikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words e there inserted."

MR. R. H. PAGET said, he thought was understood that this division was o be described as the "South-Eastern," ithout any alternative name.

MR. RAIKES said, that if that was he opinion of the Committee he was uite ready to take that course, and ould, therefore, withdraw the Amendnent in that form.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. RAIKES moved to leave out the ords "Shepton Mallet."

THE CHAIRMAN said, he would put he Question in this form — that the ord "Shepton Mallet" stand part of he Schedule.

Question, "That those words stand art of the Schedule," put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That the word 'Eastern' e there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES moved to omit the word 'Yeovil" from the fifth division for he purpose of inserting the word 'Southern."

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES next proposed, in line 24, to insert the words "Mid or," in reference to the Bridgwater Division. He did not think there was any necessity for reviving the somewhat unsavoury name of Bridgwater in connection with the division, seeing that it was sufficiently described geographically as the "Mid Division." He had intended to propose the omission of the word "Bridgwater" altogether, on account of the recollections associated with the disfranchisement of the borough; but his present Motion was a compromise which he hoped would be accepted. He knew that it might be said that this particular division did not constitute any large part, or, indeed, any part at all, of the existing Mid Division of Somersetshire; but geographically it was Mid, and he hoped that in future they would be able to speak of the Member as the Member for Mid Somersetshire, and avoid any reference to Bridgwater.

Amendment proposed, in page 74, line 24, after the word "The," to insert the words "Mid or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. E. J. STANLEY wished to bear testimony to the electoral purity of Bridgwater at the present day. If the right hon. Gentleman would go down and make an inquiry, he would find that a great deal had happened since the days to which he had referred. Indeed, he (Mr. Stanley) was able to say, from his observation and of his own knowledge, that in these days it would be found that the borough of Bridgwater was as honourable, and as high-minded, and as pure, as any borough in the Kingdom. Although it was not a question of very great importance, the right hon. Gentleman proposed to give a complete misnomer to this division. He proposed to call it the "Mid" Division, whereas it could not be regarded as the Mid Division in any sense of the term, seeing that there were five divisions of Somersetshire on one side, and only one on the other. He thought the Committee would have no desire to go back to byegone days, but would prefer to look forward; and he could assure hon. Members, having known the borough of Bridgwater for 11 years, that an entirely new generation had sprung up in it, and that the feeling of the people of Bridgwater was altogether different in regard to electoral matters from what it was in former times. He, therefore, protested against any attempt to cast unmerited obloquy upon it.

MR. R. H. PAGET also opposed the Amendment. He thought it somewhat unfortunate that his right hon. Friend, with remorseless accuracy of memory, should wish to rake up the misdeeds of Bridgwater in the past. He hoped the Amendment would not be accepted by the Committee; but that they would consider the matter upon exactly the same lines as those which had induced them to accept the proposals which had been made in reference to the other

divisions. There would be simplicity in giving the name of Bridgwater only, and there was certainly a sweetness about the name. Therefore, sweetness and simplicity demanded that the name Bridgwater should be maintained. It formed no part whatever of the present Mid Division of Somersetshire; but, as had been pointed out, there were five divisions on one side of it, and only one on the other. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be satisfied with this short discussion, and would withdraw the Amendment.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 71; Noes 33: Majority 38.—(Div. List, No. 101.)

Mr. RAIKES said, the next Amendment had reference to the only remaining division in the county of Somerset. His Amendment on the Paper was to call it "the South-Western" or "Williton" Division. He desired to keep aloof from the battle of the Wellingtons, and he did not wish to raise that question by this Amendment. He was told, however, that the name "Western" would be preferred to that of "South-Western;" and, that being so, he would propose the Amendment in this form—after the word "The" to insert the words "Western or," that being in accordance with the manner in which they had dealt with other divisions.

Amendment proposed, in page 74, line 34, after the word "The," to insert the words "Western or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. HORACE DAVEY moved, in line 34, to leave out the word "Williton," in order to insert the word "Wellington." He would not detain the Committee by any further discussion upon the matter, because he thought they were substantially agreed that this change would be expedient.

Amendment proposed, in page 74, line 34, to leave out the word "Williton," in order to insert the word "Wellington."—(*Mr. Horace Davey.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Williton' stand part of the Schedule."

Viscount NEWPORT said, he hoped the Committee would not consent to this proposal. They all desired to see as much simplicity as possible introduced into the Bill; and if a second Wellington was to be introduced it might create much confusion. The Committee had already admitted the stronger claim of Wellington in Shropshire over that of Wellington in Somersetshire by allowing Shropshire to retain that name; and he could not but think that it would tend to create confusion if there were to be two Wellingtons in the field at once. It appeared to him that if hon. Members for Somersetshire did not like the name of "Williton," the name of "Western" alone, which had already been agreed to, would be quite sufficient, and would be a good designation for this division. At any rate, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill would see the difficulty that would necessarily be involved in having two divisions named "Wellington;" and he hoped the Committee would not accept the Amendment.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had spoken upon this subject some time ago in regard to the county of Salop; but he would repeat briefly what he had said. He did not apprehend that the name of Wellington would be used in practice in that House, and that the county name alone would be employed. His hon. Friend opposite (Mr. R. H. Paget) would be known as the Member for Somersetshire—a name not altogether unknown, seeing that he already sat for it in that House. There certainly would not be any greater risk of confusion than would be created in having a Newcastle-on-Tyne and a Newcastle-under-Lyme; and also in the case of the Rosses—one in Herefordshire, one in Ireland, and one in Scotland.

Mr. R. H. PAGET said, the division which had just been taken certainly destroyed the simplicity of the original proposals with regard to this county, which proposals he had understood Her Majesty's Government to accept. The alternative principle had now found its way into the county of Somerset. Up to the last division they had simple names for each division, and he had hoped that that principle, which had been accepted apparently by the right hon. Baronet, would have been maintained; but, unfortunately, the Government had gone the other way, and the alternative system of naming the con-

stituencies had already been got rid of in the naming of the Bridgwater Division. That removed in his mind any objection here as to the introduction of the alternative. He had been prepared, if the principle of simplicity had been adopted throughout, to have adhered to it in this case, and to have left out the name of "Williton" or "Wellington;" but if there should be any alternative name at all, it should undoubtedly come in here. Wellington had a right to be regarded historically as a place of considerable importance—of far more importance than a mere upstart town of yesterday. On the ground of its historical associations, they might fairly demand that the name of "Wellington" should be connected with this division of Somersetshire.

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON said, the right hon. Baronet had given a very good reason why the name of Wellington should not be retained. He had intimated that it was not of the slightest importance what alternative name was used in the Bill, because it would never be employed in practice, and therefore one name was as good as another. Another name had already been preferred by the Boundary Commissioners; and in regard to the name of "Wellington," the Committee had already decided that it should be given to a division in another county. Therefore this matter came before the Committee from a totally different point of view. He was sorry for the people of Somersetshire; but he did see how the Committee, having once allotted this name for a division in Shropshire, should now allot it for a division in Somersetshire. The name had already been taken, and there was no reason why the arrangement should be disturbed. He would like to say one word on behalf of the name of "Williton." He did not see why Williton should be put on one side for Wellington. The only reason assigned for giving the name of Wellington was that, somehow or other, it was connected with the name of the Duke of Wellington. But the Duke of Wellington was not born there, and there had been great historical personages born in Williton. For instance, that great man, Reginald Fitzurse, one of the knights who killed Thomas A'Becket, was born there. The Duke of Wellington required no petty parish in Somersetshire to make his name remembered throughout England; and for the sake of historical associations he thought "Williton" ought not to be put on one side for the name of "Wellington." And, on more than the one ground that because the Boundary Commissioners had decided that the name Wellington should be attached to the division of another county, he thought the name of Williton ought to be retained here. He therefore supported the noble Lord the Member for North Shropshire (Viscount Newport), and hoped he would divide against the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

In page 74, line 34, to leave out the word "Williton," in order to insert the word "Wellington,"—(*Mr Horace Davey,*)

—instead thereof.

Question put, "That the word 'Williton' stand part of the Schedule."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 11; Noes 90: Majority 79.—(Div. List, No. 102.)

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE moved to omit from this division the parish of Hillfarrance, in the Sessional Division of Taunton. He explained that under an Order of the 31st December, 1883, that parish no longer existed.

Amendment proposed, in page 74, line 39, to leave out the word "Hillfarrance."—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES said, he had now to propose the first of his Amendments in connection with the county of Stafford. Perhaps he might explain that under his proposal the Leek Division would become the Northern or Leek Division; No. 2 the North-Eastern or Burton Division; No. 3 the Mid or Penkridge Division; No. 4 the North-Western or Pirehill Division; No. 5 the Eastern or Lichfield Division; No. 6 the South-Western or Kingswinford Division, and No. 7 the South-Eastern or Handsworth Division. In every case there would be an alternative name. Some of the names were not generally known; but some of them, such as Burton and Lichfield, were known to everybody. Perhaps Pirehill, Penkridge, and Kingswinford had not at-

tained equal celebrity. He proposed these alternative names in order to see whether the Committee would prefer to have alternative names, or to adopt the points of the compass only. In one or two cases, very notably in those of Burton and Lichfield, it might be considered desirable to retain the names of those towns in preference to giving the points of the compass only; and, therefore, it would be more symmetrical to provide a geographical designation in every case. He proposed now, in the case of the first division, to call it the Northern or Leek Division.

Amendment proposed, in page 75, line 4, after the word "The," to insert the words "Northern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. STAVELEY HILL said, he would ask the attention of the President of the Local Government Board to one slight variation he intended to propose in the divisions as they were designated in the Bill—namely, to leave out "Penkridge" and insert "Stone." If the right hon. Gentleman would also kindly look at a map of the county he would see that there were seven divisions, to six of which might be applied what were called compass names, and the other one—Lichfield—was the only one which contained a merged borough. The difference he would suggest in the scheme proposed by his right hon. Friend was that he should call the three divisions running down the right-hand side of the map by Eastern names, and the three divisions running down the left-hand side by Western names. Then, by striking out the compass name in reference to the Lichfield Division and using the word "Lichfield" only, they would continue the name of the only merged or disfranchised borough. Leek would become North-Eastern, Burton Eastern, Handsworth South-Eastern, Pirehill North-Western, Penkridge Western, and Kingswinford South-Western. It seemed to him that that was a much more simple way of naming these seven divisions; and it would be seen that he excepted from the compass names only one division, and that a division which contained a merged borough. As a Staffordshire man he had taken great interest in the names of these divisions; and if the system he proposed were adopted there would be no advantage in having alternative names at all. If, however, alternative names were to be given he thought there would be more advantage in calling the divisions by the names of the old Saxon Hundreds. The compass names, however, were, in his opinion, preferable; but if they were to give alternative names he would suggest the substitution of "Stone" for "Penkridge."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that he would prefer the proposal of the hon. and learned Gentleman to that of the right hon. Gentleman in regard to this county, because it was much more simple except as regarded the second division, to which he would rather see the name of "Burton" attached. Burton had a large population, and was an important urban centre. Indeed, there had been a question of making it a separate borough instead of throwing it into the county division.

SIR ARTHUR BASS preferred the proposal of the hon. and learned Member for West Staffordshire (Mr. Staveley Hill) to the nomenclature suggested by the right hon. Gentleman.

COLONEL LEVETT said, he thought that after what had been said by the right hon. Baronet it would be needless to ask him to retain the name of Lichfield. The whole of the inhabitants of that district would be grateful if that name could be retained. It had long been associated with the history of the country. The city was one of great antiquity, and its position was central. It was, therefore, most desirable, both on the ground of position and of historical and ecclesiastical associations, that Lichfield should continue to give its name to the division in which it was placed. It was not only central, but it was the headquarters of the Yeomanry, of the Militia, and of the military; around it centred all the interests of the Church in the diocese, and he was quite sure there was a very strong feeling in favour of retaining it as a Parliamentary name in the division. He sincerely hoped that the Committee would accept this suggestion.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE pointed out that the Amendment they were now discussing was the Northern Division.

MR. STAVELEY HILL said, his proposition was to use the word "Eastern"

or "Western" in connection with each division.

MR. RAIKES said, he was quite satisfied with the discussion which had taken place, and would withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

On the Motion of Mr. STAVELEY HILL, the following Amendments made: — Page 75, line 4, leave out "Leek," insert North-Eastern;" line 9, after "The," insert "Eastern or;" line 14, leave out "Penkridge," insert "Western;" line 20, leave out "Pirehill," insert "North-Western."

MR. STAVELEY HILL (for Mr. SAMPSON LLOYD) moved, in page 75, line 25, after "Lichfield," insert "and Tamworth."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that as the name of Tamworth had been proposed in connection with this division he thought it right to mention a circumstance which had occurred in an earlier discussion upon the Schedules of the Bill. His right hon. Friend the Member for Huntingdon (Sir Robert Peel) had delivered an admirable speech in regard to the association of his father's name with the borough of Tamworth—a speech which had much moved the feeling of the House. He (Sir Charles W. Dilke) considered the question very carefully, and it was because he did not quite see his way in regard to it that he wished to allude to the difficulty now. He had referred to it on a former occasion, and he certainly did not see how it was to be overcome. His right hon. Friend preferred that the name of Tamworth should be given to the Coleshill Division in Warwickshire instead of to this division of Staffordshire. But there was a difficulty in regard to that case. Tamworth was on the extreme edge of the Warwickshire Division, and was, as a matter of fact, in two counties. Coleshill was a very proper place to select for the name of the division, and it was a place where the elections for the county of Warwick were formerly held. He believed there was a strong objection in the division to the proposal to give the name of Tamworth to it. He was quite sure that the desire to retain the name of Tamworth was very strong, and he hoped his right hon. Friend would meet him in endeavouring to find some other division in connection with which it could be used. He had thought it right to mention the matter here before the Committee came to discuss the divisions of the county of Warwick.

SIR ROBERT PEEL said, he should like to say a word or two on the point which had been raised by his right hon. Friend, whose kindness and consideration for everybody all through the proceedings of the Committee had been acknowledged on both sides of the House. The Committee had decided to retain the name of the place associated with the Duke of Wellington, and also that of the borough with which Sir John Northcote was connected during the Long Parliament. But he would now refer to the passing of the Reform Bill in this country in 1832, and to the distinction which Tamworth had acquired by the services of his father as a statesman and politician; and he hoped the Committee would kindly support him in the plea which he now made in favour of giving the name of Tamworth to the Coleshill Division of Warwickshire. He did not wish to say one word against the borough of Lichfield; but, at the same time, Tamworth had no desire to play a second part to Lichfield in the matter of giving a name to a county division, and he thought that Tamworth was entitled to some distinct recognition. He observed that this was the only municipal borough in Warwickshire that had not received separate representation. The hon. and learned Gentleman who moved the present Amendment had just now said that there was a strong feeling in Coleshill against the name of Tamworth being substituted for it in the first division of the county of Warwick. Coleshill was very little known. His right hon. Friend had truly stated that it had for some time been the centre of the polling district in that locality; but that was only since the Reform Bill of 1832. Now, Lichfield was wholly in the county of Stafford; whereas, what was the geographical position of the town of Tamworth? One could not attach it to Lichfield, because it was almost entirely in Warwickshire. Now the population of Tamworth in 1881 was over 14,000, and he believed that at that moment it exceeded 15,000; but 10,000 of the inhabitants were in the county of Warwick. The population of the borough of Tamworth suppressed by this Bill was greater than the population of Coleshill, Derby,

and Nuneaton, all of which under this Bill were allowed to give denominations to districts. The Town Hall of Tamworth was in Warwickshire, the market place was in Warwickshire, the railway stations and all its public buildings were in Warwickshire. He could not suppose that anyone could bring forward the name of Coleshill as a division. Why, it had not even a railway station. There was a railway station a mile and a-half from the town, but there was no railway station in the town, whereas Tamworth was the centre of a large trade coming from Lichfield, Derby, and many other places. Under these circumstances, he trusted the Committee would approve the retention of the name of Tamworth, which he no longer represented in that House. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Spencer Balfour) who now represented the borough of Tamworth would, he was sure, endorse every word he had said with regard to the strong feeling of the people of Tamworth, that its name at least might continue to be connected with the district in which the vast majority of the people of that borough lived. Having made these few remarks he had again to thank the Committee for the way in which they had received his representations. He was bound to add that his right hon. Relative the Speaker had authorized him to say that he would consider it a favour on the part of the Committee if they would allow the name of Tamworth to continue on the Parliamentary roll of this great country.

Mr. DIGBY said, he should not detain the Committee for more than a few moments after the speech of the right hon. Baronet to which they had just listened; but as a resident of Coleshill, and one connected with it for a long period, he was, perhaps, entitled to say a few words. Hon. Members who had spoken had connected this Amendment with one lower down on the Paper, and some things had been said with regard to Coleshill which he thought would justify him in making a reply. In supporting the Amendment before the Committee to add the name of Tamworth to that of Lichfield in distinguishing one division of the county of Staffordshire, he would like to point out a few reasons why he thought the Amendment proposed was worthy of consideration. In the first place the old town of Tamworth was in Staffordshire; the portion of the Parliamentary borough in the county of Warwickshire consisted of outlying parishes which were added by the Act of 1832.

Sir ROBERT PEEL: When the hon. Gentleman says that the old town of Tamworth is in Staffordshire, I would remind him of what I have already stated, that the Town Hall and all the principal public buildings are in Warwickshire.

Mr. DIGBY said, he was obliged to the right hon. Baronet for his correction; but he had information which authorized him to say that the whole of the town was in Staffordshire. Perhaps, however, the right hon. Baronet was more accurate in his knowledge of the subject. The parishes in Warwickshire belonging to the Parliamentary borough of Tamworth had developed considerably since 1832, and a large population had sprung up within them. He desired to say that no one in that House appreciated more than he the great debt of gratitude which the whole of this country owed to the memory of Sir Robert Peel, whose country seat he would remind the Committee was in Staffordshire. He would also point out that the whole of the remainder of the first Warwickshire Division wished that it should receive its name from Coleshill. Coleshill was the centre of that division, and it was an old town, notwithstanding that the right hon. Baronet might not know of its existence before 1832; and, further, he could tell him that it was a place older than Birmingham. There was a time when Birmingham was described as near Coleshill, instead of the phrase being as now "Coleshill near Birmingham." He hoped the Committee would adopt the suggestion of the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke), and for the reasons he had given he had great pleasure in supporting the Amendment before the Committee.

Mr. SPENCER BALFOUR said, that the alteration proposed by the Amendment was desired by no one in the district. The people of Lichfield did not want it; they all united in asking that the name of Tamworth should be given to the Warwickshire Division in which the bulk of the population was. So far from Tamworth being principally in Staffordshire, he would point out that Tamworth Castle and the oldest part of the town were in Warwickshire, and that the whole of the increasing district of Tam-

worth was in Warwickshire. That part had nearly doubled its population since 1832. It would be very hard for Tamworth if, simply owing to the accident of the Government having based the Bill on the population at the last Census, they should lose both their Members and all connection with the Parliamentary proceedings of the country. He implored the Committee to accede to the eloquent appeal of the right hon. Baronet (Sir Robert Peel) and to the appeal of the people of the district. With regard to the remainder of the division, it was within his own knowledge that the electors objected to its being called "Coleshill or Tamworth," otherwise they had no objection to Tamworth; indeed, a large representative body had asked him as a Tamworth man to press the claim of Tamworth.

MR. P. A. MUNTZ said, he felt bound to support the Amendment before the Committee, because, although he had no connection with Staffordshire, he was convinced that the claims of Warwickshire in this matter were very slight indeed, while the claims of Staffordshire were very strong. He had the highest authority, notwithstanding what the right hon. Baronet (Sir Robert Peel) had stated, to say that the borough of Tamworth was in Staffordshire. The seat of the right hon. Baronet was in Staffordshire. In reply to the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, with reference to the feeling existing upon this subject in North Warwickshire, he was bound to say that he was in favour of the Northern Division of Warwickshire being called by the name of Coleshill. He said that Tamworth had not the slightest claim to give its name to North Warwickshire, and that if it were to give a name to any Parliamentary division, it should be in Staffordshire. He believed he was correct in stating that the population of Tamworth was 15,000, although the right hon. Baronet had represented it as being much larger.

SIR ROBERT PEEL: I said that at the last Census the population was over 14,000, and that my impression was that now it was over 15,000.

MR. P. A. MUNTZ said, that, looking at the fact that Coleshill had been the place of nomination for North Warwickshire during half-a-century, it had every claim to give its name to the division, and he must say that the bulk of the population would be dissatisfied with that distinction being given to Tamworth.

MR. RYLANDS said, he thought it was to be regretted that the House had been obliged, under the very proper regulations made for the redistribution of seats, to throw the borough of Tamworth into the county. On that ground alone, he thought that Tamworth had very great claims on the Committee. But he acknowledged a very much higher sentiment in regard to Tamworth. His right hon. Friend (Sir Robert Peel), on this and on a former occasion, had appealed to the House in terms which must have excited the sympathy of all; but when he remembered that the late Sir Robert Peel had been one of the most illustrious Members who ever represented a constituency in that House, he was convinced that an appeal from the members of his family would be eagerly responded to. As Englishmen, everyone in that House had reasons to feel gratitude for the great and distinguished labours of Sir Robert Peel in the interest of their country. But he took it that there was a general concurrence of opinion in the Committee that the name of Tamworth should not be blotted out, but give its name to one of the county districts. Then came the question as between Staffordshire and Warwickshire. Now, as he understood the Amendment before the Committee, it was proposed to have the alternative name of Lichfield for the 1st division of Staffordshire. He must say that, in his opinion, Lichfield, as a Cathedral city, and one which had also been deprived of its representation under this Bill, had a perfect right to give its name to that division, and he should be sorry that Tamworth should form with it a sort of "double-barrelled" arrangement. Coleshill, his hon. Friend (Mr. Muntz) seemed to think, was a place of world-wide reputation He had the impression that it was in some way or other distinguished for the manufacture of nails, and the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill informed him Coleshill had a magnificent church; but he did not hesitate to say that Coleshill, as a name, whatever might be the antiquity of the town, was scarcely known, and had never been regarded as of any importance whatever outside the narrow boundary represented by the hon. Gen-

tleman who had just sat down. He understood the hon. Gentleman to speak in favour of Coleshill giving a name to part of the county; but he hoped the Committee would not hesitate in the course they should, in his opinion, take in this matter. When they reached the part of the Schedule which dealt with the divisions of the county of Warwick, he should vote in favour of the adoption of the very distinguished name of Tamworth in place of the undistinguished name of Coleshill.

VISCOUNT NEWPORT said, the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) had begun his remarks with regard to Coleshill by a statement which showed that his local knowledge in this matter was not large. He (Viscount Newport), being connected with the counties of Stafford and Warwick, wished to say, on behalf of his brother electors, that there was a considerable feeling in favour of Coleshill being retained as the name of one of the divisions of the county of Warwick. No one had more respect than he for the memory of the great statesman who had been connected with the borough of Tamworth; but, at the same time, he would point out that the borough of Tamworth was but partly in the county of Warwick—at any rate, the seat of his right hon. Friend (Sir Robert Peel) was in the county of Stafford, and he believed it would meet the wishes of the electors in both divisions that the name of Coleshill should be retained. With regard to one remark of the right hon. Baronet (Sir Robert Peel) that there was no railway station in the town of Coleshill, he begged to say that the railway ran at the bottom of the hill on which the town was placed, and that it was practically in the town. He hoped the Committee would not allow the name of Coleshill to be struck out of the Schedule.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that the larger portion of the population of Tamworth was in Warwickshire, 8,500 being in that county, and 5,500 in Staffordshire. In view of that, he did not think the hon. and learned Member could press his Amendment very strongly, and as no one urged it very strongly upon its own merits, he suggested that it should be withdrawn. He was bound to say that in his opinion the Committee were against the adoption of the name of Coleshill, and when they came to the portion of the Schedule which dealt with the county of Warwick, he thought the Government must yield to the general feeling expressed in favour of Tamworth.

MR. STAVELEY HILL, in asking leave to withdraw his Amendment, said, he would say no more than that the Staffordshire people would be sorry to consider Tamworth as lost to the county.

MR. HICKS said, the right hon. Baronet had given the population of Tamworth as a Parliamentary borough; but it might not be within the knowledge of the Committee that the borough was composed of many different parishes—it was not the town of Tamworth alone. He thought, before the Amendment was withdrawn, they ought to know what was the population of Tamworth itself, and not merely that of the Parliamentary borough.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he was unable to give the information asked for by the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, not having the figures in his possession.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

SIR ARTHUR BASS said, he was sorry to have to move an Amendment to the Commissioners' scheme for Staffordshire, which had met with general acceptance as a whole, though considerable dissatisfaction was felt with the portion which his Amendment referred to. His object simply was to remedy as far as possible inequality of numbers, and to avoid the severance of populations of like pursuits and interests. The division of Handsworth, as at present constituted, contained 60,140 inhabitants; that of Lichfield 49,942; a difference of over 10,000, and this in spite of the fact that Lichfield contained no Parliamentary borough within its limits, whilst the freeholders of the large and important boroughs of Walsall, Wednesbury, West Bromwich, and Harborne—now included in Birmingham—3,140 in number, would vote in the Handsworth Division. The result would be that, estimating roughly one voter to six of the population, there would be 13,163 voters in Handsworth to only 8,324 in Lichfield, or less than two-thirds. Now, the Instructions to the Boundary Commissioners were "approximately to equalize populations," and—

"If the county voters having qualifications in a Parliamentary borough are numerous, some regard may properly be had to their number in determining the population to be embraced in the division."

Now so far was that from being the case, that the Commissioners had given Handsworth, which had 3,140 borough freeholders, an excess population of 10,000 over Lichfield, which had no borough freeholders. The Commissioners were further instructed to keep together populations of like pursuits and interests. Now, Handsworth was an urban and manufacturing constituency with a few agricultural parishes at its northern end adjoining the Lichfield Division. Lichfield was mainly mining and agricultural. The Commissioners had included in it the important and populous mining districts of Cannock Chase, Wyrley, and Brownhills; but they had excluded from it the parishes of Pelsall and Walsall Wood, adjoining Brownhills, with which they were entirely identical and formed practically one community. And they had gone farther, for they had actually divided the Local Board district of Brownhills, and had taken the parish of Walsall Wood from it and added it to the Handsworth Division, with which it and its neighbouring parish of Pelsall had absolutely no community of interest whatever, and from which they were separated by the intervening agricultural parishes of Aldridge and Great Barr. So that they would have one portion of the Local Board district in the Handsworth, the other in the Lichfield Division, and they would have one side of a street voting in one and the other side in the other division. Now, he could have understood a scheme by which Lichfield was retained as a purely agricultural division, and the adjoining mining districts entirely excluded from it; but he could not understand on what principle large mining populations had been added to it, and one district only—that which he was now endeavouring to re-unite to its natural associates—divided in the most inconvenient manner possible. His proposal, therefore, was to take from Handsworth the parishes of Pelsall and Walsall Wood, with a total population of 6,170, and add them to Lichfield. The population of Handsworth would then become 53,970, that of Lichfield 56,112, whilst Handsworth, with its 3,140 borough freeholders, would still have a great excess of voting power. He really thought that if this proposal were considered apart from its political aspect, its justice and expediency must be acknowledged by all those acquainted with the district. He challenged his hon. and gallant Friend opposite (Colonel Levett) to traverse any of the assertions he had made. The hon. and gallant Gentleman could not deny that by this proposal the populations and voting power of the two divisions would be much more nearly equalized; he could not deny that Pelsall and Walsall Wood were entirely identical in interests and in the character and pursuits of their populations with the adjoining district of Brownhills, to which he (Sir Arthur Bass) wished to re-unite them. He really could not conceive of any valid argument which could be urged against the Amendment; but he thought he knew what his hon. and gallant Friend would say—he would tell the Committee that Lichfield was mainly an agricultural division; that there were too many colliers in it already to please him; that colliers generally voted Liberal, and therefore he would do his best to keep out any additions. He trusted, however, his right hon. Friend in charge of the Bill would not listen to any such argument as that, and that he would give a friendly reception to his Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

In page 75, line 31, after the words "Norton Canes," to insert the words,—

"And in the Sessional Division of Rushall, of—

Pelsall, and so much of Walsall Foreign as is contained within the urban sanitary district of Brownhills."—(*Sir Arthur Bass.*)

Question proposed, "That those word be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, it was not very easy for one not familiar with the local reasons stated by the hon. Baronet who had just spoken to form any very clear notion with regard to this case. But he admitted to his hon. Friend that, in the absence of information to the contrary of what he had stated, he should form the same opinion with regard to it as himself. *Primâ facie* his hon. Friend had a good case; but he did not feel himself a free agent in this matter. He was willing to assume that the Boundary Commissioners were more likely than he to be right. He

was, therefore, compelled to resist the Amendment, as he had already resisted Amendments coming from the other side for which, at all events, a strong case had been made out.

Mr. HASTINGS said, there was not an inhabitant of the district concerned who did not desire that this change should be made in the Bill. They all viewed the severance from the district with which their interests were connected with the greatest dissatisfaction. He hoped the Committee would meet the justice of this case.

Sir CHARLES FORSTER said, that his hon. Friend asked no more than that the parishes of Pelsall and Walsall should be transferred to the division of Lichfield, with which, on geographical and other grounds, it properly belonged. He could confirm the statement that the inhabitants looked with strong dissatisfaction on their severance from their own district and their transfer to another with which they had no local connection. If his hon. Friend went to a division, he should support him.

Colonel LEVETT said, his hon. Friend the senior Member for Staffordshire (Sir Arthur Bass) had made out an excellent case, as was to have been expected from him, in favour of his Amendment. His hon. Friend had challenged him (Colonel Levett) to state reasons against that Amendment; and, although he did not know that he could state his case as well as his hon. Friend had done, he should do his best. The Amendment of the junior Member for East Staffordshire (Mr. Wiggin) had been refused, on the ground that it would open the door to a great many Amendments of the same description, and which would have the effect, if agreed to, of upsetting the whole of the boundaries. That, he thought, was a strong reason why this Amendment should not have been brought forward, because, if they were once to set about disturbing the boundaries, he believed that this Bill would never get through the House. His hon. Friend wished to transplant that district to another division. Now, the Instructions to the Commissioners were extremely clear. Where there were large populous localities of a particular character they were, if possible, to be included in the same division. Now, Lichfield was essentially an agricultural division; but his hon. Friend proposed to take out of Rushall the two most populous places in it and transfer them to that division. He (Colonel Levett) maintained that that would be in direct opposition to the Instructions given to the Commissioners, and he held, at the same time, that his hon. Friend had not shown sufficient grounds for it. There was no objection to the boundaries as shown in the map; they were extremely clear, and had been accepted by the county as a whole; in short, the scheme of the Commissioners had been universally adopted. The Commissioners themselves had remarked that, although they expected to find a great deal of difficulty in dealing with the county, they were delighted at the unanimous opinion which existed in favour of their Report, and that there was no reason to expect there would be any further trouble about it. This Motion was put forward at the time by three or four gentlemen, every one of whom was a Liberal agent; there was no general support for the Motion, which came from one Party only; and he maintained that it was not in accordance with the Instructions to the Commissioners, or the general intentions of the Bill, that the proposal of his hon. Friend should be carried out. The political effect of throwing these two places into the Lichfield Division would be to stifle the voice of the agricultural labourers, whom it was the object of the Franchise Bill to have represented in that House. His hon. Friend and himself both knew the county; they knew where the votes came from, and they knew where the conclusion would be. He maintained that this was not the proper basis on which to deal with this question. There was not one in 10 of the whole population of Rushall who had any pretension to an interest in agriculture. Under the circumstances, he submitted that the proposed Amendment would have the effect of interfering with the principle of the Bill.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 30; Noes 88: Majority 58.—(Div. List, No. 103.)

Amendment *negatived*.

Mr. RAIKES said, they now came to deal with the county of Suffolk, and after "The," in line 9, page 76, he

proposed to insert "Northern or," so that No. 1 Division would read "The Northern or Lowestoft Division." As the Committee were aware, the county of Suffolk consisted of five divisions, and four of them formed an oblong square. The fifth—the one they were now considering—was situated in the North of the county. Lowestoft was a well-known place, and he would not be found proposing to abolish the name of Lowestoft as that of the division. The names of the other divisions were the Eye Division—Eye was a district not altogether unknown; the Stowmarket Division; the Sudbury Division—Sudbury had a Parliamentary history; and the Woodbridge Division, Woodbridge being a place which was pretty well known in Suffolk, though, perhaps, not so well known out of the county. The preference, therefore, would be for obtaining the alternative nomenclature in the case of the divisions of Suffolk. He did not care whether they struck out the local names or not.

Amendment proposed, in page 76, line 9, after "The," insert "Northern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE thought they had better adopt the alternative names in the case of Suffolk.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH pointed out that, although Lowestoft was a well-known place, it had never had a Parliamentary Representative. He thought it would be well to adopt the points of the compass absolutely, unless the local names were very well known.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would not go so far as that; but he would consider the matter before Report. This was rather a peculiar case; Lowestoft was the centre of the division.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. RAIKES said, his next Amendment was to call the Eye Division the North-Eastern or Eye Division; but he believed there was a desire in some parts of the House to preserve the name of the borough of Eye.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE thought they had better have the alternative name in this case.

Amendment proposed, in page 76, line 20, after "The," insert "North-Eastern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. RAIKES thought that, as the alternative plan had been adopted so far, they had better carry it out through the county. If, however, the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) preferred to strike out "Stowmarket," he (Mr. Raikes) would move the Amendment in that form.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, it was argued by some hon. Gentlemen that the Committee should incline more to the names of merged boroughs than to other names. Personally, he did not attach so much importance to that principle as some Members did.

Mr. RAIKES said, he would, therefore, move to leave out "Stowmarket," and insert "North Western."

Amendment proposed, in page 76, line 26, to leave out the word "Stowmarket," and insert the words "North Western," instead thereof.—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question, "That the word 'Stowmarket' stand part of the Schedule," put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That the words 'North Western' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

On the Motion of Mr. Raikes, the following Amendments made:—In page 76, line 35, after "The," leave out "Sudbury," and insert "South Western," instead thereof; and in page 77, line 1, after "The," leave out "Woodbridge," and insert "South Eastern," instead thereof.

Mr. RAIKES said, they now came to the county of Surrey. The county was divided into six divisions, four of which formed an oblong square, and the remaining two were situated in the North-Eastern corner, closely adjoining London. One of the divisions, the Kingston Division, was almost, it might be said, entirely urban in its character. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would, therefore, object to the adoption of a point-of-the-compass name in respect of that division. The other five divisions grouped very naturally. The one they began with was the Chertsey Division, and he proposed to give it the alterna-

tive name of "North-Western." All the names of places given to the Surrey divisions were well known, and probably there would be a preference for retaining the alternative name. He begged to move the Amendment which stood in his name.

Amendment proposed, in page 77, line 9, after "The," insert "North Western or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that Chertsey was well known in the county, and perhaps it would be well to retain the alternative name. He had, however, a doubt as to the desirability of retaining the name of Kingston as that of one of the divisions. There were two rival places—Kingston and Richmond—in the division, and it was a question whether Kingston should, in consequence, be retained. He had no personal feeling one way or the other.

Question put, and *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

MR. RAIKES said, his next Amendment had reference to the Guildford Division. Guildford was a merged borough, and it was one of the two capitals of Surrey. He therefore supposed the division had better be given an alternative name.

Amendment proposed, in page 77, line 14, after "The," insert "South Western or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES proposed, as an Amendment, to insert, after "The," in line 21, "South Eastern or," so that the Reigate Division should be called "the South Eastern or Reigate Division."

Amendment proposed, in page 77, line 21, after "The," insert "South Eastern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES proposed an Amendment, to give the Epsom Division the alternative name of "Mid."

Amendment proposed, in page 77, line 29, after "The," insert "Mid or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES said, the next Amendment on the Paper related to the Kingston Division. The Amendment he had put on the Paper was to call the division the Northern or Kingston Division. Although he had a preference for the points of the compass, he did not think that "Northern" was distinctly and clearly the best name that he should like to propose. As, however, he preferred the alternative form, he begged to move the insertion, after "The," of the words "Northern or."

Amendment proposed, in page 77, line 34, after "The," insert "Northern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. WARTON said, he hoped that the Amendment would not be accepted. The right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had said he had a doubt as to the name to give to this division. Perhaps the Committee would permit him (Mr. Warton) to give a very important reason why they ought not to make any alteration at all. Kingston was a place of great antiquity. There was a stone there which, he believed, was the oldest and best preserved stone in the Kingdom. Coming from Saxon times, Kingston or Kingstone was really a very beautiful monument of antiquity. One of the divisions of the county had been called Guildford.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: In that case an alternative name has been adopted.

MR. WARTON: Now, for many years past the Assizes in Surrey had been held at Kingston, Guildford, and Croydon. The Spring Assizes were always held at Kingston; whereas the other Assizes were held alternately at Guildford and Croydon. Precedence was always given to Kingston over Guildford and Croydon included. The right hon. Baronet had spoken of the rival place, Richmond. No doubt, there was some hesitation as to which place should give its name to the division; but, surely, the real Richmond was the Richmond in Yorkshire. The Richmond in Surrey was, no doubt, a very pretty suburban place; but it had nothing of the antiquity or rank of Kingston. He hoped his right hon. Friend (Mr. Raikes), notwithstanding his love of alternative names, would be good enough not to

press this Amendment, but let Kingston, a distinctly celebrated and ancient place, stand by itself.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he did not wish it to be understood that he suggested that the division should be named after Richmond. He had only meant to convey that there was a doubt as to whether the division should be called Kingston or Richmond.

MR. WARTON said, he was persuaded that, on reflection, the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would see that Richmond had no claim to give its name to the division. As far as the question of the points of the compass was concerned, even the right hon. Gentleman who brought forward this Amendment was not very clearly in favour of the name "Northern." "Northern" was not a very good name to give the division, and therefore he hoped the Amendment would not be persevered in.

Question put, and *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

MR. RAIKES proposed an Amendment to give the alternative name of North-Eastern to the Wimbledon Division.

Amendment proposed, in page 78, line 1, after "The," insert "North Eastern."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. WARTON said, he wished to call the attention of the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) to the second line on page 78, because he proposed to move the omission from that line of the words "a District of the Metropolis," and to substitute the words "a Metropolitan borough." It seemed to him that the phrase "a district of the Metropolis" was not sufficiently expressive. They knew that there was a Metropolis, and that it was to have a large number of Members; but when they had done with the scaffolding of the Bill and contemplated the crowned edifice, they would have the words left "a District of the Metropolis." He did not know whether, as a matter of fact, the right hon. Baronet knew that one or more Parliamentary boroughs would be affected by these words. He thought that when they came to the Report, it would be well to have the exact truth stated. There were some boroughs created by the Bill which might be described as Metropolitan boroughs or boroughs in some way connected with the Metropolis, but which were not districts of the Metropolis. He begged to move the omission of the words "a District of the Metropolis."

Amendment proposed, in page 78, lines 2 and 3, to leave out the words "a District of the Metropolis."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that on Report he would consider whether it would be best to say "in the Metropolis," or "a district of the Metropolis."

MR. WARTON said, that after the promise of the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke), he would ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. RAIKES said, they now came to the county of Sussex, and the first of the divisions in that county was that which it was proposed to call the Horsham Division. The re-arrangement of Sussex was rather remarkable. Sussex had some very well-established and recognized boundaries, statutory and otherwise; but the new arrangements had completely changed the face of the county. Horsham was a merged borough, and Bramber had been cut in two; indeed, Bramber might have given its name to either of two divisions. He thought, however, that as the larger or more important borough had had to disappear by being bisected, it would be hardly fair for it to undergo the additional humiliation of being superseded in favour of the smaller borough, which was wholly contained in the limits of the new division. He did not propose to suppress the name of Horsham altogether, but to call the division "The North-Western or Horsham Division." The county fell very naturally into North-Western, South-Western, Northern, Mid, Southern, and Eastern.

Amendment proposed, in page 78, line 13, after "The," insert "North Western or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he thought the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would admit that Sussex was a very difficult county to divide, and that he would also admit that the statements which he made in regard to the population in the Instructions he gave to the Commissioners made the work of division even more difficult than it otherwise would have been. He (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) was bound to say that the Commissioners endeavoured to do their work as fairly as possible; but he thought the county of Sussex might have been divided better. A large number of recommendations were made; but he did not know whether they reached the right hon. Gentleman or not—at any rate, they reached the Commissioners. The people of the county would have liked, as far as possible, to adhere to the old divisions or Rapes of the county. The Rape of Bramber had been a Parliamentary borough for some considerable time; and he thought it might very easily have been adjusted so that practically for the Rapes of Chichester, Arundel, and Bramber, with some slight addition from the Rape of Lewes, particularly as two parishes were recently in the Rape of Bramber and partly in the Rape of Lewes, three Members might have been given to West Sussex. The Commissioners had dealt with the county partly by Petty Sessional divisions, and partly by Union divisions. It would be found that, in order to make up an extra 2,000 or 3,000, they had taken a large portion of the Thakeham Union, and put it to the Petty Sessional divisions of Chichester and Arundel, and the result was that the boundary was not as convenient or as well-arranged as it otherwise might have been. When they came to consider the case of the merged borough of Lewes, they found that it was now placed, as it were, almost in West Sussex. For all purposes—for election as well as for other purposes—Sussex had hitherto been divided into two counties. That had all been put on one side, for they now found that the old Rape of Bramber had been divided, and that a portion of the Petty Sessional division of Lewes, including the borough of Lewes and the Petty Sessional division of Hove, outside the borough of Brighton, had been thrown, with the remainder of the Petty Sessional division of Steyning and the Petty Sessional division of Worthing, into the Mid or Lewes Division of Sussex. There was no connection between Worthing and Lewes; indeed, it would have been a great convenience to the county of Sussex had they been able to retain more or less their old Rapes, for all their communications were from North to South, instead of being from East to West. Sussex laboured under great disadvantages when the Commissioners attended to hold the inquiries. It was one of the earliest counties taken, and being a very large county—it was as much as 90 miles long—there was no opportunity of consulting the different districts as to their wishes in the matter of division, or of forming a Committee to frame a scheme acceptable to the whole county. They were bound to attend at Lewes upon the 2nd of January, and discuss the scheme of the Commissioners. The moment the scheme was put forward in discussion, it was found that every small place had its own view on the question. After listening to all the statements made, it was thought it would be better, upon the whole, to adhere to the scheme of the Commissioners. As the right hon. Gentleman very well knew, the loss of several of its Members was very severely felt by Sussex. Sussex had a population of 500,000, and therefore they had been rather hardly dealt with, because they had lost no less than eight borough Members. It was true they had gained two extra Members for the county, but that did not compensate for their losses. He could only hope that the new arrangements would work well; but when they had done away with the old divisions of the counties, he hardly thought matters would work as smoothly as was expected. He should have no objection to the proposals of his right hon. Friend (Mr. Raikes). The names which had been given to divisions were names which, in many cases, commended themselves to the localities; but the proposal to give alternative names to the divisions was one which would also commend itself to a large number of persons who were extremely anxious that the old county names should not be done away with.

MR. GREGORY said, he could confirm all that had fallen from the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Sir Walter B.

Barttelot) as to the difficulty the Commissioners experienced in coming to a proper conclusion, and as to the great pains they took to come to the conclusions they did. Whether the conclusions of the Commissioners were satisfactory to the county at large, he was not prepared to say. It was hoped by some that the Commissioners would have found it desirable to adhere to the old Rapes—to the old historical divisions of the county; but he believed that that was found to be absolutely impossible, if there was to be anything like proportionate representation in the county. On the whole, he had no reason to complain of the distribution that had been made. He trusted that if the points of the compass were adopted as the names of the different divisions, the names of towns would also be retained. He was fully persuaded that the adoption of any proposal to do away with the names of the divisions, as proposed by the Commissioners, would give rise to very considerable dissatisfaction in the county. He trusted, therefore, that if the points of the compass were adopted, they would also be adopted in the sense of alternative names.

MR. T. C. THOMPSON said, he did not know that he could offer any strong objection to the course which had been taken by the Committee, because it had been taken with regard to the counties generally. But he certainly thought there was a strong feeling in Sussex that the old names should have been kept up. It was an Instruction to the Commissioners that they should preserve the names of the places which had formerly returned Members to Parliament. In old times East Grinstead sent Members to Parliament, and it gave great satisfaction to the people of the district to think their privileges were to be restored. He thought the same kind of feeling existed in the different districts of Sussex. It was well they should not get into too regular a groove. He did not think they exactly wanted to devide England into electoral districts, and he was surprised that there was a desire in that direction on the other side of the House. It was just possible that when some new democratic wave passed over the country, some great man might rise up and propose to do away with the divisions North and South, East and West, and that all the Members for the county should thenceforth be chosen by the county at large. He thought they should contend against that, and the best way of doing so was to stamp on each district an individuality which would grow stronger with time.

Question put, and *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

On the Motion of MR. RAIKES, the following Amendment made:—In page 78, line 17, after "The," insert "South Western or."

On the Motion of Sir CHARLES W. DILKE, the following Amendments made:—In page 78, line 20, leave out "Finden," and insert "Findon;" and in line 21, leave out "Thakenham," and insert "Thakeham."

On the Motion of MR. RAIKES, the following Amendments made:—In page 78, line 23, after "The," insert "Northern or;" in line 30, after "The," insert "Mid or;" in page 79, line 1, after "The," insert "Southern or;" and in line 10, after "The," insert "Eastern or."

MR. RAIKES said, the next county in order was that of Warwick. Now, Warwickshire naturally fell into four divisions, North-Western, North-Eastern, South-Western, and South-Eastern, and that was the form in which he had placed Amendments on the Paper. But he was bound to say there was a feeling in the county in favour of styling one of the divisions "the Northern Division"—that was, he thought, the one which he had described as North-Western. He therefore begged to move to insert, after "The," in line 20, "Northern or." If his Amendment were adopted, No. 1 Division would be called "the Northern or Coleshill Division."

Amendment proposed, in page 79, line 20, after "The," insert "Northern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. SPENCER BALFOUR said, he had now to move an Amendment which had already been discussed at much length—namely, to insert "Tamworth" instead of "Coleshill." In answer to a question put by the hon. Member for Cambridgeshire (Mr. Hicks), as to the actual composition of the municipal borough of Tamworth, he (Mr. Balfour) might say that 2,302 inhabitants of the

municipal borough of Tamworth resided in North Warwickshire, and 3,208 in Staffordshire. But to the North Warwickshire Division must be added the inhabitants of Tamworth Castle, which was really the oldest portion of Tamworth, and the district in which the two railway stations were situated, and these inhabitants numbered as many as 3,113. As a further illustration of the inconvenience of the district of Coleshill, he might say that the clerk to the magistrates at Coleshill lived at Tamworth, and in order to perform his duties he had to drive 14 miles there and 14 miles back every day. He begged to propose the Amendment which stood in his name.

Amendment proposed,

In page 79, line 20, to leave out the word "Coleshill," in order to insert the word "Tamworth,"—(*Mr. Spencer Balfour,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'Coleshill' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he thought they would only waste time if, on this question, they were to go into very much detail. It would be a great mistake for the friends of Tamworth to attempt to deny that the local feeling was in favour of Coleshill; he thought there could be no doubt on that point. Then, with regard to the importance of Coleshill, it was well known as a place where the open elections were held. Indeed, it was an old-fashioned county town of a certain amount of importance. Then, there was the argument that the part of Tamworth which was in the county of Warwick was not so thoroughly urban as the part that was not in that county. All these arguments, he thought, had certain weight against the Motion which was now made. If he had to settle the question apart from the question of sentiment, he should certainly say that Coleshill was the right name to give to the division; but he felt strongly the effect produced in the Committee by the speech of the right hon. Baronet (Sir Robert Peel). He felt so strongly the great desire of many Gentlemen not connected with the locality to give the name of Tamworth to the division, that he was not prepared to use the influence of the Government to defeat that desire.

MR. P. A. MUNTZ said, that notwithstanding the remarks of the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke), he must say that the opinion of the majority of the population of North Warwickshire was so strongly against an alteration of the name of the division from Coleshill to Tamworth, that he should feel he was not doing the people justice if he did not express their opinion in the House. It appeared to him that it would be a great hardship to Coleshill if the name were changed in consequence of a few outlying parishes of Tamworth being in Warwickshire. There was another point of importance, and that was that the decision of the Commissioners was in favour of Coleshill. He should certainly carry the matter to a division, and he hoped the Members of the Committee, whatever feeling of respect they might have for the memory of the distinguished ancestor of the right hon. Baronet (Sir Robert Peel), would, in justice to the population of North Warwickshire, support him. As to the population of the two places, he found that the inhabitants of Coleshill—a place which had been described as exceedingly small—numbered 2,356, against a population in the Warwickshire part of Tamworth of 2,302. That fact formed a most important consideration. The Committee would unquestionably do a great injustice to Coleshill if they agreed to change the name of the division to Tamworth.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE deprecated the matter being discussed again on its merits.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, the only reason which justified the time they had spent upon this matter was that there was great local interest felt upon the nomenclature of this division. After what had fallen from hon. and right hon. Gentleman opposite, it seemed to him that what the Committee were now asked to do was to allow their own sentiment to override local feeling. He could not help thinking that that was just what they ought not to do. It was not denied that that part of Tamworth which was in Warwickshire was the smallest part of the borough. However much they desired to perpetuate the memory of the late right hon. Baronet Sir Robert Peel, by giving the name of Tamworth to one of the new divisions, they ought not to give the

name to a district to which it did not belong.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, he fully appreciated the desire expressed by the sons of the late Sir Robert Peel that the name of Tamworth should be given to this division; but he had found a practical reason for supporting the Amendment—a reason which had not been mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) or by any other Member. Twenty-four thousand acres of the Union of Tamworth were in the county of Warwickshire, and Tamworth was the centre of a Poor Law Union. Coleshill was not a Poor Law Union, but simply a parish in such a Union. Now, his right hon. Friend the President of the Local Government Board, who had the matter of local government so much at heart, was disposed, when he obtained the opportunity, to bring before the House a measure dealing with Unions which were partly in one county and partly in another; and having regard to the fact that by far the larger part of the Union of Tamworth—an infinitely greater acreage than Coleshill—was in Warwickshire, he (Mr. Arthur Arnold) could not hesitate as to the way he should vote on this Amendment.

Mr. H. A. BASS supported the proposal of his hon. Friend and Colleague (Mr. Spencer Balfour). He maintained that if this boon were refused to Tamworth, it would be a most distinct breach of what the Prime Minister said would be allotted to boroughs which lost their Members by this Bill. He (Mr. Bass) thought that too much had been said about Coleshill and its importance. Coleshill was an obscure and remote village; indeed, although he had had the honour of representing the borough of Tamworth for seven years, he never heard the name of Coleshill until this Bill was printed. The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had said that the boroughs which lost their Members would give their names to some division of the county. He (Mr. Bass) supposed that was intended as a sop, and he believed that many of the constituencies which had lost their Members looked upon it as a very moderate kind of sop. Yet it was even proposed to take this moderate sop away from Tamworth. He thought that in all fairness, and considering that 8,500 out of the 14,000 inhabitants of the borough of Tamworth resided in the Coleshill Division of Warwickshire, Tamworth had very superior claims to give its name to this division, rather than to a division of Staffordshire, in which county there only resided 5,500 of the 14,000 inhabitants of the borough. Tamworth was placed in a very awkward position. If they maintained the county boundary, the Parliamentary borough was cut in half; not only that, but the municipal borough was divided, and also the parish. Now, what was termed the Coleshill Division of Warwickshire would contain no disfranchised Parliamentary borough, neither would there be any municipal borough in the division. In the Lichfield Division of Staffordshire, however, there would be the disfranchised borough of Lichfield to contend with; and seeing that the Parliamentary borough of Lichfield contained something like 8,000 inhabitants, and that the portion of the Parliamentary borough of Tamworth which would go into East Staffordshire had only 5,500 inhabitants, the people of Lichfield would certainly consider that Lichfield had superior claims to give its name to the constituency than Tamworth. He hoped that, under the circumstances, the Committee would recognize the great claim of Tamworth to give its name to a division of Warwickshire.

Mr. DIGBY said, that after what had just fallen from the hon. Member for Tamworth (Mr. H. A. Bass), the Committee ought to remember that there were agricultural interests to be studied. The hon. Gentleman had said that the town of Coleshill was insignificant; but he (Mr. Digby) must point out to the hon. Member that in the future division of the county the agricultural interests were not insignificant. The hon. Gentleman seemed to forget that the borough of Tamworth had only a few months' existence; besides, in what way had the great bulk of the Coleshill Division to do with the population of Tamworth? The majority of the population of the town of Tamworth lived in Staffordshire. ["No."] The population of that part of the town which was in Warwickshire was smaller than that of the part which was in Staffordshire. The population of Coleshill was 2,400, while that of the Warwickshire part of Tamworth was only 2,300.

[*Fourteenth Night.*]

Moreover, some attention ought to be paid to the fact that Tamworth was at one end of the new division, and that a great part of the town was outside the division. Coleshill, on the contrary, was situated in the centre of the division. They should consider, too, whether the interests of Coleshill, or of the division, gravitated towards Tamworth. Upon inquiry it would be found that they gravitated towards Birmingham. He had lived in the division all his life, and he could assure the Committee that there was very little trade done by agriculturists with Tamworth; by far the larger part of the trade was done with Birmingham. Coleshill was the centre of the trade of the division, the centre of the agricultural interest. He felt that when boroughs were disfranchised, the Committee should not only consider those boroughs, but should consider also the interests of agriculturists, and the interest of the agricultural labourer, who, according to the promoters of the Bill, was the chief person to be benefited by the Bill.

Mr. HICKS said, he claimed the indulgence of the Committee as a freeholder of this division of the county of Warwick. If the Committee seriously reflected upon the figures which were laid before them with regard to a previous Amendment concerning the county of Stafford, they would see they were rather hasty in discussing that Amendment. No one who had regard to the number of inhabitants, or to acreage, would say that Tamworth should give its name to the constituency, to the exclusion of Coleshill, which, for more than half-a-century, had been the nomination place, and the leading place of the division. He thought the Government ought to stand by their own Bill and their own officers. It was the duty of the Committee to reject this Amendment, and to support, when they came to Report, the Amendment with regard to the county of Stafford.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 17; Noes 143: Majority 126.—(Div. List, No. 104.)

Question "That 'Tamworth' be there inserted, put, and *agreed to.*

On the Motion of Mr. Raikes, the following Amendments made:—In page 79, line 30, after "The," insert "North Eastern or;" in page 80, line 1, after "The," insert "South Western or;" and in line 9, after "The," insert "South Eastern or."

Mr. RAIKES said, the county of Westmoreland, which came next, was very easily divided into two divisions—North and South. He did not propose to alter the local names of the divisions, but simply to make additions. He would move to insert "Northern or " before Appleby.

Amendment proposed, in page 80, line 18, after "The," insert "Northern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. RAIKES proposed, as an Amendment, that the Kendal Division be given the alternative name of "Southern."

Amendment proposed, in page 80, line 23, after "The," insert "Southern or."

Question, "That those words be there inserted" put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. RAIKES said, that the first Amendment he had on the Paper concerning the county of Wilts was to insert the words "North Eastern or," after "The," in line 31, so that the No. 1 Division of the county should be called "the North Eastern or Cricklade Division." He had, however, ascertained that there was a preference in that part of Wilts to give the Cricklade Division the alternative name of "Northern." That being the wish of the people, and there being no geographical impropriety in the name, he would move his Amendment in that form.

Amendment proposed, in page 80, line 31, after "The," insert "Northern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be inserted."

Sir GABRIEL GOLDNEY said, he did not think the Amendment was required. He certainly was not aware that any opinion in favour of the adoption of the points of the compass as names for the different divisions had been expressed anywhere in the county. On the occasion of the Commissioners' visit to the county, a large representative meeting was held in the Court

House at Salisbury. There were present the four Members for the county and a considerable number of borough Members, and both political Parties were represented. A large number of maps was placed at the disposal of those who attended the meeting; and although various suggestions were made relative to the nomenclature of the divisions, there was no forward indication in favour of the different divisions being named according to the points of the compass. Wilts was divided geographically into North and South by the chalk downs and Salisbury Plain, and the divisions were well known. No one ever spoke of the Eastern or Western Division. North and South were the two great divisions, and the Commissioners, who went into the question, considered it advisable to take certain Petty Sessional divisions as the basis of the five county divisions, and to name each of the county divisions after the principal disfranchised borough contained in it. Cricklade was a very ancient borough, and he hoped that its name would be retained as that of the division, not only on account of the historical associations of the town, but because of the wish of the people to be identified with the old borough. The Commissioners, in giving the names of the principal boroughs to the divisions, had merely carried out their Instructions. Chippenham, for instance, was a well-known place, and it was right it should give its name to the division in which it was situated. He would remind the Committee that Chippenham was a place of some interest, owing to the circumstance that it was the first constituency represented by the late Sir Robert Peel, and it also had the distinguished task of turning out a Government, by the adverse decision of an Election Committee. But apart from sentiment the divisions, as arranged by the Commissioners, were clearly marked, and their names were well known. The local newspapers had discussed the matter for a considerable period, and not a single reason, that he was aware of, had been given or advanced for changing the name. He, therefore, trusted that the Government would retain the proposal in the Bill, in the absence of any local expression of opinion in an opposite direction. He might say that so acceptable had this proposal been to the meeting held in Salisbury, that that meeting had passed a vote of thanks to the Boundary Commissioners for the manner in which they had divided the county and defined the divisions.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, his interest in Wiltshire was very great; but it differed in this respect from that of some other hon. Members—namely, that it was an interest in the county, and not in any particular town. He entirely differed from the hon. Member who had just sat down (Sir Gabriel Goldney), and thought that the claims of the county rather than the claims of the towns should be considered by the Committee. There was not one of these places which was really entitled to be called a town, with the exception of Swindon and Devizes. The other towns were only large villages. As to anything having been said with regard to this matter at the meeting at Salisbury, if that gathering had at all resembled the meeting held in Gloucester, it must have been known that the points of the compass names were barred by the Instructions given to the Commissioners. He objected to the divisions of the county having to bear the names of these small towns.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that for his own part he quite agreed with the hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Gabriel Goldney) that it would be better to take the county names absolutely, instead of having alternative names. However, he thought the Committee were not disposed to take those names absolutely, but were pretty generally of opinion that the alternatives should be accepted. He felt that he must assent to the proposal.

MR. STORY-MASKELYNE said, he thought a compliment was due to the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Raikes) for his efforts with regard to nomenclature in this Bill. The right hon. Gentleman had really been practising as Attorney General for the points-of-the-compass names, and had exhibited an amount of topographical knowledge which did him the greatest credit. He (Mr. Story-Maskelyne) did not think there was a very strong feeling in Wiltshire in favour of one way or the other of dealing with these names; but he thought there was a point of view which the Committee might adopt which would corroborate the right hon. Gentleman

(Mr. Raikes) in regard to his proposal. It was this, that whatever they did with the district he (Mr. Story-Maskelyne) had the honour to represent, and with regard to which he had an Amendment to move, there were historical places in Wiltshire whose names they could attach to the county districts. Everyone knew that these places were not without considerable historical interest. One of them was Cricklade, which had been represented in the very first Parliament of England, and which had returned Members to the House pretty nearly ever since. But that observation applied to almost every town and village which appeared in the list of places within the county. He thought, however, that as regarded many of the names in the county, it would be well to assign to those divisions, at least as an alternative name, a point-of-the-compass name. The effect of that would be very largely to remove local jealousy. Marlborough and Devizes were two of the largest boroughs in the county, and it might be said that their claims to have a district named after them were about equal. In spite of what had fallen from the hon. Baronet the Member for Chippenham (Sir Gabriel Goldney), all the difficulties which had been pointed out could be, he thought, got rid of by calling the district in question, "The Eastern District of Wiltshire," and so at once do away with a great deal of heart-burning. As to the district he (Mr. Story-Maskelyne) had the honour to represent, he thought the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University had wisely dropped the word "East" from his proposal. "North Wilts" was, no doubt, a very proper name for the Cricklade Division. It represented a portion of the Thames District and the White Horse Valley. That was the greater part of North Wilts; while, on the other hand, the North-Western District, which the hon. Member for Chippenham represented, was one in which the centre of gravity of population would be found between Melksham and Chippenham, so that it could hardly assert a claim to be called "North Wiltshire." If the Committee were to adopt names from the points of the compass—that was to say, alternative names—he thought the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Raikes) had put those names down correctly. Therefore, he (Mr. Story-Maskelyne) would not raise any objection to those proposals. On the understanding that he could bring his own Amendment forward as to his own borough, he should not offer any opposition to the present Motion.

Question put, and *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

MR. STORY-MASKELYNE said, he wished to propose, in line 31, page 80, to leave out "Cricklade," in order to insert "Swindon." He did not mean to say that the proposal he was making was one which would be unanimously accepted by the whole constituency he had the honour to represent; but he would say this, that he thought that the objection to the proposal was one limited to a comparatively small portion of the constituency. The town of Cricklade, no doubt, could justly say that it had an historical position in the county. It might say, in the first place, that the borough had sent a Member to Parliament since the Parliament of 1295, and that, since that time, the district had been extended over a very large area. It might say that when this Bill was brought before the House, the borough of the Hundreds of Cricklade was a typical borough in the county, representing an agricultural district of 50,000 inhabitants, a number corresponding to the unit of population which, according to the idea of the Redistribution of Seats Bill, was to be represented by a single Member. If archæological associations were to apply to Cricklade, it must give its name to the division of the county in which it was situated. On the other hand, he had to call attention to the enormous increase which had taken place in the population of Wiltshire, according to the last two Censuses. The increase had been owing largely to the rapid development of the town and neighbourhood of Swindon. Some years ago Swindon was a small town on a hill, a quiet, sleepy little place, with all the characteristics of a country town; but it had now become one of the busy hives of railway industry, having round it scattered villages which were practically suburbs, representing a population of 22,000 or 23,000. They formed part of the Northern Division of Wiltshire, and represented nearly half of a constituency of 47,000. His Swindon constituents had asked him to urge the House to agree to change the name, as recommended by the Commissioners, from "Crick-

lade" to "Swindon." He thought that was a demand he had a right to make in the name of the majority of his constituents, and the Committee, he was sure, would not think he was asking too much. In making this demand, he was going against the principle laid down by the Government in their Instructions to their Commissioners; but, if his proposal were acceded to, this would not be the first time the Government had passed over those Instructions and violated the principles they had laid down, in deference to the desire of constituencies.

Amendment proposed,

In page 80, line 31, to leave out the word "Cricklade," in order to insert the word "Swindon,"—(*Mr. Story-Maskelyne,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'Cricklade' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that his hon. Friend (Mr. Story-Maskelyne) had supplied him with the remark he wanted, for, in his argument, he had divided this district into two, one part belonging to Cricklade and the other to Swindon. Cricklade, as the hon. Member had said, was an extremely ancient name, and better deserving the distinction of giving a name to a division than Swindon. Swindon was the name of a small area. Beyond that, looking at the associations of the places, he thought Cricklade was by far the better name.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES said, the next Amendment stood in his name, and had reference to the Chippenham Division, to which he desired to add the style of "North Western." There was no geographical objection to this proposal, and the hon. Member who had just now spoken (Sir Gabriel Goldney) had pointed out special reasons for the adoption of the name, having shown that the main part of the population lay more to the West than anywhere else. The Amendments he (Mr. Raikes) had put upon the Paper had been suggested by the senior Member for the county of Wilts (Mr. Estcourt); therefore, there was good reason for thinking it would be acceptable to the Committee.

Amendment proposed, in page 80, line 34, after "The," insert "North Western or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

On the Motion of Mr. RAIKES, the following Amendment made:—In page 81, line 1, after "The," insert "Western or."

MR. STORY-MASKELYNE said, he desired to move, after the word "or," in the last Amendment, to omit the name "Westbury," in order to insert the name "Trowbridge." His argument in favour of the Amendment was of a similar kind to that he had urged upon the Committee just now, and to which the Committee had given such a feeble response. Nevertheless, he thought it right to ask the Committee to make this change, Trowbridge being really a very ancient and important place. It was a neighbouring town to Bradford-on-Avon, which had been a manufacturing place from very ancient times. It was considerably larger than Westbury, a place of a small and unimportant character. He could not give the exact number of the population; but he should think that there were more people there than in any other town of Wiltshire, except Swindon and, possibly, Salisbury. He thought himself that it was larger than Salisbury. On those grounds, he could very fairly ask the Committee to make the change he proposed—to strike out a name which was unknown to fame, and to substitute for it one of great importance at the present time, one with old historical associations, and one really more worthy of giving the title to this division of the county.

Amendment proposed,

In page 81, line 1, after the word "or," to leave out the word "Westbury," and insert "Trowbridge,"—(*Mr. Story-Maskelyne,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That 'Westbury' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that no doubt Trowbridge was the more important town, having got to be regarded as the county town; but, on the other hand, Westbury was a borough of some importance, and he thought they should keep that name as against Trowbridge.

SIR GABRIEL GOLDNEY said, if there was to be a change from Westbury, he was not at all satisfied that the town and parish of Bradford was not larger than Trowbridge. Trowbridge

had a very limited area, while Bradford had an area of considerable extent; but Westbury was the proper and recognized name.

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, that if importance were to be attached to the name of Chippenham, owing to the circumstance that it had been the first constituency represented by the late Sir Robert Peel, they might probably view this town of Trowbridge with greater favour, from a knowledge of the fact that it had had the advantage of possessing Crabbe as its Rector.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Amendment *negatived.*

On the Motion of Mr. RAIKES, the following Amendments made:—In page 81, line 7, after "The," insert "Eastern or;" and in line 14, after "The," insert "Southern or."

MR. RAIKES said, they now passed on to the county of Worcester, which was cut into five divisions by the Bill—namely, Bewdley, Evesham, Droitwich, Oldbury, and King's Norton. Bewdley, Evesham, and Droitwich were merged boroughs, and, therefore, it would be desirable, following the precedent they had hitherto set down, to accept those names and the alternative nomenclature. The Oldbury Division, however, was a very small one, and almost entirely of an urban character; and he did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would not prefer that it should take a point-of-the-compass name simply. Geographically, there could be no objection to Bewdley being in the Western Division, Evesham being in the Southern Division, Oldbury being put into the Northern Division, and King's Norton in the Eastern Division. That would leave only Droitwich to deal with, and that he thought might have attached to it the designation of "Mid." He begged to move to insert "Western or" before "Bewdley."

Amendment proposed, in page 82, line 25, after "The," to insert "Western or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

On the Motion of Mr. RAIKES, the following Amendments made:—In page 81, line 33, after "The," insert "Southern or;" and in page 82, line 1, after "The," insert "Mid or."

MR. RAIKES said, that now, as to the 4th division, in line 13, he would propose to insert the words "Northern or." He understood that the hon. Member for East Worcestershire (Mr. Hastings) had some criticism to pass upon this Amendment. If the hon. Member objected to it, as he (Mr. Raikes) was not particularly wedded to it, he should be prepared to give way. However, there could be no geographical objection to his proposal, because Oldbury was certainly in the Northern part of the county. But if the hon. Member had anything to say, he was sure the Committee would be glad to entertain his objection.

Amendment proposed, in page 82, line 13, after "The," insert "Northern or."—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. HASTINGS said, he wished to ask the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) and the Committee to do in this case what they had done in several previous cases—namely, to leave out the word "or." In the other three divisions, the towns giving the names to the divisions were merged boroughs. It was quite right that boroughs which no longer sent an independent Member to Parliament should live in the nomenclature of the Bill; but in the case of the Oldbury Division, there had been no previous borough of that name, and it therefore seemed to him unnecessary to take that name as an alternative to the point-of-the-compass title. There had been considerable local jealousy exhibited against the name Oldbury being used at the time the Commissioners made their inquiry. This local jealousy was particularly pronounced between Oldbury and Halesowen. He thought, therefore, that to adhere to the name "Northern Division" only would be to satisfy all parties, and to allay all local jealousy.

MR. RAIKES said, he should be glad to withdraw the Amendment as it stood on the Paper, and move it in an amended form—that was to say, to leave out "Oldbury," in order to insert "Northern."

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed,

In page 82, line 13, to leave out the word "Oldbury," in order to insert the word "Northern,"—(*Mr. Raikes,*)

—instead thereof.

Question, "That the word 'Oldbury' stand part of the Schedule," put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That the word 'Northern' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES said, he wished now to move to leave out "King's Norton," in order to insert the word "Eastern."

Amendment proposed,

In page 82, line 19, after "The," to leave out the words "King's Norton," in order to insert the word "Eastern,"—(*Mr. Raikes,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'King's Norton' stand part of the Schedule."

MR. HASTINGS said, he had to-day presented a most influential Petition, containing 700 names, from the town of Bromsgrove, praying that for the name of "King's Norton" the name of "Bromsgrove" should be substituted. As far as he was concerned, however, he thought the Amendment proposed by the right hon. Gentleman would satisfy the Bromsgrove people.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That the word 'Eastern' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES: That, I am happy to say, is the last county in which the points-of-the-compass names have to be introduced.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the Amendment which stood in his name on the Paper had reference to the extension of the municipal borough of York under the York Extension and Improvement Act, 1884, which Statute only came into force during the present year. The extension was not therefore covered by the Definition Clause; and that was the reason why it was necessary to describe the parts taken into the borough by the Improvement Act in more precise terms. The measure was drawn up in its present form before it had been ascertained that the Act had not yet come into force.

Amendment proposed,

In page 82, line 33, leave out from beginning of line, to end of line 37, and insert,—

"The Sessional Divisions of,—

"Birdforth,

"East Bulmer (except so much as is added to the municipal borough of York by 'The York Extension and Improvement Act, 1884'),

"Hallikeld,

"Malton, and

"West Bulmer,

"The wapentake of the Ainsty of York (except so much as is included in the municipal borough of York as extended by 'The York Extension and Improvement Act, 1884'),

"And the municipal borough of York, inclusive of the places added to that borough by 'The York Extension and Improvement Act, 1884' (47 and 48 Vic. c. CCXXXII.)."—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule," put, and *negatived.*

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. STAFFORD HOWARD said, he should like to ask the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill (Sir Charles W. Dilke) if he would consider, on Report, whether the first division should not be called "Thirsk and Malton," instead of merely "Thirsk," considering that Malton was quite as important a borough as Thirsk? Anyone who looked at the map would see that Thirsk did not, in a reasonable way, describe the district. Thirsk was a small borough, situated at one side of the division. If the alteration he (Mr. Stafford Howard) proposed were made on Report, it would, he thought, give great satisfaction.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would promise to consider the matter before the Report stage if the hon. Member would place his Amendment on the Paper.

Mr. DUNDAS said, he had an Amendment on the Paper to substitute for the name "Northallerton" the name of "Richmond." There had been a strong expression of local opinion upon this matter, which, he trusted, would have some weight with the Committee. In this district there were 18 polling districts, 11 of which had petitioned in favour of the name of Richmond. In those 11 districts the opinion in favour of the substitution of Richmond for Northallerton might be said

to be unanimous. In two other districts opinion was divided, the Liberals taking one view, the Conservatives another. That left only five polling districts, as to which he knew nothing; but, for the sake of argument, he would presume them to be in favour of retaining the name "Northallerton." There were six Petty Sessional districts in the division, of which five had petitioned in favour of the change he was proposing. Northallerton was not at all an important place; Richmond was a place which was extremely well known, having returned Members to Parliament, from time immemorial, without being disturbed, whereas Northallerton had forfeited a Member in 1832. Northallerton was not in any historical sense the capital of the North Riding; it was situated at the extreme eastern edge of the division, whereas Richmond lay in a central position. The latter place had been a well-known area for at least seven centuries—it had been, he might say, the capital of the district. The people who resided in Richmond were proud of their historical connection, and would feel it very much if the name "Richmond" were not given to the Parliamentary division. Public opinion was very high on the subject, and whether the name decided upon were "Richmond" or "Richmondshire" he should not care.

Amendment proposed,

In page 83, line 1, to leave out the word "Northallerton," in order to insert the word "Richmond,"—(*Mr. Dundas,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'Northallerton' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, his own feeling was rather in favour of Richmond as against Northallerton; but he knew there was a great difference of opinion upon the subject. The town of Northallerton had a population nearly as large, only short, in fact, by about 100 of that of Richmond, and it was exactly equal in size. Northallerton might be considered the capital of the North Riding, all the county buildings being in it, and the Commissioners were of opinion that the division should bear the name of that place. His (Sir Charles W. Dilke's) opinion, however, inclined in the other direction, seeing that Richmond was regarded as the more ancient town.

MR. GORST said, he must apologize to the Committee for intervening in a local question of which he knew nothing; but his excuse was that his hon. Friend the Member for Northallerton (Mr. G. W. Elliot), who was present in the House all last night with the view of giving the Committee his opinion upon this subject, had been unexpectedly called away by the sudden illness of his son, and, having no one else in the House to reply for him, had asked him (Mr. Gorst) if he would be kind enough to make a few observations that the hon. Gentleman himself would have made had he been present. The hon. Member had been good enough to hand to him (Mr. Gorst) the notes of the speech that he had wished to make. He would use those notes; but he was quite sure the Committee would lose by not having a personal expression of the local knowledge and the local feeling of the hon. Member for Northallerton himself on this occasion. Most of the facts the hon. Member had wished to bring under the notice of the Committee had already been stated by the hon. Member for Richmond (Mr. Dundas) and the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board; and he (Mr. Gorst) did not know whether he ought to take up the time of the Committee by repeating what they had said. It had been admitted by the hon. Member for Richmond that Northallerton was by far a more central point than Richmond.

MR. DUNDAS: No; I said it was the centre of the North Riding, but not of this division.

MR. GORST said, he knew enough about the railway geography of this district to know that Richmond was a *cul de sac;* whereas Northallerton was a great railway junction through which important lines ran. It was admitted that Northallerton was a place for the Yorkshire Registry of Deeds, and that the Sessions were held there. The hon. Member for Richmond had said that it was not the county town of the Riding.

MR. DUNDAS: I did not.

MR. GORST said, that if he were inaccurate in his statements, this was one of the disadvantages which must be attributed to the absence of the hon. Member for Northallerton, and which the Committee, he was sure, would

be indulgent enough to excuse. The hon. Member for Northallerton had every local knowledge; whereas his (Mr. Gorst's) knowledge of the district was extremely limited. He had, however, understood the hon. Member (Mr. Dundas) to say that Northallerton was not the county town. At any rate, it was the place where the Quarter Sessions were held; and, that being so, it certainly looked as though it were the county town of the Riding. It was also, he was told, the headquarters of the Constabulary, and the place which the Commissioners, after sitting and taking evidence upon the subject, had come to the conclusion was the most suitable to select to give its name to the division. It was clear, therefore, that there was a great deal to be said in favour of the retention of the name of Northallerton. He was rather surprised that the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill did not defend the decision of the Commissioners. He (Mr. Gorst) had been sitting here during the greater part of these discussions, and throughout he had observed that the right hon. Baronet had defended the Commissioners even when the Committee was disposed to take a view of its own against them. He (Mr. Gorst) had been in hopes that his task would have been rendered a great deal more easy by the right hon. Baronet on this occasion taking the course he had adopted on other occasions. There seemed, however, to be a feeling behind the right hon. Baronet in favour of the name of Richmond, on account of which he was ready to throw over the opinion of his Commissioners. He (Mr. Gorst) trusted that the Committee and the Government would not throw over these gentlemen, but would back their opinion, unless some reason of an overwhelming character were alleged to the contrary. Everybody knew that these questions of name were not vital questions. He was not at all sure that the names they were discussing at such length in the Committee, and settling so elaborately, would be the ultimate names by which these divisions would be known, because the people had an odd way of giving what names they thought proper to everything, and of using those names in spite of Acts of Parliament, or the rules and regulations of Committees. Therefore, it was not the actual phraseology of the Act of Parliament, but the usages which would spring up hereafter, which would determine whether the division was to be called "North" or "South," or after this or that place. The matter was not of very great importance; but, so far as he was able to understand the question—and he was quite impartial in the matter—it certainly seemed to him that it would be more advantageous to take the name of Northallerton than that of Richmond. People talked about the ancient character of the one name against the other—about one being better known than the other. Well, he confessed that the name of "Northallerton" was a name which every child who read English history was familiar with, as that of a place where an important battle was fought between England and Scotland. That most of them were familiar with the name of Richmond as a town was true; but he thought that the name was known mostly in its connection with persons who had taken titles from it.

Mr. ARTHUR PEASE said, he was sure they all regretted the absence of the hon. Member for Northallerton (Mr. G. W. Elliot), and of the hon. Baronet the Member for the North Riding (Sir Frederick Milbank), through indisposition. The hon. Baronet to whom he referred was strongly in favour of the substitution of the name of "Richmond" for "Northallerton." The hon. and learned Member who opposed the Amenment (Mr. Gorst), from his remarks, seemed hardly to fully appreciate the geographical position of the town. There could be no doubt that Richmond was the centre of the divison. Some allusion had been made to the inconvenience of its position through its being at the end of a line of railway. They had not now to decide the polling places, or the place to which the ballot boxes were to be taken on the occasion of an election. But on that point there could be no doubt that the boxes could be more rapidly taken to Richmond than to Northallerton. He wished to support the statement of the hon. Member for Richmond, that there was a very strong feeling on this subject in the locality on the question, and that if the name "Northallerton" were retained in preference to "Richmond" great dissappointment would be felt.

Mr. DUNDAS said, he was thoroughly familiar with the district in question,

being Chairman of Quarter Sessions. He trusted the Committee would give effect to the expression of opinion which had been elicited in favour of changing the name of the division.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 73; Noes 113: Majority 40.—(Div. List, No. 105.)

Question, "That 'Richmond' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to*.

MR. WARTON said, that before they left this division he should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill whether a point-of-the-compass name could not be added in this case.?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he did not think that could be done in this case, which referred to a division of a Riding; and, moreover, Richmond was one of the merged boroughs.

MR. RAIKES said, he had now to move an Amendment which, if not of great importance, had an interesting peculiarity. It was proposed to leave out the name of an electoral division contemplated in the Bill, which he would undertake to say no one outside the East Riding of Yorkshire had ever heard of before this Bill was introduced, and which very few in it knew anything about. It was a name of some antiquity; but was only one of three Petty Sessional divisions combined in this particular electoral circumscription. The three Petty Sessional divisions were those of Dickering, Bainton Beacon, and Buckrose—Buckrose had been chosen as the name of a division—and why the Commissioners had hit upon it in preference to the equally-as-little-known places Dickering and Bainton Beacon he could not say. All three were equally known, or equally unknown, to fame; but the other divisions—those in the North Riding—were places extremely well known. He referred to such places as Thirsk, Richmond, Cleveland, and Whitby. Probably the Commissioners thought they had chosen such remarkably good names for the North Riding that, on the strength of those, they could take less important names in other divisions. The hon. Member for the East Riding (Mr. Sykes) it was said was likely to become a candidate for the division of "Buckrose;" therefore, perhaps, he had had something to do with the choosing of the title. At all events, his hon. Friend had, he believed, a preference for it. He (Mr. Raikes) would have been glad to have respected the hon. Member's preference, were it not that they were put in this position. They might indulge in an extremely absurd name where there was an alternative; but in regard to Yorkshire, it had been agreed, generally, that the alternatives of North, South, East, and West were practically impossible, the number of divisions being too large for their adoption. If the division in question could have been styled "The Northern or Buckrose Division" of the East Riding, there would not have been so much to object to, for in that case "Buckrose" would never have been unearthed. The Member returned by the division would have been known as the Member for the Northern Division of the East Riding. But as there was to be no point-of-the-compass name taken in this case, and as the division was to have fixed to it a local title, the title chosen should be one well known and recognized. He would defy any hon. Member to have formed an opinion, before this Bill appeared, as to whether a Gentleman to be returned in the future as "the Member for Buckrose" came from Suffolk, Lincolnshire, or Lancashire. As the first object they had in giving a name was to indicate something, as there was nothing indicated in "Buckrose," and as it would be better to take a name that would, at all events, have something like an idea in it, he would propose that "Bridlington" should be substituted for "Buckrose." There were other towns in the division—Driffield, and several more—but they were small places. "Bridlington," he thought, a good name, although he was not particularly devoted to it. He would be willing to substitute "Flamborough," which would be, to a certain extent, a distinguished name in connection with the well-known promontory of "Flamborough Head." If this latter proposal met with the approval of the right hon. Baronet, he should be glad to alter his Amendment accordingly. At any rate, he felt compelled to enter a protest against the *reductio ad absurdum* in which they were involved, owing to the passion for local nomenclature which seemed to possess those in charge of the Bill.

Amendment proposed,

In page 83, line 26, to leave out the word "Buckrose," in order to insert the word "Bridlington,"—(*Mr. Raikes,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'Buckrose' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he believed this was a deep-laid design on the part of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Raikes) to provoke a speech from the hon. Gentleman the senior Member for the East Riding (Mr. Sykes). That hon. Member might be expected to have preference for a sea coast name such as "Flamborough Head," seeing that one of his first acts in the House had been to bring forward a Bill for the preservation of sea birds, and that there were plenty of sea birds in the neighbourhood of Flamborough Head.

MR. SYKES said, he would explain why he earnestly hoped the Committee would not reverse the decision of the Commissioners in this matter. Buckrose was neither an absurd nor an obscure name. To all who were acquainted with the history of Yorkshire, Buckrose was a very familiar name, and one of which there was no need to be ashamed. The town of Bridlington, for which he had the greatest respect, and which he had represented for many years in the House, lay at the extreme edge of the proposed constituency. The Wapentake of Buckrose was almost coterminous with the proposed constituency; and he sincerely hoped the Committee would not interfere with the proposal of the Bill.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Amendment *negatived.*

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would here move the Amendment of the hon. Baronet the Member for York (Sir Frederick Milner), who, as it had been stated, was prevented by indisposition from being in his place.

Amendment proposed,

In page 83, line 33, after "Ouse and Derwent," insert "except so much as is included in the municipal borough of York, by virtue of 'The York Extension and Improvement Act, 1884.'"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

On the Motion of SIR CHARLES W. DILKE, the following Amendment made: —In page 84, line 4, leave out the word "six" in each case, and insert "five."

SIR MATTHEW WILSON said, he wished to move to insert at the end of line 8, on page 84, the words "Hazlewood with Storiths and Beamsley." He had presented a Petition from these small townships, possessing 388 inhabitants, praying very earnestly to be added to the division of Skipton. In old times they were included in the parish of Skipton, They were in the Skipton Poor Law Union, in the Skipton Petty Sessional Division, and Skipton was their market town. He had spoken to the Commissioners on this subject, and had ascertained that if they had had the power they would have had no objection whatever to include these small townships in the proposed division of Skipton. He hoped the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill would be kind enough to take this proposal into his favourable consideration. Perhaps, on Report, he would include these townships. As he had said, it was only because they had not the power that the Commissioners had not done it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. Baronet move his Amendment?

SIR MATTHEW WILSON: No, Sir.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would consider the matter before the Report. The question was a trifling one. If there were not a universal opinion against this alteration being made, the Commissioners would not oppose it. The change had not been made, because the Commissioners had regarded the Northern Division of the West Riding as a separate county in itself. There might be reasons why the alteration should not be made; but if there was a universal opinion in favour of it, no doubt it would be effected.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he supposed this district would be included in the Eastern Division, on account of its being on the Eastern side of the river. Skipton was its natural market town, and it had more intercourse with that town than any other.

MR. HEALY said, they had just such a case as this in Waterford, and he hoped the right hon. Baronet would consider that also.

[*Fourteenth Night.*]

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would consider that case when they came to it.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON said, he had an Amendment to move in page 84, line 29 in the Bill, to insert the name of "Batley" in the place of "Morley," so that the southern part of the West Riding Division should be called the "Batley Division" instead of the "Morley Division." He said that the Boundary Commissioners in 1867 divided the extensive parish of Batley into two parts—placing the town of Batley within the Parliamentary borough of Dewsbury, and throwing the other part of the municipal borough and the parish into the present county division. The proposed new division, under the present Bill, was made up entirely, or nearly so, of the parish, and of that portion of the municipal borough of Batley which was not within the Parliamentary borough of Dewsbury; and Morley, which the Commissioners proposed as the designation of the new division, was a town of 15,000 population, situate almost at the extreme end. It would be out of the question to work the election there; while the town of Batley, with its Corporation and separate magistracy, was at a central point of the district, with its line of railways running through and from it to all parts. It was a town of great and growing importance, having an extensive trade with all parts of the world. Its population in 1881 was 27,508; and he might safely say that, according to the rate at which it had hitherto increased, it would not be less now than 30,000. Yet this important town, with its great and growing trade and population, and a central town of the district, it was proposed to ignore, and to pass over in favour of Morley, with only half its population, and situated, as he had said, at an extreme point. In the town of Batley there was an excellent Grammar School, and the people of Morley sent their children there to be educated. Surely, then, as between the two towns, there was no comparison as to which should give the name to the new division. But it was said that the town of Batley was not in the county, but within the Parliamentary borough of Dewsbury. If that was a question of representation, there might be something in the objection. But it was not a question of representation, but a question of name — which town should give the name to the division—the town which was identical in name with the area or parish that was to form the new division, or a town of half the population and of less importance, which happened to be situated in a corner of it. He had no intention of saying anything in detraction of Morley; but, in his view, the claims of Batley were beyond all comparison stronger than those of Morley. Adjacent to Batley was a succession of townships all engaged in the same or in similar branches of the same industry—namely, the heavy woollen trade. There was constant communication going on between them. Their population was of the same urban character; they formed almost one community. The population of these places, together with that portion of the population of Batley which was outside of the Parliamentary borough of Dewsbury, amounted to something over 44,000. In fact, they constituted the greater portion of the population of the new division. Some of those adjacent places had petitioned in favour of the claim of Batley to the designation, and he had not heard of any who were against it. On the score of population, therefore, he thought that it would be carrying out the spirit of the Instructions to the Commissioners to give the preference to Batley. But, independently of that, he ventured to say that, on the ground that the new division was really and substantially part of the municipal borough or the parish of Batley—["No!"]—not the town of Batley itself, Batley should be the name given to it. Morley was merely a part, and a very small part, of it. Was the part to absorb and be greater than the whole? or were they to act upon the axiom that the "whole is greater than the part?" The Instructions to the Commissioners were that, among other things—population, and so forth—they were to take into account considerations of area. It became a question whether, under all the circumstances, the new division should not be called by the name of the area which comprised it, and which was part of the municipal borough and parish of Batley, rather than by the name of a small town situated within it. He trusted that his right hon. Friend the President of the Local Government Board (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would see, and that the Committee also would

see, the reasonableness of his contention; and, looking at the lateness of the hour (20 minutes to 6 o'clock), and to the fact that one or two Friends of his who were familiar with the districts in question would address a word or two to the Committee, he would conclude his remarks by moving the Amendment of which he had given Notice, to which he hoped his right hon. Friend would give his assent.

Amendment proposed, in page 84, line 29, to leave out the word "Morley," in order to insert the word "Batley,"—(*Mr. Serjeant Simon,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'Morley' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Serjeant Simon) had stated the whole case fully and fairly. The part of the town of Batley in the borough of Dewsbury contained 25,589 people; whilst that part outside Dewsbury contained 1,916; therefore the greater part of Batley was in the borough of Dewsbury, and the question would seem to be not whether the name "Morley" should give place to "Batley," but whether the name "Dewsbury" should not be changed. He could not accept the Amendment, but would leave it in the hands of the Committee.

MR. E. A. LEATHAM said, he was of opinion that the town of Batley had been very badly treated. In 1867, when it was put in the borough of Dewsbury, it was told that another Reform Bill would be brought forward before very long, and that then matters would be put right. But, instead of putting matters right, the Government, in this Bill, were doing the very reverse, and were heaping fresh indignities on the town. The parish of Batley had been turned into an electoral district; but it was to go not under its own name, but under that of a large manufacturing village situated somewhere in the parish. He trusted that the Committee would avail itself of this opportunity of removing what was by no means a sentimental grievance.

MR. MACKIE said, he knew the district in question very well, and could only say that he concurred in everything that had been said with regard to it by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon). He trusted the Committee would decide to confer upon the district the name of "Batley."

MR. WARTON said, that, owing to the lateness of the hour, hon. Members wished to hurry on the decision of this matter without having given the Committee sufficient time to properly consider the facts of the case. So far as he was concerned, he was not going to abate one jot the amount of discussion he considered Amendments of this kind deserved. He was going to do justice to Morley. He did not scruple to say——

It being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to report Progress; Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at ten minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 16th April, 1885.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Federal Council of Australasia (69); Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Orders* (70); Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 2)* (71); Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 3)* (72).

Report—Tramways (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 1)* (34); Elections (Hours of Poll)* (43); Educational Endowments (Ireland)* (44).

Third Reading—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Labourers Act) (No. 1)* (35); Municipal Voters (Relief)* (39); Army (Annual)* (62), and *passed.*

DEFENCES OF THE EMPIRE—DEFENCE OF THE COALING STATIONS.

QUESTION.

VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH asked, If the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies could lay on the Table of House the Correspondence with the Colonies in respect to the defence of coaling stations?

THE EARL OF DERBY, in reply, suggested that the noble Viscount should take the opportunity, which the Government would be happy to afford him, of looking through the Papers before they were produced. He was inclined to think that there some were of them which, in

the circumstances of the present moment, it would not be in the interest of the Public Service to make public.

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—ADVANCE OF THE RUSSIANS—THE NEGOTIATIONS.

QUESTION.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: As I do not see the noble Earl the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in his place, I wish to ask the noble Earl the Colonial Secretary whether he is able to give any information as to the progress of the communications with the Court of St. Petersburg, in respect of which there are many rumours abroad? Any information which the noble Earl can give will be very gratefully received by the House.

THE EARL OF DERBY: My noble Friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs will be in his place at the usual time; but, meanwhile, I am not in a position to give the information for which the noble Marquess asks. The progress of the negotiations, so far as I am aware, is only known to those responsible for the Department.

LORD ELLENBOROUGH: It is the usual time now.

Afterwards,

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said: May I ask the noble Earl the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, who is now present, whether he is able to give us any information with respect to the condition of communications between this Court and that of St. Petersburg, as there are many rumours about, and great anxiety is felt, on the subject?

EARL GRANVILLE: We have not yet received the official reply from the Russian Government, nor have we received from Sir Peter Lumsden his reply to the queries we have addressed to him on the statement of fact and the statement made by the Russian General. Sir Edward Thornton, our Ambassador at St. Petersburg, informs me that it is not likely that the Russian Government will receive for a few days any answer to the questions which have been put to their General. Naturally, in these critical times, I have had frequent communications with the Russian Ambassador; but no official communications have passed between us except as to matters of fact.

EARL STANHOPE: Would the noble Earl inform the House when the reply of Sir Peter Lumsden is likely to arrive?

EARL GRANVILLE: I am afraid I cannot fix a date. We have telegraphed, and I am sure he will reply as early as he can.

LORD ELLENBOROUGH: May I ask whether the Government have ascertained the fact that it only requires one day from Penjdeh to Merv, and from thence there is a telegraph direct to St. Petersburg? It is stated in the best mediums of information that such is the case. Can the Government say whether it is so or not?

EARL GRANVILLE: I think it takes six or seven days. The last telegram, I am informed, was dated on the 6th or 7th.

THE EARL OF JERSEY: I presume it is incorrect that Her Majesty's Government, as stated in the newspapers, have agreed to give up Penjdeh to Russia?

EARL GRANVILLE: I must really decline to make a statement as to the unauthorized and nearly always inaccurate accounts of the proceedings of the Government upon those difficult questions.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF AUSTRALASIA BILL.

BILL PRESENTED. FIRST READING.

THE EARL OF DERBY, in presenting a Bill to constitute a Federal Council of Australasia, said, he believed it would be more convenient to their Lordships if he were to make a statement with respect to it on the Motion for the second reading. He supposed there would be no objection to the Bill being read a first time, and he would be prepared to move the second reading on Tuesday next.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, that was rather short Notice. Would the noble Earl say Thursday or Friday?

THE EARL OF DERBY: Yes, certainly.

Bill to constitute a Federal Council of Australasia—*Presented* (The Earl of DERBY); read 1ª. (No. 69.)

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 16th April, 1885.

[MINUTES.]—Private Bill (*by Order*) — *Second Reading*—Manchester, Middleton, and District Tramways.*

Public Bills—*Committee*—Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) (*re-comm.*) [49]—R.P. [*Fifteenth Night.*]

Committee—Report—Egyptian Loan [122].

QUESTIONS.

—o—

ORDER—SELECT COMMITTEES—ATTENDANCE OF MEMBERS.

Mr. SEXTON: I wish, Sir, to ask your ruling on a point of Order in reference to an entry which appears upon the Votes and Proceedings of the House for Tuesday last. Shall I be in Order in bringing forward the matter now?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member can state the point of Order now.

Mr. SEXTON: I find this entry—No. 19—in the Votes of Tuesday—

"Railway Bills (Group 4)—Mr. Wyndham *reported* from the Committee on Group 4 of Railway Bills, That Dr. Cameron and Mr. Kenny, two of the Members of the said Committee, were not present within one hour after the time appointed for the meeting of the Committee this day.

"*Ordered*, That Dr. Cameron and Mr. Kenny do attend the Committee on Group 4 of Railway Bills To-morrow, at Twelve of the clock."

The Chairman of the Committee further reported that, in the absence of a quorum, the Committee had adjourned until the next day at 12 o'clock. My hon. Friend the Member for Ennis (Mr. Kenny), referred to in this Order, has informed me that he only received a notification that he would be required to attend during a certain week, but that he had received no intimation of the day and hour when he would be required. Under these circumstances, I wish to know whether this entry, which may seem to imply censure upon my hon. Friend, should be allowed to remain, seeing that it was through the neglect of the official whose duty it was to send such a notification, and not through any fault of his own, that my hon. Friend did not attend at the hour appointed for the meeting of the Committee?

Mr. SPEAKER: The proper course will be to communicate with the Chairman of Committees, who, no doubt, will put the matter right. It is clear, as it appears to me, that the hon. Member for Ennis (Mr. Kenny) should have been informed of the meeting of the Committee.

Mr. SEXTON: Then I presume that, in the absence of any such notification, no censure upon my hon. Friend will be implied?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is so.

POOR LAW (METROPOLIS)—PAUPER MARRIED COUPLES.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON asked the President of the Local Government Board, If he could state how many of the Boards of Guardians in the Metropolis have complied with, or are making arrangements for meeting, the requirements of sec. 23, 10 and 11 Vic. c. 109, relating to the accommodation of old married couples in receipt of in-door relief; and, if he would specially direct the attention of those Boards which have hitherto ignored this provision of the Law to the necessity of compliance with it?

Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL: There are 16 Unions in which separate accommodation is at present provided in the workhouse for the purpose of compliance with the Act referred to. There are eight Unions in which additional workhouse buildings are either in course of erection or about to be erected; and when these buildings are completed the Guardians will be in a position to make such provision. In the remaining six Unions no such accommodation is at present provided; but as regards two of these Unions, we are informed that it will be provided at once when found necessary. In one of these cases it is stated that, on more than one occasion, inquiry has shown that the inmates have no desire for such accommodation. In two other Unions accommodation was formerly provided, but is no longer used for the purpose, in consequence of the inmates not desiring to avail themselves of it. In the other two cases we understand that the subject of providing such accommodation is under the consideration of the Guardians. If it should appear to be necessary for the Board to intervene in any particular case they will not fail to do so.

PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—SLIGO HARBOUR BOARD.

MR. SEXTON asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the Lords of the Treasury have considered a Memorial addressed to them, on the 14th of January last, by the Sligo Harbour Board, praying that the period fixed for commencing the repayment of the principal of the Treasury loan of £20,000 to them may be deferred; that the term of years in which repayment is to made may be extended; and that the rate of interest charged may be reduced to the lowest practicable terms, in accordance with the recommendation made in the Report of the Select Committee on Harbour Accommodation; whether it appears from the Memorial, and from other information in the possession of the Treasury, that the Board have expended the full amount of the loan in deepening the channel, dredging for deep-water berths, improving the berthage at present quays, and other works of urgent necessity; that very considerable progress has been made with these works; that, owing to the failure of the contractors to execute their contract, the Harbour Board have been obliged to undertake the completion of the works with their own staff and plant; and that, as no improvement in revenue can result from the works until they are completed, and as the existing terms of the loan would necessitate the payment of £1,700 a-year, out of a revenue of only about £6,000, which barely allows the requisite margin for prosecuting the works, the Board will be constrained to abandon the effort to complete the works in which they are now engaged, and to give up the hope of improving the portal revenue, unless the Treasury terms are relaxed; and, whether the Treasury will grant the terms prayed for in the Memorial of the Board?

MR. HIBBERT: I understand that the Sligo Harbour works will be inspected to-day at low water spring tides. The Board of Works hope to be able to make their Report to the Treasury in about 10 days' time, and it will be dealt with here without delay. With reference to the Question of which the hon. Member has given Notice for to-morrow, I may say that the sole object of the engineer's visit is to enable the Treasury to decide on the questions raised in the Memorial, not to interfere with the Harbour Commissioners in the discharge of their duties; and, this being so, it would not be right to incur the expense of engaging a special engineer to report as the Question appears to suggest.

NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS' (IRELAND) ACT, 1875—WORKHOUSE TEACHERS.

MR. HEALY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, During 1884 how many Boards of Guardians in Ireland, under the 12th Clause of the Teachers' Act of 1875, voted the results fees earned by Workhouse Teachers, and how many withheld such fees; what was the amount of results fees earned by Workhouse Teachers during that period, and how much was paid to them; and, have Workhouse Teachers set forth their grievances on this subject to the Chief Secretary and to the Local Government Board, and is it the intention of the Government to make such provision in the Bill now before the House as shall secure the results fees accruing to them?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Thirty-three Boards of Guardians voted the results fees earned by teachers in 1884, and the amount so voted was £704. Where application for them is not made by the Guardians, the Education Department do not calculate the amount. I cannot hold out any prospect of the introduction into the Education Bill of such a provision as is suggested in the Question; but the Government would be glad to see all Boards of Guardians make arrangements by which a part of the incomes of workhouse teachers should be derived from results payments, as in the case of ordinary National school teachers. It must be remembered that workhouse teachers have advantages which teachers of other National schools have not. In addition to their salaries, they are provided by the Guardians with apartments, rations, fuel, and light.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS—ESTIMATED COST.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR asked the Secretary to the Treasury, To lay upon the Table of the House such

an explanatory Memorandum as will show the variations between the estimated and actual cost of various public buildings, such as the India, Foreign, Home, and Colonial Offices, Natural History Museum, and Law Courts; the amount expended in alterations, additions, improvements, and to remedy defects in original cost, to be stated?

MR. HIBBERT: My hon. and gallant Friend will find the actual and estimated cost of the Natural History Museum stated at page 55 of the Appropriation Accounts for 1883-4; and that of the Royal Courts of Justice at page 14 of the same volume. I can, if it be thought necessary, ascertain and communicate to the House the actual and estimated cost of the Foreign Office and of the Home Office block; and I can ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can supply similar figures for the India Office. I am afraid it would, for many reasons, be impossible to give the further details which the Question seems to suggest.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—ELECTION OF GUARDIANS—MONAGHAN UNION—MR. WILLIAM ANCKETILL.

MR. HEALY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he will make inquiries into the threats used at the recent Poor Law election, by Mr. William Ancketill, in Monaghan Union, where he was a defeated candidate, against any tenants who voted against him; will the police make inquiries amongst his tenants with a view to a prosecution under the Crimes Act; has Mr. Ancketill, in consequence of the votes given against him, served over eighty processes for rent upon hostile voters; have these been confined to the tenants of the contested division; is this the same Mr. William Ancketill who was deprived of the Commission of the Peace for cruelty; and, what action do the Government intend to take to prevent intimidation at these elections, which for years has been made the subject of questions and debate in this House?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No complaints have been made to Government or to the police by any persons as to threats being made use of towards them by Mr. Ancketill, and it is not proposed to make inquiries as suggested in the Question. Mr. Ancketill, who, I believe, was removed from the Commission of the Peace, is understood to have issued several processes against his tenants; but his doing so is not a breach of the law. It has been frequently stated that the Government will not use the Crimes Act in connection with Poor Law elections. Parties on both sides frequently complain of intimidation; but the true remedy for such proceedings, in the opinion of the Government, is the ballot, a proposal for the use of which in Poor Law elections is at present before Parliament.

POST OFFICE—THE IRISH MAILS.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Postmaster General, Whether it is a fact that for some months past the English day mails for Belfast and the North of Ireland have arrived regularly at the Amiens Street Terminus, Dublin, before 7 a.m. and frequently before 6.45 a.m. and have had to remain there awaiting the departure of the Limited Mail train to Belfast, which is not due to leave Dublin until 7.45 a.m.; whether he can state the number of occasions from the 1st of January until the 31st ultimo on which these mails arrived at the Dublin Terminus between 7 a.m. and 7.15 a.m., and between 7.15 a.m. and 7.30 a.m., and what time are they due (officially) at the Railway Station to be forwarded by the train which leaves at 7.45 a.m.; and, whether, if true that the mails arrive regularly before 7 a.m., additional facilities could be made, through an agreement with the Great Northern Railway Company, for an earlier despatch from Dublin, and thus effect an earlier delivery in Belfast and the North of Ireland generally?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: A margin of 38 minutes is allowed in Dublin between the arrival of the night mail from England and the departure of the day mail to Belfast—that is to say, when time is strictly kept, the mails for the Belfast line are lodged at Amiens Street Station by 7.7 a.m., while the time fixed for the departure of the train is 7.45 a.m. During the three months referred to in the Question of the hon. Member, the mail reached Amiens Street Station 19 times before 7 a.m., 20 times between 7 a.m. and 7.15 a.m., and 21 times between 7.15 a.m. and 7.30 a.m.; but still I am by no means satisfied that an earlier hour than at present could safely

be fixed for the departure of the train. I may mention that during the same period there were four failures of the connection altogether, even with the departure fixed at 7.45 a.m.; while if the departure had been at 7.30 a.m. instead of 7.45 a.m., there would have been 10 failures; and if at 7.15 a.m., instead of 7.45 a.m., there would have been 17 failures. The Question is not an easy one to decide; but as some alteration will become necessary in October next in connection with a somewhat earlier arrival of the English mail in Dublin which is arranged for that date, it shall, at the same time, be considered whether any reduction of the margin of 38 minutes can safely be effected.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—MR. MATHEWS, POSTMASTER OF BALLYMENA.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Postmaster General, Whether his attention has been officially directed to the statement of Mr. Hugh Rainey, junior, a member of the Ballymena Town Commissioners, made at a meeting of that body held on the 31st ultimo, a report of which appears in the Belfast *Morning News* of the 1st instant, to the effect that the clerk to that body, a Mr. Mathews, who is also Postmaster of Ballymena, holds nineteen distinct appointments, viz. High Constable, Postmaster, Town Clerk, Clerk to the Burial Board, Executive Sanitary Authority Officer of Ballymena, Clerk of Union, District Registrar of Marriages, Secretary to the Ballymena and Harryville Gaslight Company, Secretary to the International Schools, Clerk to the Town Court, Receiver for Copy of Valuations, Registrar to Burial Board, Reviser of Voters' List, Reviser of Jurors' List, Presiding Officer at Town Commissioners' Elections, Insurance Agent, Returning Officer at Elections of Poor Law Guardians, Clerk to Lunatic Board, and Executive Officer for Rural Sanitary Authority; whether it is consistent with the duties of a provincial postmaster, and in keeping with the rules of the Post Office Service, that Mr. Mathews should hold other appointments in addition to that of postmaster; how many hours per day are provincial postmasters supposed to spend in their offices, and how many has Mr. Mathews been in the habit of spending in his; whether or not he has utilised the Post Office as a convenience in respect of his other appointments; and, whether these have been conferred upon him in respect of political services?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: The Postmaster at Ballymena, as in the case of all holders of small post offices, is not an established officer of the Department, and is not, therefore, bound to give his whole time to Post Office work. No complaint has reached me as to the manner in which Mr. Mathews performs his duties; and I do not consider it necessary, therefore, to inquire as to his other appointments.

CUSTOMS—GALWAY DOCKS.

COLONEL NOLAN asked the Secretary to the Treasury, If, in the month of March, ships in Galway dock are only allowed to discharge between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m. just six hours shorter than between sunrise and sunset (5.37-6.31); if, on Easter Monday and other days during which every vessel discharges, the Custom House officials, for their own individual profit, are allowed to levy rates, sometimes exceeding a shilling a ton, even on non-excisable articles; and, if it is a fact that for very many years no smuggling of any kind has been carried on in the port of Galway, and shipowners discharging there are not entitled to work free of cost between sunrise and sunset?

MR. HIBBERT: Ships in Galway Docks are in March allowed to discharge free goods from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. If they discharge before or after these hours, the officers are entitled to payments for overtime on a scale fixed by the Board of Customs. On Easter Monday and other statutory holidays the officers are entitled to receive payment from the merchant for attendance; but on no occasion of any kind are they allowed to levy any charge on goods landed, except the statutory duties. For some years previous to 1884 no smuggling had been detected at Galway; but in that year five seizures were made.

THE WEST INDIA ISLANDS—COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

MR. A. M'ARTHUR asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether he will inform the House what is the present state of the negotiations

r the improvement of commercial in-rcourse between the West India lands and the United States and nada?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: ull information respecting the negotia-ons for improving commercial inter-urse between the British West India olonies and the United States will be und in the Parliamentary Paper Com-ercial No. 4, 1885. As stated at page 2 of those Papers, Her Majesty's Go-ernment does not abandon the hope of ming to an agreement, and they are communication with Her Majesty's inister at Washington on the subject. here have been no negotiations with spect to Canada.

TATE OF IRELAND—POLICE PROTEC-TION TO REV. FRANCIS DOPPING, COLUMBKILL, CO. LONGFORD.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY asked the hief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant Ireland, Whether it is a fact that the ev. Francis Dopping, a Protestant ergyman, who has had for some time olice protection in Columbkill, county ongford, is always accompanied by two olicemen, while one other is stationed his lodge; whether, in addition to is police protection, to which no one the county objects, there is also a arade of four policemen armed with evolvers, every Sunday, at the hours of ivine Service, on the roads which this entleman has to pass; whether he has ver been insulted or molested during l this time; whether this part of the ounty is not entirely free from crime r outrage of any kind; and, whether, nder the circumstances, the parade of ne four policemen with revolvers on unday is necessary?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: he protection which is afforded to the ev. gentleman named, which is more r less accurately described in this uestion, is believed by those who are esponsible for his safety to be abso-utely necessary.

NLAND REVENUE—THE INCOME TAX —HALF-YEARLY PAYMENTS.

MR. E. STANHOPE asked Mr. Chan-ellor of the Exchequer, Whether, in he event of the financial requirements f the Country necessitating a further ddition to the Income Tax, he will consider the great relief which would be afforded to the taxpayer by reverting to the old practice of allowing the tax to be paid in half-yearly instalments?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHE-QUER (Mr. CHILDERS): In reply to the hon. Gentleman, I have to say that at present a large amount of Income Tax is paid for the whole of the financial year during its last quarter. Except at a cost to the Revenue of several millions, half that payment could not be post-poned until the following financial year; and I have not heard that any payers of Income Tax would wish to pay half their tax six months earlier. I cannot, there-fore, give any encouragement to the proposal.

RAILWAYS (INDIA)—THE QUETTA RAILWAY.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS asked the Under Secretary of State for India, What progress has now been made in the Railway from Sibi in the direction of Candahar, the works upon which Railway were suspended in 1880-81, ac-cording to the Report upon Railways in India for that year; and, when the works were recommenced?

MR. J. K. CROSS: No particulars in addition to those communicated to the House on March 12 have yet been re-ceived from the Government of India concerning the progress on the Quetta Railway; but we know that the works are being vigorously prosecuted, and they may be completed at an earlier period than was then anticipated. They were recommenced in May of last year.

NAVY—PURCHASE OF MERCHANT STEAMERS.

SIR JOHN HAY asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, If he will state to the House the names and prices of the vessels of the Navies of other Powers and of the Mercantile Marine of this and of other Countries which it has been deemed necessary to acquire for the Navy since the introduction of the Navy Estimates; and, whether this change of policy is in consequence of the insuffi-ciency of the Navy at present to protect our shores, colonies, and commerce?

SIR THOMAS BRASSEY: I regret that I cannot, consistently with the public interest, reply to the first part of the Question of my right hon. and gal-

lant Friend; in reply to the second part of his Question, I have to say that the policy of encouraging the construction of merchant steamers of a type suitable for conversion into cruisers has been consistently pursued by successive Boards of Admiralty, and has been the means of giving us a large reserve of fast and effective cruisers.

SIR JOHN HAY: I would further ask whether a Supplementary Estimate for the purchase of these ships will be laid on the Table; and also whether the Admiralty have been successful in obtaining the *Esmeralda?*

SIR THOMAS BRASSEY: A Supplementary Estimate will be laid upon the Table.

MR. STEWART MACLIVER asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, whether it was intended to put into commission the ships which had been so promptly made ready for sea with provisions and stores on board at the various naval ports?

SIR THOMAS BRASSEY: I can only state that the ships will certainly be commissioned as soon as the Government deem it necessary.

LAW AND JUSTICE — THE SENTENCE ON MRS. WELDON.

MR. W. J. CORBET asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he has received a memorial signed by nine of the jury in the recent trial of the Queen *v.* Georgina Weldon, in which they say—

"We are perfectly shocked at the sentence of six months' imprisonment passed upon the said Georgina Weldon after we had strongly recommended her to mercy;"

and, whether he will, under the circumstances, remit the sentence?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I have received the Memorial referred to, and it will be carefully considered.

CYPRUS—REPORTED REVENUE FRAUDS.

MR. GORST asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether Nos. 355, 356, and 357 of the Rules for Her Majesty's Colonial Service, relating to the duties of the Local Auditor, apply to the Island of Cyprus; whether the observance of these Rules by the Auditor of Cyprus would have rendered impossible the frauds recently committed by the revenue officials; and, whether any inquiry has been, or will be, instituted by Her Majesty's Government as to how the commission of these frauds became possible, without complicity or connivance on the part of the superiors of the guilty officials?

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY: The Colonial Regulations referred to apply to Cyprus. The frauds being all connected with the collection of so variable an amount as tithes, and most of them being not in the collection but in the assessment, and largely in collusion with the villagers, I am not prepared, on our present information, to say that the strictest observance of the Rules by the Auditor would have rendered the frauds impossible. There is no doubt that the method of assessment and collection of tithes in Cyprus is imperfect and obsolete, although it has been already much improved since the British occupation. The question, however, of superseding it by an entirely different system has been and still is under consideration by Her Majesty's Government. As to the question of inquiry, I may say that a searching investigation is now being made by the Receiver General, Mr. Swettenham, an officer of great Colonial experience, who has only recently been appointed to Cyprus. Until we receive further details as to the method and results of his action, the Secretary of State is unable to say whether anything more in the way of investigation is necessary. The Governor's attention, however, will be specially drawn to the points referred to in the hon. Member's Question.

REGISTRATION OF PARLIAMENTARY ELECTORS (IRELAND)—COST OF PREPARING LISTS.

MR. SHEIL asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he will advise that the cost of preparing the Parliamentary Voters List be a charge upon the Consolidated Fund, instead of on the poor rates?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: In Ireland, as in England, the cost referred to is a charge upon local rates. I am not aware of any intention to make any alteration in the law in this respect.

LAW AND JUSTICE—EX-POLICE INSPECTOR MINAHAN.

MR. SHEIL asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whe-

ther his attention has been called to the statement of Mr. Minahan, ex-police inspector of the T Division, a witness called for the prosecution of a Mrs. Jeffreys, of Chelsea,

"That he had reported to his superintendent respecting the defendant's houses, but was laughed at, and told he had better be careful what he was saying. He was laughed at for refusing to accept gold as a bribe;"

and, whether he has caused any steps to be taken towards ascertaining the truth of this statement?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he had made inquiry into this matter. He could not enter into all the details of the case; but, from the information he had received, he had reason to believe the statement was not true. If the hon. Member would care to see the Papers he would be glad to show them to him.

MR. SHEIL: Will the right hon. Gentleman lay them on the Table?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: No; I cannot do so.

MR. SHEIL said, he would put a further Question on the point.

RAILWAY RATES AND CHARGES BILLS.

MR. ROLLS asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether it is with his approval that the Railway Companies, instead of withdrawing the Rates and Charges Bills, intend to press the same on for Second Reading; and, whether he intends to oppose the Second Reading on behalf of Her Majesty's Government?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN, in reply, said, the Railway Companies had not consulted him as to the course to be taken in this matter. He had no information as to the course which they had determined to pursue; but if the Bills should come on for second reading, then, as he had said before, he would consider it to be his duty, on behalf of the Government, to oppose them.

BRITISH MUSEUM—LIGHTING AND HOURS OF OPENING.

MR. DANIEL GRANT asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he has arranged to provide the funds asked for by the Trustees of the British Museum, to enable them so to light the great national collection that it can remain open for the enjoyment of the public until 10 o'clock at night every week day throughout the year?

MR. MOLLOY had also the following Question on the Paper:—To ask the junior Member for Leeds, If he has now had an opportunity of consulting with the Treasury, in accordance with his promise to that effect, upon the subject of assisting the Trustees of the British Museum to open that institution to the working classes during the evening; and, if so, can he now state the result?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): I have to inform my hon. Friend, in answer to this Question, and also in reference to the Question which the hon. Member for King's County (Mr. Molloy) proposes to ask my hon. Friend the Junior Lord of the Treasury, that no application, so far as I am aware, has been recently made by the Trustees of the British Museum to light what he calls the "great national collection" until 10 o'clock on week days. In 1883 the Trustees applied for funds to light some of the Natural History Galleries at South Kensington, and they were informed that—

"Before their wish could be further considered it would be necessary that a complete Estimate should be laid before the Treasury of the cost it involved, not only in the erection of plant, machinery, &c., but in the permanent increase that must be apprehended in the charge for services and salaries."

They have not furnished us as yet with this information.

MR. DANIEL GRANT: Is it not a fact that the hon. Member for the University of London (Sir John Lubbock) last year stated that an Estimate had been made?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): I can only say that I have had the Treasury records carefully searched, and I can find no trace of such an Estimate.

AFGHANISTAN—ARREST OF AYOUB KHAN.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he can state the cause and the circumstances of the arrest of Ayoub Khan?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The residence of Ayoub Khan has been fixed at Teheran. Correspondence on the subject is contained in Asia, No. 1, 1884. Sir Ronald Thomson has re-

ported that special precautions have recently been thought necessary to prevent Ayoub's escape; but no information has been received of his arrest.

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—MR. JAMES ELLIS FRENCH.

MR. CALLAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is a fact that Colonel Bruce, the Inspector General of the Royal Irish Constabulary, held an inquiry in the Castle, Dublin, into certain charges preferred against his colleague, James Ellis French; whether the minutes of the evidence taken at that inquiry, which resulted in the said James Ellis French being officially informed by Colonel Bruce that he should "not return to his office till called upon to do so," in other words, that he was suspended from duty, were laid before the Officers of the Crown for advice and direction; whether it is a fact that District Inspector Bell, Athenry, in the course of his evidence at said inquiry made a statement with reference to charges made by his clerk against James E. French of solicitation to commit a felony; and, if so, whether Colonel Bruce took any and, if so, what steps to secure the evidence of the said police clerk; whether it is a fact that Mr. John Mallon, the Chief Superintendent of the Detective Department of the Metropolitan Police, received no instructions to prosecute any further inquiries into the said charges, and, if so, whether any further inquiries whatever into the said charges were made; and, if so, by whom ordered, and by whom made; and, whether it is a fact that Colonel Bruce, instead of directing the prosecution of further inquiry into the matters disclosed at said inquiry, arising from which J. E. French was suspended from duty, on the contrary warned the District Inspectors so examined to suppress all mention of the matter, and not to divulge the fact that such an inquiry had been held?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The answer to the first two paragraphs of this Question is in the affirmative. District Inspector Bell made a statement with reference to conduct of French towards a clerk which he regarded as suspicious; but there was no allegation whatever of solicitation to commit a felony. Colonel Bruce took immediate steps to procure the statement of the clerk, and it and the statements made by the officer at the inquiry were at once submitted by him in full to the Government. No instructions were immediately given to Mr. Mallon for a further inquiry, because, in the opinion of the Law Officers, the facts which had been then elicited did not constitute ground for an accusation of felonious conduct; but on the termination of the trial of Cornwall *v.* O'Brien, Mr. Mallon, as well as the other members of the Dublin Police Force, received instructions to make the most exhaustive inquiries, and prosecute all persons against whom evidence could be found. The inquiry held by Colonel Bruce was necessarily confidential, and those examined were so informed, as a matter of course; but, as I have previously stated, Colonel Bruce put the Government in immediate possession of all the information he acquired.

VISIT OF H.R.H. THE PRINCE AND PRINCESS OF WALES TO IRELAND—THE DISTURBANCE AT MALLOW.

MR. PARNELL asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, on the day previous to the passage of the Prince of Wales through Mallow, Mr. Purdon Coote, one of the Directors of the Great Southern and Western Railway, had an interview with Lord Spencer; whether, as a consequence of this interview, any, and, if so, what, instructions were issued to the Constabulary at Mallow, and to which officer of the Constabulary, by the Irish Executive; whether the resident magistrate, Mr. Butler, in charge of the peace at Mallow on the day in question, was informed of these instructions, or their nature, by the Executive; whether Mr. Purdon Coote satisfied Lord Spencer that he had been authorised by the Board of Directors of the Great Southern and Western Railway Company to make any application or representation to the Lord Lieutenant on their behalf; whether, before the people were removed by the Constabulary, any request for such action was made to Mr. Butler, resident magistrate, by Mr. Coote, and, if not, to what official was such request made; whether County Inspector Carr ordered the Police to charge the people in the railway station without the orders and without the knowledge of Mr. Butler, resident magistrate; whether

any warning was given to the people or request made to them to leave the station by any Government official before the Police drove them away; whether County Inspector Carr was intoxicated and unfit for duty to such an extent as to refuse to obey the orders of his superior officer, Mr. Butler, R.M., when Mr. Butler, on learning of the action of the Police, ordered County Inspector Carr to desist, but was refused obedience by the latter; whether the Police under County Inspector Carr, in addition to driving the people without notice from the railway station, beat them with their batons, pursued them amongst the cattle pens and on to the public roads; whether many of the people had return tickets from Cork and other places, and were legally entitled to shelter and accommodation from the company while waiting for their trains; and, whether a sworn inquiry, conducted by persons unconnected with the Constabulary, will be instituted by the Irish Executive into the conduct of County Inspector Carr and the Constabulary, and Carr suspended from duty pending this inquiry? I also wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he will give the name of the official from whom he has received the information he purposes giving to the House in regard to this affair?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: On the morning of the 13th instant Mr. Coote, a Director of the Railway Company, who had been deputed by the Company to represent them, had an interview with his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant. Instructions were sent to the Resident Magistrate and County Inspector of Constabulary to the effect that if the hon. Member for Mallow (Mr. O'Brien), who had publicly announced his intention to be present at Mallow Railway Station for the purpose of giving expression to his sentiments, wished to make any representation to the Prince of Wales he should be allowed to come to the platform with a few of his friends and communicate with His Royal Highness through the proper channel. Nothing, however, in the nature of a riotous disturbance was to be permitted. An intimation to this effect was made to the hon. Member, who, however, did not avail himself of the opportunity so given to him. It had been pre-arranged between Mr. Butler, Resident Magistrate, Mr. Coote, and Mr. Carr, the County Inspector, that on the departure of the Kerry train at 4 o'clock the platforms should be cleared of their occupants for the purpose of making preparations for the reception of the Royal Party. A number of persons, led by the hon. Members for Cork and Tipperary (Mr. Deasy and Mr. John O'Connor), had in the meantime arrived from Cork accompanied by bands, and taken up a position in the station. On the application of Mr. Coote to Mr. Carr a party of police were told off to clear the platforms. The party so detailed advanced and directed the people to leave the station. The greater proportion complied. Some, however, refused to do so, and these were removed. Mr. Carr positively denies that there is any ground whatever—and I do not know what authority the hon. Member can have—for the assertion that he was intoxicated, nor did he refuse to obey any orders of Mr. Butler. Some of the people who were on the arrival platform, when requested to leave, dispersed over the adjoining lines. The police had thus to follow them for the purpose of removing them from the Company's premises, and some had to be followed into cattle-pens for this purpose. In the very few individual cases where resistance was offered the police had recourse to their batons, using no more force than was necessary to overcome the resistance. I do not know whether any of these people had return tickets to Cork; but I am advised that the Railway Company, whose Director (Mr. Coote) had charge of the station, had a perfect right to make what arrangements they thought fit for admitting persons to the platform and keeping the station clear; and, in my opinion, they would have incurred great responsibility if they had not made such arrangements as they did. I see no cause whatever for a sworn inquiry. The information I have now received comes from the different Resident Magistrates, from Mr. Butler especially, and from County Inspector Carr.

MR. PARNELL: I wish to direct the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to the fact that he has not specifically answered certain portions of my Question. I asked him whether Mr. Coote satisfied Lord Spencer that he was authorized by the Board of Directors of the Great

Southern and Western Railway Company to make any application or representation to the Lord Lieutenant on their behalf. The right hon. Gentleman says that Mr. Coote was acting on behalf of the Company; but he has not replied to the part of the Question in which I specifically asked whether Mr. Coote satisfied the authorities that he had the authority of the Board of Directors before his action? I also asked him whether any request for action was made by Mr. Coote to Mr. Butler, the Resident magistrate; and, if not, by what official was that request made; and whether County Inspector Carr ordered the police to charge the people at the railway station without the orders or the knowledge of Mr. Butler? The right hon. Gentleman has asked me what authority I had for the allegations in the Question as to the condition of Inspector Carr. I wish to say that I made that statement with great reluctance, and that I made it on the authority of my two Colleagues.

MR. HEALY: Better authority than the police, anyhow. ["Order!"]

MR. PARNELL: I made the statement on the authority of the junior Member for Cork and the hon. Member for Mallow, who informed me that if the inquiry be given which they demand they will be in a position to prove this and other statements that have been made.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I will endeavour to answer the hon. Member's Question. Mr. Coote came to the Lord Lieutenant on the part of the Railway Company. I do not presume that the Lord Lieutenant demanded his credentials, or to see any written delegation on the part of the Directors; but I have no doubt that Mr. Coote did act on the part of the Directors of the Railway Company. Then the hon. Member asks me whether Mr. Coote made his request to Mr. Butler, or to whom he made it? I have said in my answer that he made it to County Inspector Carr; but it was in accordance with the pre-arrangement to which I have alluded, and to which the parties were Mr. Butler, Mr. Coote, and Mr. Carr. Then the hon. Member asks me another Question—whether Mr. Butler gave direct orders?

MR. PARNELL: Had any knowledge of the action of the police.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: He had knowledge of what the police were about to do, and he explains in his Report that one part of the proceedings took place on a platform which was separated from where he was by a train, and therefore he was not a positive eyewitness of what occurred in that particular part of the station. Otherwise he expresses no disapproval of anything that took place.

MR. DEASY: I beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman who it was gave notice to the people on the central platform from which they were about to be ejected that if they did not leave peacefully they would be brutally batoned by the police? I ask the Question because the statement which has been furnished to the right hon. Gentleman is absolutely false.

MR. M'COAN: I wish to ask whether the Messrs. O'Brien, Harrington, O'Connor, and Deasy, who are reported by the newspapers to be the leaders of these riotous and disloyal demonstrations at Mallow, Cork, and elsewhere, are identical with the persons of the same name who have sworn allegiance to the Queen, Her heirs, and successors, at the Table of this House?

MR. HEALY: I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman——

MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman has answered the Question in great detail, and I think that any further Question is unnecessary.

MR. HEALY: I rise to a point of Order. [*Cries of* "Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: Will the hon. Member state the point of Order?

MR. HEALY: I wish to ask you, Sir, whether it is admissible for an hon. Gentleman, under cover of a Question, to make a gross insinuation of perjury against a series of Members of this House? I wish to ask whether you, Sir, as Speaker of this House, will allow an imputation of that kind to be cast upon Members of this House?

MR. SPEAKER: Any imputation of that kind cast upon an hon. Member of this House would, in my opinion, be out of Order; and if the hon. Member had desired to put the Question on the Paper I would certainly have revised it.

PUBLIC HEALTH ACTS—MEDICAL OFFICER OF HEALTH, CHELTENHAM—APPOINTMENT OF MR. ROCH.

MR. J. A. CAMPBELL asked the Secretary of the Local Government

Board, If he can state the result of his inquiries into the circumstances of the recent appointment of a Medical Officer of Health by the Town Council of Cheltenham?

MR. GEORGE RUSSELL: We have obtained further particulars as to the appointment of Mr. Roch. It is true that when he was appointed he had a surgical qualification only. The Regulations of the Board require that unless they dispense with the requirement a Medical Officer of Health shall possess both a medical and surgical qualification; and in the case of a borough such as Cheltenham we should not have consented to the office being held by a medical man with one qualification only. But Mr. Roch about three weeks before the date when he was to enter upon his duties obtained the requisite medical qualification. The Town Council, when this further qualification had been obtained, ratified the election by formally applying to the Board to dispense with the requirement referred to so far as was necessary, in consequence of Mr. Roch not actually possessing at the time of the election the double qualification. The Board have complied with their request, and have sanctioned the appointment.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (CORRUPT AND ILLEGAL PRACTICES) ACT, 1883 — BREAKFASTS TO THE UNEMPLOYED.

MR. KENNY asked Mr. Attorney General, If his attention had been called to paragraphs, prominently printed, and appearing with increased frequency in London daily papers, which announce the intention of persons, mostly Members of Parliament and Parliamentary candidates, and sometimes Members of Her Majesty's Government, to give free breakfasts to unemployed workmen and other deserving persons: and, whether, considering the near approach of a General Election, such acts will be taken into consideration as constituting violations of "The Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Act, 1883?"

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES): I have a very limited knowledge of what takes place in relation to these free breakfasts. As far as I have seen, they have been given by gentlemen in localities with which they have no connection either as Representatives or in respect to any future candidature, and they are given to persons who are not voters, and from whom no advantage can be obtained. I therefore cannot say that they constitute a corrupt practice.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I wish to ask the hon. and learned Gentleman if the Radical candidate for the borough of Fulham gives free breakfasts in the borough of St. George's-in-the-East, and if the Radical candidate for the borough of St. George's-in-the-East gives free breakfasts to the unemployed in the borough of Fulham; and whether such reciprocity of action on the part of two candidates would not constitute an obvious evasion of the Corrupt Practices Act? I wish to ask the Attorney General what guarantee there can be that the Radical friend of the Radical candidate in any borough actually defrays the cost of the free breakfast provided?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES): If any other hon. Member but the noble Lord had put this Question, I should have considered it one of an argumentative character. This Question is purely hypothetical. I know of no such facts having occurred as he has referred to; but if, when they actually occur, the noble Lord would put his Question I will endeavour to answer it.

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—THE AFGHAN BOUNDARY COMMISSION—SIR PETER LUMSDEN'S MISSION.

MR. TOMLINSON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government have any information leading to the conclusion that the condition of Sir Peter Lumsden's Mission is less serious than would appear from the letter of the Correspondent of *The Standard* newspaper, published in their issue of the 15th instant, or that the statements in that letter are, to any extent, overdrawn? The hon. Member said he desired to put the Question in the form in which he originally placed it on the Paper—namely, by substituting for "serious" the words "humiliating and disastrous to British interests."

MR. SPEAKER: Those words would be out of Order.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The Foreign Office have not received any information showing that the condition

of the Mission is serious. Some regrettable loss of life among the camp followers occurred when crossing the mountains between Gulran and Tirpul owing to a snowstorm.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—OFFICERS OF THE RESERVE—EQUIPMENT MONEY.

MR. MOLLOY asked the Secretary of State for War, If, under the Regulations, Officers in the Reserve who are called into active service are entitled to £100 for equipment; if the Government will extend this rule to such Officers of the Reserve as have volunteered for service in Suakin and been sent there; and, if, under the special conditions of the very expensive outfit required for that climate, and the high price of all necessaries there, the fact of having volunteered will not be allowed to prejudice the rights they would have if only called upon in the ordinary way, without the preliminary of volunteering; and, if the cost of the necessary outfit will not absorb an amount equal to the greater part of a year's pay?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: The hon. Member is under some misapprehension in regard to this Question. Officers of the Reserve are not entitled, under any circumstances, to an outfit allowance on being recalled to Army service; but if they proceed on active service, they receive an advance of field allowance to provide field equipment.

FOREIGN AND COLONIAL LABOUR STATISTICS.

MR. ALBERT GREY asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether his attention has been called to the letter recently addressed by the Secretary of State at Washington to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, reviewing the Reports from the Consuls of the United States, on the relations of labour and wages, and capital and enterprise, existing in every Country, Colony, and Island in which the United States have consular representatives; and, whether he will cause to have issued to the Consuls of Her Majesty a Labour Circular, similar in character to that issued, on the 15th of February 1884, to the consular officers of the United States, with a view of obtaining the fullest possible information as to the conditions affecting and surrounding Foreign and Colonial labour, viz.: the rates of wages, hours of labour, prices of food, articles of consumption, rent, &c., and thus affording material for a comparison of their conditions with those which prevail in the United Kingdom?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN (who replied) said, his attention had been called to the summary of a very important Return which the United States Government were seeking to obtain as to the rate of wages and other particulars affecting the working classes. He recognized the extreme importance of such a Return, and he very much desired that a similar one should be obtained for this country. He desired, however, to reserve to himself the right of further considering the best way of securing an accurate Return, because he had reason to believe that the Board of Trade could correct and materially add to any Reports of Consular Agents by comparing them with the statistics at present in the possession of the Department.

CENTRAL ASIA—HERAT—ACTION OF ENGLAND IN CASE OF SUDDEN SEIZURE BY RUSSIA.

MR. MONTAGU SCOTT asked the First Lord of the Treasury, What steps Her Majesty's Government have taken, or are about to take, to prevent the sudden capture of Herat?

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the First Lord of the Treasury, If his attention has been called to the important letter from the Correspondent of *The Standard* with Sir Peter Lumsden's Commission, and especially to the following passages:—

"The importance to the Russians of acquiring Ak Tepe and Penjdeh district is obvious; the position gives them the command of the Kushk Rud and Murghab Valleys, of the passes leading across the mountains to the Herat Valley, and practically of Herat. With the control of these two valleys passes away the control of the Herat Valley; the advance by the Heri Rud, a much more difficult and inhospitable line, becomes unnecessary. The importance of the move to Pul-i-Khisti must be distinctly understood: it means the fall of Ak Tepe, the Penjdeh position, of the Kushk Rud and Murghab Valleys, and practically of Herat, to the Russians, and finally the solution of the Central Asian question in favour of Russia;"

and, what steps Her Majesty's Government are taking to counteract the injurious effect of General Komaroff's aggression upon the peoples of Central Asia?

Mr. GLADSTONE: To both these Questions I have to make one and the same reply; and my reply is that the matters named in both Questions have received the careful attention of Her Majesty's Government.

Mr. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Can the Prime Minister, consistently with the interests of the Public Service, inform the House whether it is true, as reported, that Her Majesty's Government have agreed to cede Penjdeh to the Russians?

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Can the right hon. Gentleman give us any information as to the receipt of any further communications from Sir Peter Lumsden, and say whether he is in a position to affirm or deny the statement which has been made that a provisional Government has been established at Penjdeh by the Russian authorities?

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: Will the right hon. Gentleman also inform the House whether there is any truth in the statement which appears in the evening papers to the effect that a large number of those who were with Sir Peter Lumsden's Commission had died from frost and hunger?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I may dispose of the last Question by pointing out that an answer has already been given by my noble Friend (Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice) on the part of the Government. With regard to the first Question of the right hon. Gentleman, we have had no further communication from Sir Peter Lumsden; and I think it may be of use to the House if I venture to warn hon. Gentlemen—not with reference to this or that particular communication—that there is a very great uncertainty indeed as to the time which is now required, either from St. Petersburg or London, to communicate with the officer on the spot. Partly we are uncertain, because we do not know precisely the state of the telegraphic communication from St. Petersburg, it being by no means established to our minds that there is a proper telegraph from St. Petersburg as far as Merv; and it likewise appears that the inclemency of the weather over that country has introduced a great deal of uncertainty, and from recent despatches from Sir Edward Thornton, dated the 11th of this month, I have an apprehension that we must be content to put up with some further delay before we can receive replies either from St. Petersburg with respect to the questions Her Majesty's Government have asked with reference to General Komaroff, or from Sir Peter Lumsden as to the important messages that have been sent to him, and which will in due time, no doubt, be fully answered by him. As to the Question of the right hon. Gentleman, all we know is this—there is a somewhat detailed statement in such evening papers as I have seen which purports to be from General Komaroff. With respect to the details and particulars of that statement we are not informed; but we have a telegram from Sir Edward Thornton, received this afternoon, which states in a very few words that an Administration—or a provisional Administration—has been established in Penjdeh. So far, I think, I have answered all that was asked by the right hon. Gentleman. With regard to the inquiry whether it is true that Her Majesty's Government has undertaken to cede Penjdeh to the Government of Russia, the state of the case is this—that not only is that statement a statement without authority, but likewise I can assure the House that no assurances have been either given or received on the part of either Government on the subject of particular points upon the Frontier. There has been friendly conversation between Lord Granville and M. de Staal, with one or two present who were competent to assist them; but no assurances have been given which convey the intention of either Government with respect to particular points on the Frontier. I can only say that it was friendly conversation. Lord Granville has had frequent communications with the Russian Ambassador, as might naturally be expected during the critical circumstances of the last few days; but they have been of an unofficial character, except as regards certain matters of fact with respect to which it was his duty to make inquiry. I think that is all that has been asked me with regard to this question.

Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE: Can the Prime Minister inform the House whether Sir Edward Thornton in his despatch mentions by whom the Administration at Penjdeh has been formed?

Mr. GLADSTONE: He does not mention it. His expression is "is estab-

lished;" but I cannot doubt that it is established under Russian auspices, and I perceive that the detailed communication in the newspapers appears to be founded upon the necessity of establishing some Administration there after the disappearance of the Afghans from that district.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: May I ask the Prime Minister whether, in the course of the communications that have passed between the Russian Government and Her Majesty's Government, Her Majesty's Government have made any inquiry of the Russian Government as to the precise point in Central Asia to which their telegraph system extends; and, if so, whether there has been a reply?

MR. GLADSTONE: No, Sir; we have not made inquiries of the Russian Government as to the state of its telegraphic communications, nor would it be very easy probably for them to give an exact reply, because the telegraph line to Merv is in course of construction, and they might not know at any particular moment how far it had proceeded. It will be observed that this very telegram in to-day's papers seems to have taken nine or 10 days in its transmission to St. Petersburg; and my impression is that no communication is at present passed between the Russian Government and General Komaroff in much less time than that, and therefore, of course, twice that time would be required for a reply.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it is true that the Russian Government have asked or demanded that the zone of the debatable or debated land should be extended from Sari-Yazi, Puli-Khisti, and Penjdeh down to the Parapomesus Hills which skirt Herat on the North; and, also, whether he is aware that the Russian telegraph line is now finished as far as Sarakhs, within 100 miles of General Komaroff's headquarters, and that the attack of the 30th by General Komaroff was known at St. Petersburg on the 4th of April, and in Berlin on the 5th, whereas it was not communicated to this country until the 9th?

MR. GLADSTONE: I have nothing to say as to what has been demanded by the Russian Government or by ourselves. With regard to the rest of the Question, I should have to thank the hon. Gentleman for giving me a great deal of information which I did not possess if I believed that he was accurately informed; but I do not believe that he is accurately informed on the points to which he has referred.

MR. BOURKE: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman, whether, in the conversation between the Russian Ambassador and Lord Granville, any suggestion has been made by the former that Penjdeh should be annexed to the Russian Empire?

MR. GLADSTONE: I have not been present at these conversations. ["Oh, oh!"] Do I understand hon. Members to say that it is my duty to know everything that has passed in these conversations?

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Certainly, about Penjdeh.

MR. GLADSTONE: Certainly! If the law of manners had permitted the withholding of that interruption, I was about to say that I have no reason to believe that any such suggestion or demand has at the present time been made; and, as I have said, no assurances have been given or received by either Government.

MR. HEALY: I wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether there is any truth in the statement which appears in *The Daily Telegraph* this morning, to the effect that the Czar has sent a letter containing assurances of an extremely pacific character?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I did not see any such statement.

MR. HEALY: The following is the passage I refer to:—

> "I am charged by the personal commands of His Majesty the Czar to beg you to make known to the Government of the Queen that in the opinion of His Majesty a war would be deplorable for the two countries, and His Majesty hopes firmly that a prompt and simple arrangement will be established."

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I can at once state that that has not been received at the Foreign Office.

SIR HENRY HOLLAND said, that as great importance was attached to the exact date on which the information arrived at St. Petersburg from General Komaroff as to the Russian attack on the Afghans, he wished to know whether it was inconsistent with the nego-

tiations now going on to instruct Sir Edward Thornton to learn on what date that information was received, either officially or otherwise?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I have no fear of being in error in saying that Sir Edward Thornton is himself convinced, and states it as his opinion, that the intelligence of the unhappy action at Pul-i-Khisti did not reach St. Petersburg until the evening of the 7th of April.

ARMY—PAYMENT FOR ADDITIONAL KIT.

Sir FREDERICK MILNER asked the Secretary of State for War, If it is the case that it is the rule of the service that, on the occasion of troops going to India, the privates have to pay out of their own pocket for the additional kit, such as spine protectors, cholera belts, &c.; whether he is aware that the same rule has been carried out with regard to the men now on active service in the Soudan; and, whether our gallant soldiers could not be provided with the articles necessary to enable them to carry out their duties without extra charge to them?

Mr. BRAND: Soldiers proceeding to India are provided with certain necessaries, for which they have to pay. The articles are mainly for the purpose of enabling the men to save the wear during the voyage of their ordinary necessaries; and, as the maintenance of the latter is at their own cost, it would seem to be quite fair that they should pay for the substitutes which add to their comfort and save them expense. The charges against a soldier embarking for the Soudan have been very small—something under 1*s.*, I understand.

ARMY—THE 5TH LANCERS.

Mr. CALLAN asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention has been called to the following statement in the Dublin Correspondence of *The Tablet* of the 10th April, relating to the embarkation, on board the *Lydian Monarch*, of the 5th Royal Irish Lancers:—

"About six weeks ago two squadrons of this regiment sailed from Kingstown for the Soudan on board the *Lydian Monarch*. The men marched from the Island Barracks, under the command of Lieut. Colonel Chichester. So far, there was no more irregularity than what also took place when the Guards left London for the seat of war. On arriving at Kingstown it was found that the *Lydian Monarch* would not be ready to embark them for another two hours. This enforced halt led to many of the men being supplied with drink by their friends. Colonel Vandeleur, in command of the Home contingent of the regiment, was present as a spectator. Shortly afterwards these irregularities were brought under the notice of the Commander-in-Chief, and Colonel Chichester was recalled all the way from Egypt. Colonel Vandeleur was called upon by the Duke of Cambridge for an explanation, though he was not officially in charge of the departing corps. Colonel Vandeleur sought an interview with the Duke of Cambridge, which at first was refused, but ultimately, through the intervention of Lord Hartington, was granted. The Duke of Cambridge, however, was inflexible. Not even an inquiry would be allowed, which had been eagerly requested. The sting of the injustice lies in the fact that neither of these officers is responsible for the delay of the *Lydian Monarch*, which was the primary cause of the mischief, nor for the intrusion of the civilian element, against which it was the duty of the general staff to take the proper precautions, and is aggravated by the further fact of the proper authorities, Lord Clarina and his staff, being present on the spot officially. It is of course admitted that there has been a distinct breach of the 57th and 58th paragraphs of the 17th section of the Queen's Regulations, but for the due effect of these the officer, i.e. Lord Clarina, commanding the district or station is responsible;"

whether it is a fact that Colonel Chichester was so "recalled all the way from Egypt;" whether it is a fact that Colonel Vandeleur was present on the occasion in question merely as a spectator, and not officially; whether it is true, as stated, that "not even an inquiry would be allowed," and that both Colonel Chichester and Colonel Vandeleur, both of whom have seen over a quarter of a century's service, were "summarily compelled to resign;" and, whether Lord Clarina, the officer commanding the district, was present on the occasion in question; and, if so, whether he was present officially, or as a mere spectator, like Colonel Vandeleur, and, in either case, on what grounds has not the Commander-in-Chief held him responsible, under the like circumstances, as he has held Colonel Chichester and Colonel Vandeleur?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: Very grave irregularities occurred at the embarkation for the Soudan of the two squadrons of the 5th Lancers. Although my attention has not been drawn to the particular newspaper article to which the hon. Member refers, the whole subject has been brought officially to notice by the General Officer Commanding in

Ireland, and has received, and is still receiving, careful consideration. It was not considered desirable, under the circumstances, that Lieutenant Colonel Chichester should command the squadrons in the field, and he was therefore recalled from Egypt. Lieutenant Colonel Vandeleur was present, and as he commands the regiment could only be held to have been there in an official capacity. He was called upon to resign the command; but, owing to contradictory statements having reached the Commander-in-Chief, His Royal Highness has postponed removing these officers from the regiment until a Court of Inquiry shall have reported on all the circumstances. Lord Clarina only arrived at Kingstown during the afternoon. He is responsible to the Commander-in-Chief for the manner in which duties are carried out in his district.

ARMY—MILITIA OFFICERS.

VISCOUNT EMLYN asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is proposed to grant any Commissions in the Line to Officers of Militia, beyond the number annually granted to such Officers; whether Officers of Militia, and others serving as troopers in Sir Charles Warren's Force in South Africa, will be eligible for such Commissions; and, whether care will be taken that such Officers shall not lose the chance of obtaining a Commission in consequence of their having volunteered for such service?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: In addition to the 75 commissions granted each half-year to Militia officers, Line commissions have been offered to all Militia candidates under 22 years of age on the 1st January, 1884, who had passed the qualifying standard in military competitive examinations. The fact of serving in Sir Charles Warren's Force in South Africa has not prevented offers being made to qualified officers, and steps are now being taken to meet their cases.

EGYPT—THE SOUDAN—THE SUAKIN AND BERBER RAILWAY.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he can state in whom will be vested the property of the Suakin and Berber Railway when completed; by what title such property will be held, whether by right of conquest or by grant or concession; and, in the latter case, by what competent authority such grant or concession has been or will be given; and, what measures, if any, Her Majesty's Government have taken, or intend to take, for the custody, maintenance, and working of the line when British troops have left the country?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: The railway, as at present in course of construction, is for military purposes. The question of the future, when the military exigencies shall have ceased or have been materially lessened, must be left for consideration under the circumstances that will then have arisen.

ARMY CONTRACTS.

MR. W. J. CORBET asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether the form of tender for clothing issued by the Department contains a clause of the following purport:—

"All garments shall be made up at contractor's factory at [contractor to state position of factory] only, and no work whatever must be done at the homes of the workpeople. Any infringement of this condition, if proved to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State for War, shall render the contractor liable to a penalty not exceeding £700;"

and, whether, with reference to the alleged sub-letting of the Post Office Clothing Contract to a sweater at the East End of London, he will cause the contract to be cancelled and the penalty enforced if such sub-letting has taken place?

MR. BRAND: The clause quoted in the Question—in which, by the way, the penalty should be £100, not £700—is not inserted in the tender or contract for Post Office clothing, as was stated in my reply to the hon. Member on Monday last. It is, however, included in the contract for Army clothing. It is not intended to take any steps to cancel the contract for Post Office clothing, which has not been sub-let.

ARMY—WOOLWICH ARSENAL—EXTRA HOURS, &c.

MR. BOORD asked the Surveyor General of the Ordnance, Whether he will state the present hours of work in the several Departments of the Royal Arsenal at Woolwich, and explain why the present urgent requirements of the

public service cannot be met by at least a temporary increase in the number of men employed, instead of imposing an excessive amount of extra labour on the existing staff; and, whether it is a fact that artizans, otherwise fully qualified, are not engaged at the Royal Arsenal unless they are members of a Trade Society?

Mr. BRAND: The present hours of work in the several Departments of the Royal Arsenal at Woolwich vary according to circumstances. For instance, nearly all branches of the Royal Laboratory are working up to 8.30 P.M., with, of course, the usual interval for meals, while in the Gun Factory work is carried on day and night without intermission on shifts. In the Royal Carriage Department, on the other hand, some Departments are working only the ordinary hours; but in this case others are working up to 8 o'clock at night, and even later. Where possible the present urgent requirements of the Service have been met by a temporary increase in the number of men employed; but, as a rule, the accommodation and plant do not admit of extra hands being employed, and the emergencies are best met by extra exertion on the part of the existing Establishments. It is not a fact that artizans otherwise fully qualified are not engaged at the Royal Arsenal unless they are members of a Trade Society. No inquiry whatever is made on the point.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE asked the Prime Minister, If he could give the House any information with regard to the Business of the House? The Seats Bill might probably be through Committee this week; and he should therefore like to know what Business would be taken on Monday?

Mr. GLADSTONE asked some indulgence from the right hon. Baronet, because he could not exactly define the period of closing the Committee on the Seats Bill. He had a hope that the Committee on that Bill would close to-morrow night. ["Oh, oh!"] He dared say the hon. Member who interrupted knew more about it than he (Mr. Gladstone) did himself. Evidently it was their duty to close the Committee on the Seats Bill as soon as possible. Therefore, he might say they should not interpose anything which would take time in such a manner as to interfere with the closing of the Committee on the Seats Bill.

Mr. SEXTON: With regard to the Seats Bill, I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister if he is aware that the separate maps for the divisions of the Irish counties have not yet been provided, and that the special set of maps promised by the President of the Local Government Board, showing the first schemes of the Boundary Commissioners in certain Irish counties, have not been provided, and when they will be provided?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I was not aware that the maps had not been provided; and my right hon. Friend, who has had, as is well known, extremely hard work in connection with the Bill, is not at this moment in his place, or he might be able to give some information on the point.

In reply to a further Question,

Mr. GLADSTONE said, they were all anxious that the interval between the Committee and the Report should be as short as it could conveniently and properly be made. At the same time, the intervention of a certain interval was necessary. They could not say what the interval would be; but his right hon. Friend (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would endeavour to make such an arrangement as would be recommended by general propriety, and by the desire of the House.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—o—

EGYPTIAN LOAN BILL.—[Bill 122.]

(*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Hibbert.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I rise to move, Mr. Speaker, that you do leave the Chair, and in so doing I need not detain the House for an unreasonable time. I wish to say that if I am to understand the present opposition to the Bill mainly to have reference to the question of the Suez Canal, the ground of dispute between us is so narrow that my eyes practically fail either to define

or even to discern it. I will say a few words with regard to the merits of this Bill, and I will close by stating what is the view of the Government with respect to the proceedings now going on at Paris in relation to the Suez Canal. I think with regard to the Bill so much notice has been taken of the transactions which took place in 1855 that it would not be respectful on my part were I not now to make some short reference to that transaction. I did not deem it necessary to do so on the former occasion, because, in my mind, the two subjects are as different as it is possible for any two subjects to be that involve the same particular word. The particular word "Guarantee" is involved in both —"Joint Guarantee," I should say— and that, in my own opinion, is the only resemblance that I know between the two subjects. It is only right that I should express what I take to be the nature of these matters. I am one of those who think that even in private life it is dangerous to make a gift under the name of a loan; and most certainly, in my opinion, it is dangerous and objectionable for a State to make a gift under the name either of a loan or of a Guarantee. I myself was a party, at the time of the Crimean War, to advancing a sum of £2,000,000 to the Sardinian Government. That was even a step beyond a Guarantee. We raised the money and handed it over, and made an arrangement for its repayment. To my mind the essential condition of justification of that measure was our full and absolute conviction that the Sardinian Government would fulfil as punctually and accurately as we ourselves could have fulfilled the engagement to pay the money. Thirty years have elapsed, and I do not think all the money is repaid yet under the arrangement then made; but my recollection is that the great bulk of it has been repaid, and the remainder will be repaid. The foundation of the objection taken in 1855 to the proposal to guarantee the loan to the Turkish Government was a belief that the Turkish Government would probably be unable to fulfil the conditions of the Guarantee. That was the belief that I and many others entertained; and I am bound to say the belief was not altogether unjustified by facts. I do not mean to say that the money is not now secure, because I think that by the arrangement which it has been found practicable to make upon what I may call the collateral funds, not coming under the description of ordinary Turkish resources, sufficient provision has been made. But if we had been dependent upon the ordinary Exchequer payments of the Turkish Government there would have been great difficulty. But that is not all. What were we doing? We were at that time engaged in a great war, which had been brought about by an attempt of one or two Great Powers to interfere with the internal arrangements of Turkey. We knew quite well, if we guaranteed the loan, that if the condition of the loan were not fulfilled, that title to interference would again arise. That is the point of distinction to which I wish to direct attention. Unless hon. Gentlemen are conscientiously and intelligently of opinion that Egypt is likely to fulfil the pecuniary conditions of the Guarantee and exempt the Powers from liability in respect of it, I am not prepared to defend the Guarantee. I have the firmest conviction to the opposite effect; I believe that 19 out of 20 hon. Members of this House entertain the opinion with me that Egypt is able to fulfil its obligations. As long as there is any Revenue at all in Egypt—and there must always be some Revenue—the first charge upon it will be that of this Guarantee. That is the broad and fundamental distinction which I draw between it and other Guarantees where a doubt arises as to the fulfilment of the engagement. That is not a mere pecuniary question; but it is also a political question of the utmost importance, because it cannot be denied for a moment that when a State which has taken the benefit of a Guarantee is unable to fulfil its pecuniary covenants, then claims of the most indefinite character to interference may be urged with a view to procure, by whatever means, the fulfilment of those engagements. But, of course, a demand of that kind may be made a cover for almost any amount of interference that may be conceived. I hope right hon. Gentlemen opposite will not think I speak disrespectfully when I say that I am under the impression that they are not really aware with what edged tools they are playing in opposing this Bill. Have they considered the consequences which

would follow if they could succeed in persuading the House—but I have no apprehension that they will—to reject or refuse to pass this Bill? I will just point out two of the consequences which would certainly follow. Had this Convention not been made, Egypt would have become bankrupt on the 6th of April by its failure to pay the dividend of tribute money, which on that day became due to Turkey. Now, the object of opposing this Bill, as I understand it, is to prevent foreign interference in the affairs of Egypt. Have right hon. Gentlemen considered that, independently of the other consequences of bankruptcy, the very first effect of the inability of Egypt to pay the tribute money would have been to establish an absolute right on the part of the Ottoman Porte to interference in Egypt? So that, in addition to the internal consequences of bankruptcy—a discredit and disgrace involving discredit to this country, we being in military occupation of Egypt—there would be created that very right of interference which right hon. Gentlemen wish to avoid. Moreover, the Sultan might be backed by the other Powers, to what extent I do not know, but that he would have an absolute title to interfere in Egypt for the fulfilment of the primary engagements of that country to the Turkish Empire is beyond all question and doubt. Well, Sir, I should have thought that was rather a serious consideration of the consequences that would have followed the failure of the British Government to conclude the Convention which we have been enabled to form. I will refer to another question which I can find no sign from their speeches that right hon. Gentlemen opposite have taken into view. I want to know what, but for this Convention, would have become of the suit that was raised by the *Caisse* in the last autumn against the Egyptian Government? Have they considered what would have become of that suit? I will give, Sir, the particulars as far as they are essentially necessary. The sum which was diverted by the Egyptian Government from its legal application under the Law of Liquidation was £524,000. I say from its legal application under the Law of Liquidation. I have had the satisfaction of reading today an article in *The Quarterly Review*, in which the reviewer appears coolly to contend that from change of circumstances the Law of Liquidation is now entirely placed at the arbitrament of the British Government, and that it is for the British Government to say how far that International engagement is in force. If that ancient periodical expresses the views of Her Majesty's Opposition on this subject, it is well that we should understand it, because I perfectly grant that if that be so—if we are to assert that International Law has no longer any existence in Egypt, that we have become masters of it, and, consequently, can deal with Egyptian Revenue as we please—then I admit that that is a ground broad enough to carry with it all the consequences which you may desire. But I have great doubt whether any Gentleman in his senses will say that he is prepared to adopt that ground, or to deny that the provisions of the International Law of Liquidation form a covenant absolutely binding upon us, and upon everyone a party to it; and I must say that they formed that covenant with the Powers of Europe at its back to enforce the doctrine that the law is in force, and to enforce the provisions in respect to it. That appears, at all events, to be the opinion of most of the Powers of Europe; because although the Conference last summer had agreed that if an arrangement had been made the Sinking Fund should be suspended, yet, as is well known, no arrangement was made; and it was in a desperate necessity, and for the purpose of avoiding the confusion that would have followed upon bankruptcy—it was upon that ground that the Egyptian Government diverted these moneys, and was supported by the British Government in so diverting them. Notwithstanding that anything but satisfaction was given to the Powers, the diversion took place between the 18th of September and the 23rd of October in last year. It was followed by the immediate protest of the Commissioners of the *Caisse*, and subsequently by protests from, I believe, the whole of the foreign Consuls General. Therefore, by that protest, those gentlemen, acting, without doubt, under the instructions of their Governments, laid the ground for ulterior measures. Now, what was to take place in Egypt? On the 5th of October, 1884, while the diversion of the Funds was going on, but long before

it was completed, action was initiated by the *Caisse* against Nubar Pasha, the head of the Executive Government of Egypt; Mustapha Pasha Fehmy, the Minister of Finance; the Mudirs of the assigned Provinces, and the heads of the assigned administrations—namely, the Customs and the Railways. That action was initiated on the 5th of October. On the 9th of December judgment was given by the Court of First Instance, and they condemned the whole of these functionaries, except Nubar Pasha, and held them personally responsible under sentences for replacing the money—for a sum of £500,000 taken from necessity by the Egyptian Government out of the *Caisse* to meet necessary charges of administration. The Court of First Instance gave judgment, declaring that the agents of that Government who had been directly or indirectly concerned, with the exception of Nubar Pasha, were personally responsible for that money. Had it been at once communicated to the Egyptian Authorities the execution would have followed immediately, unless delayed by appeal; and had it been confirmed on an appeal made at that date, execution might have been enforced as early as the 23rd of January, 1885. But, Sir, of course, every fair measure was taken to procure postponements, and postponements were procured, so that the judgment, although published, was not notified officially to the Egyptian Government until the 29th of December, 1884. So much time was gathered by the intervention of Diplomatic Representatives. When it was notified, the Egyptian Government immediately appealed; and on the 7th of January, 1885, negotiations were opened by France for delaying the hearing of the appeal. In consequence of the friendly progress of these negotiations, we were enabled to exercise influence with the Commissioners of the *Caisse* to interfere to prevent the execution. Postponements took place on the 14th of January to the 18th of February, on the 18th of February to the 4th of March for a fortnight, and before the expiration of the fortnight the Convention of the 19th of March was signed. Now, Sir, what would have been the effect if that Convention had not been signed and the negotiations had been broken off? The appeal would have been judged, beyond all doubt, in the sense of sustaining the sentence of the Court of First Instance. It would have been confirmed without any question whatever; and in the regular course of these proceedings the judgment would, by the regular machinery of Egyptian law, have immediately followed. Well, have Gentlemen realized to themselves what that means? What would have been the position of this country with regard to this sum of money—£500,000—diverted from its legal application under necessity, but declared by the International Tribunals to be exigible personally from the agents of the Egyptian Government? I ask you in what position would Parliament have been placed if such a result had been allowed to come about? Would you have asked this House to give this money? Egypt had no power to borrow it, and we had no power to lend it. Were we to come down and ask this House for it? How much more was to be given, and were you prepared to incur all these liabilities? If the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir R. Assheton Cross), who is going to move, I suppose, an Amendment to-night—should succeed in stopping the progress of this Convention, and if he himself, in consequence of his so succeeding, were to be one of those who had to deal with the *Caisse*, he would be compelled, whether he liked it or not, to sign and agree to this Convention, or perhaps one much worse. I have not heard a word from the opponents of the Convention which shows to me that they have ever thought it worthy to be taken into consideration; but they have played with the subject in discussing the advantages of this International Guarantee. Now, Sir, it may be said, and I hope it is true, that this is not an opposition to the principle of the Bill that is now before the House. I think the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire said the other evening that the Bill of 1855 was carried by a small majority of 40. Whether that was a small majority or not, the Convention of 1855 was carried by a majority of three or four; and yet, notwithstanding that it was so carried, our sense of the delicate nature of the matters involved operated with that very large minority to prevent any challenge of the measure upon a division, and it was allowed to pass. It appears there is to be a further division taken upon the

resent occasion; but it is to be taken upon an Amendment rather than upon the principle of the Bill. Well, Sir, what are we going to fight about with respect to the Amendment? When there is a battle it is surely requisite that there should be a cause. Well, what is the cause. The right hon. Gentleman asks the House to affirm that it will not proceed with this Bill until the Convention relating to the Suez Canal is concluded. But what connection is there between these two subjects? I contend that the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman is in the nature of attack. In the old days of Constitutional dispute it was occasionally attempted by this House to enforce its just claims by associating them with measures that in themselves were unobjectionable, but which they were disposed to stop for the purpose of insuring the recognition of those just claims. So it is that the right hon. Gentleman now wants to stop this Bill until he has got before him the Convention on the Suez Canal. Now, Sir, there is no connection between the two subjects. The necessity of this Bill is extreme. To shake the confidence of the other Governments with respect to it would entail those consequences to which I have briefly referred. There are a great many consequences. I may say that we have before us an assurance that the French Chamber—of course the change of Government in France has somewhat interfered with the progress of affairs—will apply itself to it at once on its assembling, and it is not expected that there will be any opposition. But anything like hesitation on the part of this House would, of course, at once alter the position of other countries in regard to this Convention. The right hon. Gentleman thinks we are going to behave very badly about the Suez Canal—that we have got some secret plot or plan, and that we are going behind the back of this House to agree to some dreadful provision about the Suez Canal which we do not wish to disclose. Assume that to be true. Is that any reason why Egypt should be allowed to become bankrupt—that we should give the Powers a title to intervene at once by force in Egypt, and expose the Ministers of Egypt to the indignity of personal liability and to personal confinement for having laid their hands on moneys which we encouraged them to apply? Why should our misconduct about the Suez Canal be visited on Egypt? There is no connection between these two things. If I can give satisfaction to the right hon. Gentleman, I think he ought not to resort to this ancient practice of tacking, which was deemed to be extremely objectionable unless under the pressure of absolute necessity. He says he wants to see the Convention. Why, Sir, his Motion is perfectly inefficient. By his Motion he would punish Egypt, but he would not insure any satisfaction to this House respecting the Convention. Supposing he carried his Motion and stopped the Financial Agreement, I have shown what would happen in the regular course of law in Egypt. And what would happen here? Presuming we were engaged in a foreign plot, which the right hon. Gentleman is endeavouring to prove, we should make a Convention at the back of the House. We should come down to the House and say—"Now you have got the Convention; that is all you asked; you did not ask what is in it beforehand, and did not make any conditions as to its terms; now you have got it, go on with your Financial Agreement." It appears to me that that would not be sufficient for the purposes of the right hon. Gentleman. But I want to know what is demanded? I think what the right hon. Gentleman really means, though I cannot say, as his Amendment is not happy in the mode of expressing it, is that he desires that the Government should not in this matter act behind the back of the House. Well, Sir, there is no concession that a reasonable man can ask in the way of Ministerial declaration on that subject that we are not perfectly willing to make. We have done what we could thus far, because the House is cognizant of the principles upon which Her Majesty's Government have proposed to the Powers to act. What I have heard from the other side of the House gives me reason to believe that our objects are recognized as good. The freedom and the security of the Canal are generally acknowledged to be the ends at which we should aim. The Commission have met at Paris; of course they have arrived at no conclusive results, but they have commenced the discussion of the subject; and I am bound to say, without entering into details, that as yet we have no reason to complain, but, on the contrary, we have

reason to be satisfied with the progress that they have made and the course that apparently things have taken. But you will say that when you come to compare notes and go into details, you will very likely find that you will have to allow this or that deviation, willingly or unwillingly, from the basis you have made, and you may either purposely or unawares be led into some conclusion which the House will disapprove. Well, Sir, the House cannot conduct this business itself. If it could, I do not know that there is any great reason why we should grudge it the pleasure. But it appears to me to be an instrument of Executive Government or of diplomatic negotiation. That being so, all we can say is that our desire is to throw our mind into common stock with the mind of the House, and to be assured upon very material and substantial points involving British views and British interests. It is not a concession I am reluctantly making to the right hon. Gentleman under threat of intimidation—it is an expression of our own spontaneous and real desire that we shall on every point be in the fullest possession of the opinion of the House; that we shall take the very best means in our power to satisfy ourselves that in anything that is proposed we should not deviate from what the interests and convictions of this country require; and, finally, that we anticipate no practical difficulty in acting upon that principle and conducting negotiations in that sense. I do not know, Sir, that the right hon. Gentleman can ask anything more. He cannot now have the Convention before him. He cannot wish to tie us up in regard to every matter of form or procedure. There will be a multitude of matters connected with the Convention with respect to it which the final form of them must evidently be reserved to those who are to be the instruments of the respective Governments. But, distinguishing between these things and the substantial matters which relate to the views and interests of this country, I believe there is no reason why I should impose any practical limitation whatever upon the desire and intention of the British Government that we should only proceed after giving the fullest confidence to Parliament, and making Parliament aware of what we are doing, and being assured that we shall have Parliament with us. Now, Sir, if there is any addition to be made to that declaration I am not aware what it is. If there be any addition, we are quite ready to listen to it, and to see what we can do. I do not know that I could carry it any further. I do not think that any of my Colleagues are disposed to restrict it within the wide and liberal limits that I have been enabled to lay down. I must say, Sir, I hope that the spirit in which I have spoken will be recognized as not being a spirit of contention, but, on the contrary, as exhibiting a desire to avoid contention. If there be a question of principle at issue between the two Parties, if the conduct of the Government is to be censured, if some broad sentence of condemnation is to be passed, I am very far indeed from saying that the position in which the Empire is at this moment is a reason for waiving or avoiding that condemnation. I do not hold that opinion at all; but I must say this—that if there is a point at issue between us which is narrow, unreal, almost invisible, it is not a moment when it is desirable to come to an issue on such a matter. We had better recollect that England requires to present herself in the view of the world as united. Apart, as I have said, from discussions on matters of broad principle, upon matters that are not of broad principle—and here, as far as I know, we are perfectly agreed in principle—surely it would not be well if a great semblance of difference, a great stir and tumult of Party contention, should be raised. I feel that the House has shown for the last fortnight—I think we owe much of it to the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition—a great deal of self-restraint, a great deal of temperance in relation to the critical matters of Imperial policy and interests that are now at issue. I only hope that the House will continue to exhibit that feeling, and we shall endeavour to do all in our power to promote it, especially when we think that some issue is being presented which possibly conciliatory language and declaration may avoid. We shall go as far as we can for the purpose of meeting any demand that may be made upon us, being anxious that the Parliament of this country should exhibit, along with its determination to maintain freedom of opinion and difference of opinion so far as conscience and

principle may require, a cordial and hearty union in what relates to the fundamental conditions of the honour and existence of the Empire; and, therefore, that we should avoid the needless semblance of differences which have no substantial basis.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS, in rising to move the following Amendment:—

"That this House, taking into consideration the terms of the Declarations of the Great Powers of the 17th March, declines to proceed to the discussion of the details of this Bill until it shall have before it the Convention which is to be concluded with regard to the Suez Canal,"

said: I must throw myself upon the indulgence of the House, as I am suffering from a very severe cold. I am quite willing to accept the friendly spirit in which the Prime Minister has just spoken, and to assure him that nothing is further from my mind at the present moment, considering the state of foreign affairs, than to ask the House to do any act, or myself to utter any word, which would give the impression that, so far as foreign relations are concerned, we are not a united people. It is only as a matter of duty that I bring this question forward. The Prime Minister has gathered quite rightly from the Amendment that it is not my intention at the present moment to object to, or divide again upon, the principle of the Convention itself. My object is of an entirely different character; but I am bound to say, in the interests of this great commercial community, that I do not believe a more important document was ever laid upon the Table than that one which contains the Declarations of the Great Powers of Europe of the 17th of March. The Prime Minister has asked that this question of the Suez Canal should be treated as perfectly distinct from the first and second parts of the Declaration. I am bound to say that I think that these Declarations were practically one. They were so considered by the Great Powers, and were put in the same Declarations because the Great Powers thought they were united. If anything is wanted to prove the assertion I have just made, I will quote the language of one of the Powers which was used before the Declaration was finally concluded. M. Waddington, in the Papers which have been laid on the Table, says—

"The Government of the Republic, trusting to the sentiments of justice and of friendly feeling which have always animated the Queen's Government, count upon their consent to enter upon the examination of these questions at the earliest possible moment. Amongst them, and of primary importance, is the establishment of a definitive arrangement to guarantee the free passage of the Suez Canal at all times to all the Powers. The examination of this great European problem might be undertaken at once, by means of a Conference or otherwise, without awaiting the issue of the proposed inquiry into the financial situation."—[Egypt. No. 4 (1885), p. 101.]

The French Ambassador goes on to say—

"An agreement upon this subject would be a fair compensation for the financial sacrifices which the Powers are ready to impose upon their subjects."—[*Ibid.*]

It was quite clear that, in the opinion of the French Ambassador, the two subjects could not be separated, and we are perfectly entitled to consider them at one and the same time. If that was his opinion, the other Powers had practically come to the same conclusion. It was perfectly understood at the time the Convention was signed that the several Parliaments of the Powers that have Parliaments were to be consulted, and that the freedom of every Parliament was absolutely unfettered; and if this Parliament had chosen to resist that Convention, and to reject it, that would not affect our friendly relations with the other Powers. But although theoretically this Parliament was free, practically, when we came to consider the question, we were not so unfettered. I should like to ask, of those who formed the majority of 48, how many really approved the Convention that was made? It is quite true that when they came to balance one advantage with another, they thought it better, on the whole, to support the Convention; but it must have been evident, from the speeches they made, that there were many serious matters in the Convention which they disapproved as much as we did. Of course, the question naturally arises, supposing the Convention had been upset or rejected, could the respective Powers have come to any other conclusion, after what had been said by Her Majesty's Government? That may be a difficult question to answer. The finan-

cial difficulties which were pressed upon the House at the time by the Prime Minister had, no doubt, very great weight and effect on the votes of many Members on that occasion. Now, however, all this is passed. The particular liability on which Egypt was to become bankrupt has been got over, whether through the action of the House or of the Convention is immaterial; Egypt has overcome her immediate difficulty, and we are in a state of calm peace. I am bound to say that I believe my hon. Friend the Member for Portsmouth (Mr. T. C. Bruce) was probably right when he said that even if the Convention had not been passed by this House Egypt would have found many ways of getting the money she required, and bankers would have been quite willing to lend to her on terms she would have been able to offer. But this question of the Suez Canal is one which we can deal with irrespective of all the financial difficulties of which the Prime Minister has spoken. It is one which most seriously affects this country. I know no question in which the commercial community is more interested, and any mistake made now may be fatal to our commercial interests for a long time to come. The Prime Minister says—"Why do you oppose our going into Committee on this Bill because you want to force upon us some views you entertain about the Suez Canal?" The answer is, it is our only chance of holding Parliamentary control over your proceedings with regard to the Suez Canal. The junior Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) asked the Prime Minister whether the Convention would be submitted to Parliament before it was signed, and whether the ratification of Parliament would be required? The answer of the Prime Minister was that at that time he could not say what course would be pursued. Mr. Gladstone stated what the terms of his answer were. Then I do not misconstrue the answer of the Prime Minister, who, at the present moment, is not able to tell us whether the Convention will require the ratification of Parliament or not.

MR. GLADSTONE: No; not the ratification of Parliament. I used the word "ratification" in its diplomatic sense. There is no question of its being strictly within the jurisdiction of the Government.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS: Then that makes my case all the stronger. It is quite clear that in no circumstances can we have any Parliamentary control over this question of the Suez Canal if we do not use this opportunity. I was in hopes the Prime Minister would have held out some promise that we should be consulted upon the actual terms of this Convention about the Suez Canal before we bound ourselves to the other Powers, or that, at all events, Parliament would have an opportunity of seeing the text of it before this country was bound. That, however, I understand is not to be. All that the right hon. Gentleman says is that we shall be kept acquainted with the principles laid down. It is quite impossible that he can keep us *au fait* as to the principles the other Powers may choose to press upon the Commissioners. Hence, if we are dissatisfied with the Convention, we shall have no means of putting any pressure on the Government if we allow this opportunity to slip. Therefore, until we have seen the Convention and are satisfied it is one which the country will approve, we must hold our hands and say that we will stop this Bill. We may ask ourselves—Are we so well pleased with the action of the Government and with their negotiations as to be satisfied that they will carry on further negotiations in a way to meet with our approval? Are we satisfied there can be no International interference? Are we satisfied they have taken all proper precautions against future complications with Foreign Powers? Or are we satisfied with the way in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer dealt with this matter of the Suez Canal in a former year? Is there anything in the Agreement with M. de Lesseps which shows that the Government was aware of the importance of the subject and appreciated all the intricate questions connected with it? Have they satisfied us before that we may safely leave these important matters in their hands, and allow them to make a Convention behind our backs without the smallest Parliamentary control to keep them in check? My answer to that question is in the negative. It is for that reason—and for that reason only—that I bring this Motion forward. I do not propose to take a division as against the Agreement itself; the object of the

division I propose to take is simply to delay these proceedings until we can be satisfied, in some way, either that the proposals in the Convention as to the Suez Canal are satisfactory to us, or that we shall have an ample opportunity of considering them in this House before the nation is bound to them. The Prime Minister urges two objections to delay—the bankruptcy of Egypt, and the action against those who took the money out of the *Caisse*. As far as the bankruptcy of Egypt is concerned, practically the danger is over; and as regards the £500,000, the taking it out of one pocket and putting it into another was the action, not of the Egyptian Government, but of the British Government itself. The noble Earl (the Earl of Northbrook) was responsible for it. It is all very well to say that the action, although it was necessary, has left us in a strait, and we must get out of it. They are responsible for all the mischief, and it is for them to see how they can get out of it. If we are to take the bankruptcy of Egypt and this liability for £500,000 as reasons why this particular stage of this particular Bill should be passed at once, it is obvious that the same reasons would apply with equal force if the Convention had been much worse than it is, for the difficulties would have been just as great. This is a question of International interference, one about which we are jealous, although we do not propose to stop the Bill on that ground alone. When the London Conference was held there was great alarm about International interference and International complications, and there was a feeling of relief when the Blue Book came out and it was found that, when the proposal was made by the French Representative that there should be a Joint Guarantee of all the Powers, the Chancellor of the Exchequer said they could neither expect nor ask Parliament to give its assent to that. No doubt, with the publication of that Blue Book, the Government got credit with the country for having been firm on that particular point; and, therefore, we were much surprised when the proceedings of 1885 were made known, and when it was found that on the French Commissioner making the same proposal the Chancellor of the Exchequer, instead of holding the language he held before, immediately stated that, while we had no desire to ask Foreign Governments to join us, if they desired to do so we should make no objection. We naturally thought there was a great discrepancy between those two modes of dealing with the matter in 1884 and 1885, and I think that anyone who would put the two proceedings in parallel columns would come to the conclusion that there was a great discrepancy in the action of both years. The proposal of 1884 was that—"In order to facilitate the task of the English Government the Powers are to be asked to join in a guarantee of the proposed loan." But in the next year it was this—"It is far preferable and more simple to increase at once the loan to £9,000,000 attaching thereto the collective guarantee of the Powers." What were the answers to these proposals? In 1884 the answer was—"We could not accept or ask Parliament to agree to a Joint Guarantee, nor have we reason to believe that all the Powers would agree to it." In the next year the answer was—"We have no desire to ask the Powers to share with us the liability which such a guarantee would involve; still if it is the desire of the Powers to join us in the guarantee we are willing that they should." If anyone would look at the Protocols and the action of the Italian Government and the statement of the French Minister, he would find that the explanation of the Chancellor of the Exchequer is not practically borne out by those documents, but if the present contention of the Government is that there is no discrepancy between their action in 1884 and their action in 1885, then it is quite clear that the Government enjoyed in 1884 a popularity which they did not deserve, and gained a credit to which they were not entitled. When the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced on that Wednesday afternoon the conclusion of the Agreement with the Foreign Powers we still had some ray of hope that, although they had not resisted the Joint Guarantee, they had taken some precautions to prevent interference on the part of other Powers—because the words of the Chancellor of the Exchequer were apparently explicit on the subject. But the speech of the Prime Minister to-night showed that it was the Turkish Convention of 1855 which, in his opinion, gave to England and France the right of interference with Turkey.

MR. GLADSTONE: If the covenants were not fulfilled.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS: I will come to that presently. The Prime Minister has given us a full explanation of this subject, and it really comes to this—that Turkey was financially in a very bad way, and that Egypt is in about as sound a financial condition. But that does not account for the words used in 1855, because there are two evils the Prime Minister mentions. He says—"It is not the worst of this Guarantee that if Turkey does not pay we shall have to pay for her; but the worst is that all the Guaranteeing Powers acquire a political hold upon Turkey." The Prime Minister says that is only because Turkey is financially unsound. But there is another danger which is equally great, and which he pointed out in the following words—namely—

> "Here is a Convention which creates and husbands the opportunity of quarrelling with foreign nations, but if there is one thing we want more than another it is an immunity from complications with foreign nations with regard to Egypt."

It is quite clear from the Prime Minister's speech to-night that he has persuaded himself that there is this vast difference between the two cases, although the Chancellor of the Exchequer thought they were practically the same. The question is not about the Prime Minister's persuasions, but what the Foreign Powers think, and how far he will be able to persuade them that there is a difference between the Turkish Guarantee of 1855 and the Guarantee of 1885. There is another matter which is, I think, of the greatest possible consequence to consider, and that is the question of the Suez Canal. Anyone who considers that question will readily admit that we are the country most interested in it; nor can we well judge what evils would happen to us if our interests were not properly protected in it. There is no doubt that the interests of other nations are growing in other parts of the earth, but still we cannot forget what a paramount interest we have got. The difficulty, however, is to describe the Canal and ascertain in what category to place it, and I want to know what is meant by the Suez Canal in Lord Granville's despatch of 1883? My right hon. Friend behind me spoke of that despatch as being full of pitfalls, and so it is to a great extent. I want, first of all, to know what is meant by the Canal? Do you mean simply the actual Canal, or do you mean to include the Sweet-Water Canal also? And where is the provision in case of a belligerent Power sinking a man-of-war in the Canal simply for the purpose of stopping the traffic? Supposing there are two belligerent Powers contending as to what use is to be made of this Canal, is it for Egypt alone to preserve the Canal in its proper state, or is she to be allowed to call in any neutral Power, or what position is Egypt left in? These questions which I have mentioned give rise to considerable complications, and I only mention them in order to show that we cannot rely sufficiently on that basis, as laid down in Lord Granville's despatch, because that basis is capable of extension. A superstructure built upon this basis may be one of which we entirely disapprove, and which may be much against our interests. It is clear that the despatch of Lord Granville has gained further importance by being accepted by the Powers; but still the Powers may put their own construction upon it, and the question to consider is, are we certain that, when the Conference is at end, we shall be safe in the Convention they may make? Whatever danger may have been supposed to exist when the Conference first met, anyone who has followed the proceedings of that Conference must have become alarmed lest dangers which at that time were shadowy have become very sensible and very real. This Commission has met in Paris—I presume because it is a French Company. One would have thought that, as this was the basis accepted by the Conference, they would have asked the English Representative what superstructure it was proposed to build upon it. Nothing of the kind. The French came forward at once with a series of propositions of their own, quite irrespective of any communications from other nations or even from ourselves. We are told that the scheme drawn up by France contained complex rules interfering with the management of the Canal and full of puzzles and ambiguities of all kinds. When we present our counter-proposals are they to be printed in parallel columns by the side of the French proposals? And when the Conference meets again are

they to discuss these several proposals? I should have thought that that would give rise to serious apprehensions as to the result of the Conference. From the general tone of the French Representatives, and from M. Ferry's speeches, it appears that the French were inclined to give a different construction to the basis laid down in this despatch. This French scheme, conjointly with the English proposal, is an instrument the value of which will depend upon the skill of those who use it. We find it said that the proposed Convention agrees with the views previously expressed informally by the Great Powers. Well, we should like to know something about those informal expressions of opinion on the part of the Great Powers, and how far the French consulted them, and whether the English Member of the Commission was consulted. All these things show us the great dangers that are going on. We find language used which in its spirit, if not in its terms, refers to the necessity of the principle of the neutralization of the Canal. With this staring us in the face we ought to be very cautious that no Convention is made behind our backs which we might bitterly regret afterwards, and which Parliament would have no opportunity of discussing. Then we come to the next meeting of this Conference. I do not know that we shall be more satisfied with the second meeting than we are with the first. Although it is quite true, if the reports we hear are correct, that they accepted the English proposals in regard to the Canal in time of war, we find that all the more difficult questions on which there was likely to be disagreement and argument and differences of opinion are put off till the end of the Conference. First, as to the Guarantee and the superintendence of the Canal. See how different the proposals are to the propositions which the Government accepted as a basis. There are three schemes. The first is that there should be an International Permanent Commission like that on the Danube in 1856. What single, solitary point is there in which the Danube can be compared with this Canal? I would ask the learned Professor of International Law at Cambridge what he thinks of this proposition. I think he would tell you that there is not one point of similarity. We have this Canal going through the country of Egypt, and practically in one country; whereas we all know that the Danube passes through different countries and is totally differently situated. The second proposition is that Turkey, as Suzerain, under the control of the Powers, is to manage the Canal. How is that to be rendered compatible with the sixth and eighth proposals of Lord Granville that Egypt should take all the measures to enforce the conditions as to the passage of vessels in time of war? The third proposition is that the Conference should merely be formally called upon to vote the neutrality of the Canal, and trust to the honesty of all the Powers to carry it out. If such propositions are to be brought forward and discussed, we ought to be still more on our guard as to the final result. I have endeavoured to show that there is great danger in this question of the Suez Canal. I think I have conclusively shown by the opinion of the French Ambassador that this third declaration is practically inseparable from the other two. We are equally entitled to watch against the one as we are to watch against the others. I do not desire the House to consider that I wish to raise any question to disturb our relations with Foreign Powers. I do not wish the House to consider that I have any desire or wish to challenge the Convention in its terms. The sole object I have in the Motion I am about to make is to insure to this House that which in my opinion this House is entitled to, and which the country will require this House to exercise—namely, the right of supervising the Convention that is to be the outcome of this Conference before we are tied hand and foot by Her Majesty's Government making an engagement behind the back of this House. The Prime Minister to-night said he was willing to meet us as far as he could, and I expected he was going to make some proposition to the House. I hope still that, in the course of this debate, Her Majesty's Government will go a step further than they have yet gone, and that they will meet us in this matter, so that there may be no division of opinion upon the question. All we want is that Parliament should have a controlling voice in this matter. I do not want to treat this as a Party question. As a Member representing one of the largest commercial constituencies in

the Kingdom, I know that this is a matter which is watched with intense eagerness and desire in every quarter of of England; and I feel confident that if the Government were to consult the wishes and feelings of this country, they would give to this House practically all that I desire—namely, an assurance that before any Convention is entered into which binds us with other Powers, as far as the Suez Canal is concerned, this House will be consulted as to its provisions and will be able to give a vote—aye or no—as to whether they consent to it or not. The right hon. Gentleman concluded by formally moving the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House, taking into consideration the terms of the Declarations of the Great Powers of the 17th March, declines to proceed to the discussion of the details of this Bill until it shall have before it the Convention which is to be concluded with regard to the Suez Canal,"—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. GLADSTONE: I must refer to the closing sentences of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman said he was in hopes that I should go a great deal further than I have done already in regard to consulting the House in this matter; but the right hon. Gentleman did not indicate with any clearness what steps he wishes us to take. There is only one word which I could gather, and I think it is this—that he wished the House to be consulted before the Convention is concluded. The right hon. Gentleman knows perfectly well that we cannot consult the House in regard to the formal proceedings; but we have promised to let the House know exactly what we are about; and if that is so, the House will have an opportunity, on a Motion for Adjournment or in other ways, of letting its voice be heard. As far as I know, these are the only consultations which there can be. The Government cannot propose Motions in the House. We can perfectly ascertain the views of the House; but as there is no money concerned, they cannot submit the question to a formal judgment. I believe I have shown that, in the only modes known to Parliament, the House will be practically consulted, so far as I am able to judge; and there will be on the part of the Government every disposition to accede to the wish of the right hon. Gentleman.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: The remarks which I feel compelled to ask the House to allow me to make are most reluctantly extracted from me by the very vivid memory I have of some advice given to the Conservative Party only two or three days ago by no less a person than the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, speaking, as it were, *ex cathedrâ*. He told us we ought to be very careful not to make feeble and ineffective attacks upon the Government, because the result always was to give them a larger majority than the real feeling of the House would entitle them to, and induced the public to believe that they are being granted a greater amount of Parliamentary confidence than is really the case. Well, Sir, I do not mean to insinuate for a moment that the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross) was either feeble or ineffective. Such an insinuation would be extremely unbecoming and quite untrue. It appeared to me that the speech of the right hon. Gentleman was very interesting, very exhaustive, and very weighty. But what I would suggest, with all possible respect to the right hon. Gentleman and to the Leader of the Opposition, is that they are running the risk of making an attack on the Government which may be argumentatively effective, but which will be numerically weak and ineffective. Viewing the state of the House and the apparently apathetic condition of public opinion, and remembering the result of the last division on this question, I cannot imagine that the decision which the House will come to will show anything but a very large numerical majority on the side of Her Majesty's Government, or will have any effect but that of doing precisely what the Leader of the Opposition told us ought not to be done, by giving the country to understand that the Government possesses on this question a larger, much larger, amount of confidence than we know they do possess. That is a suggestion I will throw out,

with very great respect, to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire. I think the Prime Minister has placed the House generally, and the Conservative Party in particular, in rather a disagreeable position in regard to this Egyptian Agreement. I am not alluding to the remarks the right hon. Gentleman made concerning other matters. The Prime Minister said in effect—"The result of our interference in Egypt has brought this country into such an extremely reduced condition that we are obliged to break the law of Europe to save it from bankruptcy. The European Powers were extremely angry at this breach of the law of Europe, and so Her Majesty's Government concluded an Agreement which, if you do not sanction it, will entitle the European Powers to intervene by force in Egypt, and if you resist then you will be at war with united Europe." Of course, if the Prime Minister comes down and says that if we do not sanction this Agreement there will be a war with Europe, it is very difficult for the Opposition, as it would be for any body of reasonable people, to refuse him the sanction he asks for; but I think it is a strong appeal, and an appeal the strength of which ought not to be frequently resorted to. [Mr. Gladstone: Hear, hear!] The Prime Minister stated that he had been reading an article in *The Quarterly Review*. I congratulate the right hon. Gentleman not only on turning to such excellent quarters for political information, but also on being able to find leisure for the study of that rather voluminous and weighty work. But I do feel inclined to protest against the right hon. Gentleman attributing to the Tory Party a statement of policy with regard to Egypt which he found in the pages of *The Quarterly Review*. I did not know that *The Quarterly Review* was ever supposed to represent officially or authoritatively the policy of the Tory Party. It makes guesses at that policy at times, but I did not know that it ever went further than that. With regard to the statement that *The Quarterly Review* makes, that the Tory Party claim for this country an exclusive predominance in Egypt, I do not know that I have myself ever heard that claim put forward by any Gentleman who is entitled to speak on behalf of the Tory Party. I imagine that the position many on this side took up with regard to the Agreement and to the policy of the Government is something to this effect, that all the sacrifices we have made since July, 1882—all the money we have spent, all the lives we have lost—have been made not only in our own interests, but in the general interests of Europe; and that this fact entitled the Government to claim and threw upon them the absolute duty of obtaining greater consideration for British views and larger concessions to British claims than have actually been conceded in the negotiations which have taken place. I do not know that any Member who is entitled to speak authoritatively on behalf of the Tory Party—at any rate, any Gentleman sitting on the Front Opposition Bench—has pushed the position further than that. No claim, to my knowledge, has been set up which would exclude the fair and equal rights of Europe. Turning to the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman, I wish with every possible respect to ask him to kindly give his attention to one or two considerations which may possibly, before he goes to a division, modify his present intention. The right hon. Gentleman has in his Motion mixed up two questions, which, as far as I can see, are entirely separate, and not only so, but which there was every reason should be kept separate. I think that this combination of the great question of the navigation of the Suez Canal with this Financial Agreement which the House of Commons has already decided upon is an impolitic combination, and may be an extremely dangerous one to the very object which he has so rightly and so properly in view. The House of Commons is now pledged to the acceptance of a Financial Agreement—and the right hon. Gentleman himself disclaims any desire to reverse that position—but it is absolutely unpledged as to questions relating to the navigation of the Suez Canal. On that point we at the present moment occupy a position of the greatest possible advantage, because I do not know that any opinion has ever been expressed by any responsible Member of Parliament outside the Government as to that question. That is a great advantage, and I should view with the greatest possible alarm any act by which that position was in any degree compromised. The right hon.

Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire appears to be under the greatest alarm lest Her Majesty's Government should conclude an arrangement which would commit the country to certain principles with regard to the navigation of the Suez Canal without the knowledge and sanction of Parliament, and the right hon. Gentleman has no confidence that Her Majesty's Government will be likely to conclude any arrangement which will be satisfactory to the British Parliament. In that sentiment, judging from the past, I entirely concur. But I deny entirely the Constitutional right of the Executive Government to conclude any arrangement about the Suez Canal which will have one spark of validity without the consent of Parliament. This House votes money every year in connection with the charges for the Suez Canal, and therefore, not so much technically but Constitutionally, I believe the Executive Government of the country have no power to commit the House and the country to Treaties respecting the navigation of the Canal without the consent of Parliament. But is it not absolutely ridiculous and preposterous as well as dangerous to assume that a Government, which may be turned out at any moment, can, of their own pleasure and without the consent of Parliament, conclude arrangements with respect to the navigation of the Suez Canal by which the whole of our shipping interests, the whole of our commerce, the whole of our manufacturing interests, and millions and millions of people would be affected, without coming to Parliament for its consent? If such a proposition had been put forward in the Reign of Charles I., I could have understood it; but I am surprised that anyone acquainted with the customs of Parliament and the Constitution of the country, like the right hon. Gentleman, should have made any suggestion of the kind. I do not altogether follow the right hon. Gentleman. No doubt, technically, the power of the Crown to conclude Treaties is unlimited. But what would be the procedure? Questions would be asked of the Government about what was going on at the Conference. A Motion for Adjournment would be made if those Questions were not answered, and some information would be elicited, on which a Vote of Censure would be proposed. If the Government had agreed to proposals of which Parliament did not approve the Vote of Censure would be carried and the Government would go out. I really do not know any recent instance of any great Treaty about which public opinion was very strongly excited and in which British interests were very much involved, having been concluded without a full discussion in Parliament in the first instance. I think the right hon. Gentleman is really endeavouring by means of these unjustifiable alarms to get the House of Commons to reverse its previous decision. Of course, it is a very proper object to endeavour to defeat an Agreement which is considered obnoxious, and to use any instruments which may be convenient for that purpose. Any stick is good enough to beat a dog; and in the Suez Canal Agreement the Opposition would, under any other circumstances, have had a very good stick. But I think in this instance the Opposition are using a stick which is more likely to beat themselves and the object they have in view than the Government. If the Agreement is opposed by a large majority, you will not only re-affirm the excellence and merit of an instrument about which the public are not exactly enthusiastic, but you will have compromised the country about this question of the Suez Canal, and have committed it in a way it is certainly not desirable to commit it. Suppose the Government, under such circumstances, do conclude a Convention respecting the Suez Canal and a large number of Members of this House disapprove of it. In that case the Government will come down and say—"All these things have been discussed; you raised them and you sanctioned them; we had no power to do this." On the other hand, if no question is raised, the Government will go on bearing the whole responsibility of the negotiation, and having before them the fact that they have pledged themselves not to commit the country to any principle respecting the Suez Canal without the consent of Parliament. Under these circumstances, I do appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to consider whether he is not injuring the object he has at heart by mixing up this Agreement with the financial proposals of the Government respecting Egypt upon which the House has already decided.

There is another argument which I wish to submit to the House. The Tory Party very rightly assert that the relations of the Government with all Foreign Powers are extremely strained and unfriendly owing to the foreign policy that has been pursued by the Government, and they endeavour to convince the country that were they in Office those relations would assume a far more harmonious and friendly character. That I am perfectly certain would be the case. But, after all, this is an Agreement which, be it good or bad, the Powers of Europe have agreed to, and in which some of the Powers are very deeply interested. I doubt whether, if you are in a position before long to direct the Government of the country, and if you have indulged in an obstinate and protracted and rather quarrelsome resistance to this European instrument, you will have predisposed the Powers to welcome your advent to Office, or whether you would be likely to improve to any considerable extent the strained and unfriendly relations between this country and the rest of Europe. At all events, I feel certain there will be a considerable amount of imprudence and even rashness in any large section of Parliament at this moment taking a line which would be viewed as unfriendly by any great European Power. Of the advantages or disadvantages of the Agreement the country must judge. The whole thing will be before the country in a short time. It is an Agreement which satisfies nobody in particular, and which everybody recognizes as giving no *quid pro quo* for all we have laid out; but I hold very strongly that it would be unwise, seeing that we have possibly before long some great enterprize to undertake, to refuse an opportunity of settling a difference with the Powers which is becoming rather acute. Under all the circumstances of the case — in view of the pledges given by the Prime Minister with regard to the Suez Canal, in view of the undoubted power of Parliament to examine any Treaty which the Government may wish to conclude, and in view of the present position of our foreign relations generally, especially in regard to the great difficulty which is hanging over us on our Indian Frontier—I do hope I may be allowed, without exciting any displeasure in the right hon. Gentleman, to appeal to him to reconsider his intention of taking the sense of the House on his Amendment.

Mr. NORWOOD said, the noble Lord had made a powerful Party speech, and his advice from a Party point of view was very wise; but the noble Lord's argument did not affect his (Mr. Norwood's) position as the Representative of a large commercial port. Without committing himself to the opinions of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, he would remind the House that they never had the opportunity of expressing a single opinion with respect to the Suez Canal Convention. He had listened with the greatest possible interest to the speech of the Leader of the House. He could assure the House that, if the right hon. Gentleman had felt himself in a position to have given them a more definite assurance that the House would have an opportunity of considering the matter before the Treaty was concluded, he would not now be found raising his voice on the question. The right hon. Gentleman had talked about the Constitutional manner in which a debate might be raised, but he had not gone so far as to say that the Convention would be a question which would require the confirmation of Parliament. Governments made astonishing blunders in commercial affairs, and he could not help fearing that if this important question was referred to the Great Powers, our diplomacy would not be able to protect us from some unfortunate concession which would be detrimental to the interests of this country. He was one of those who very much doubted the wisdom of the Declaration of Paris as affecting the maritime power of this country. The Russian newspapers were now openly advocating the breaking of the arrangements in regard to privateering, and we were threatened with Russian privateering in the event of war. He believed that these paper arrangements only fettered the Power which desired to carry them out honourably. The Suez Canal was a great and important undertaking, and, no doubt, shortened the distance to India and China; but he was convinced that the Suez Canal was strong enough to take care of itself in case of a great European war. The principal holders in the Canal were French people. Their *prestige* and pride and interest was in the Canal, and he could imagine no Government

in France which could afford to set at nought the material interests of a large body of the people of that country. Almost all the other mercantile countries had a large and increasing interest in the Canal, and he could not see why we should apprehend that there could be any serious obstruction or injury to the Canal even if we left it to protect its own interests. He agreed, however, that it might be desirable to neutralize the Canal, and to make its approaches free from hostilities. But he would point out that by the 3rd clause of Lord Granville's proposals it was stipulated that no hostilities should take place in the Canal, in its approaches, or in the territorial waters of Egypt; but supposing hostilities were declared, and even if Turkey herself were a belligerent or Egypt our Ally, the entire Littoral of Egypt would be neutral ground, and we could not pursue an enemy anywhere within the three-mile radius on the Mediterranean or the Red Sea Coast of Egypt, the former extending some 500 and the latter 700 or 800 miles, while our enemy would be freely permitted to take refuge in the Ports of Alexandria or other anchorages. He could not imagine a position more damaging to the country than the embarrassment caused by such an arrangment. Then Clause 1, which required that the Canal should always be open to the vessels of all countries, demanded attention. It must also be borne in mind that the chief maritime countries of Europe were only about half the distance of this country from the Suez Canal, and therefore we should, in the event of war, be at an enormous disadvantage as compared with them as respects access to the Canal in time of war. He should not venture to criticize at any great length the heads of this Convention, for he did not consider that that would be the proper time to do so; but he did think it was the proper time for him, as representing a shipping constituency, to say that this subject was one of extreme nicety and difficulty and of grave importance, and one which the House ought to have an opportunity of debating, and debating effectually. It was no use to tell him, as the Prime Minister had done, that it would be in the power of any hon. Member to move a Vote of Censure on the Government if the terms of the Agreement were objectionable, or that the Convention would be laid on the Table when signed.

MR. GLADSTONE said, he had stated that the communications previous to its signature would be laid on the Table. It was the intention of the Government to make the House fully acquainted with everything that might affect the interests of the country.

MR. NORWOOD said, he had not understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that. But he wished to have a distinct understanding. If the right hon. Gentleman would say that the House should have before it sufficient documentary evidence as to the form the Convention was likely to assume—if they only knew that they would have an opportunity of protesting against what they might think contrary to their interests —he should not have another word to say; but he never understood that there was a distinct and definite assurance that they would be able to raise the question before the signature of the Convention. Certainly it was utterly useless, as he had said, to be told that if the Convention proved objectionable, he could get up and move aVote of Censure on his own Party. No man could be content with a position like that. This was a subject of the deepest importance and interest; and with every belief in the good faith and good intentions of the Government, he could not but remember, after recent experiences, that when Her Majesty's Government entered into discussions with the Ministers of Foreign Powers the result was too often a concession to those Powers, and he feared lest this should be the case again. He hoped to obtain a distinct assurance that this important matter would not be concluded without the House having another opportunity of considering it.

MR. GLADSTONE: With the permission of the House I should like to say a word of explanation. My hon. Friend seems to be under an impression that I recommended the House to be satisfied with the assurance that this Convention would be laid on the Table, and that if the House disapproved of it they could censure the Government. I must say there was not one word in my speech which either recommended or contemplated any such method of proceeding. On the contrary, I found fault with the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman, because I said that was

all it offered to the House. What I offered to the House was—I am not aware that we should have had the power to submit the Convention in form before it was concluded—but what I offered to the House was, that as to every substantial question and every important question, involving the interests of the commerce of this country, we should use our best endeavour to make the House fully aware of our views and intentions before we came to any conclusion or any binding engagement, and that we were convinced we should have no difficulty in giving effect to that end.

Mr. STAVELEY HILL said, he wished to express the pleasure with which he had heard the closing sentences just uttered by the Prime Minister. If that were really the intention of the Government, then the right hon. Gentleman (Sir R. Assheton Cross) had done a good work in causing it to be announced to the country. He could not agree with the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill), for how many times had the House been promised a full opportunity of knowing what were the details of measures about to be agreed upon, and how many times had they found that the Convention, Treaty, or whatever it might be, was very different indeed from that which they had been led to expect? In his opinion they would have been trusting to a broken reed if they had abandoned the present opportunity and relied, as they were now told to do, on obtaining a future opportunity of moving a Vote of Censure if the Convention turned out to be unsatisfactory. Those who had studied International Law could see there were grave dangers and pitfalls even in the draft Convention as it now stood, and he was afraid that those who had the conduct of the negotiations on behalf of England might consent to terms which the acuter eye of the House of Commons would detect as objectionable and most detrimental to the country, but which official blindness would prevent Her Majesty's Government from perceiving. If he understood the Prime Minister's phraseology, it was to the effect that the House of Commons should have a full opportunity of examining and criticizing the details of this Convention so far as they might affect an exercise of the national strength and the national resources. If that was the case they would be satisfied; but he submitted that the House ought not to be satisfied with anything short of a declaration to that effect. The question of the merits or demerits of the Convention rested, of course, to no inconsiderable extent on the consideration of the duties and the responsibilities which connected Egypt with this country. The Government said that they owed certain duties and responsibilities to Egypt. The Prime Minister had over and over again put pressure on the House by stating that the bankruptcy of Egypt was imminent and that we must save Egypt from bankruptcy. But, he asked, why should this be so? Was it because we had conduced to the bankruptcy of Egypt ourselves? If this was the case, there could be no doubt we had laid up for ourselves a considerable store of difficulties. Who was it that bombarded Alexandria, destroyed the Egyptian Army, and ordered the evacuation of the Soudan? Who was it that made it necessary to provide the greater part of this sum we were now proposing to guarantee to Egypt? It was, of course, the English Government themselves. They had brought about this Egyptian bankruptcy, and having brought it about, did it not seem to them that the best thing they could do was to take this opportunity of imminent bankruptcy and make the best terms with the creditors of Egypt? The Report which Lord Northbrook had made with reference to this Convention showed that the total amount of indebtedness of Egypt was £100,000,000, including the £9,000,000 now to be provided. He had stated that the total revenue of Egypt from the land and other sources amounted to £8,900,000. It would be much better if England, recognizing, as she must do, that it was she who had caused this bankruptcy, and that she possessed the greatest interest in the Suez Canal, not only on account of its importance to us as a mercantile country, but on account of the large interest we received from the Suez Canal shares, instead of offering this £9,000,000 to Egypt, were to guarantee the whole Debt of Egypt. The total indebtedness of Egypt was £100,000,000, and if England guaranteed 3½ per cent, she would be enabled to benefit the Egyptian taxpayer by reducing his taxes; there would be a surplus sufficient for a Sinking Fund to

pay off the total Debt within that reasonable term during which she might control the country, and the bondholders would be benefited by the rise in the value of their securities which would follow on such action. Criticizing the 7th Article of the Convention, the hon. Member wished to have an explanation of the meaning of a Joint and Several Guarantee on the part of one of the Powers, while a postcript which was added abrogated this liability? He wished to know how under one clause of the Agreement they found this Power agreeing to a Joint and Several Guarantee, and in another portion of the Convention discarding that Agreement and saying that she would only be liable for her own share? They also found in this Article of the Convention that all the Governments guaranteeing the loan were going to their Parliaments for consent. Would the Prime Minister undertake in any way that there should be some similar clause in the Convention delaying its completion untill there should be an acquiescence on the part of the Parliaments of the different countries engaging themselves in the Convention which they were about to sign? If a provision of this character was laid before the House of Commons, then he thought the right hon. Gentleman had done a good work in bringing this matter forward. If this were not done, he hoped the House would divide on the question, in order to see who were in favour of protecting the interests of England.

MR R. N. FOWLER (LORD MAYOR) said, that his objection to this arrangement was that he thought it very unwise on the part of this country to enter into a Guarantee in regard to which it might possibly bear all the loss, and which must lead to a great deal of political difficulty. Assuming that Egypt was not able to pay, it seemed to him obvious that the whole of the amount must fall upon this country; and if that was the case, he thought it would have been much better for this country to have taken the whole burden on its own shoulders. If we were bound to enter into this Guarantee, he believed it would have been much better to have undertaken the whole duty ourselves; but instead of doing this we were taking other countries into a partnership of a commercial character. He asked the House whether it was likely that the other Powers, having entered into this Guarantee, would allow the matter to stop there? Would they not make their participation in this Guarantee a reason for interfering with the government of Egypt? They would say—"We are equally responsible with you, and being equally responsible with you, we have a right and a duty to see that Egypt is well governed." After all the expense this country had been put to in regard to the administration of Egypt, he certainly was of opinion that the Government were entitled to see that this country maintained a dominant influence in Egypt. He would support his right hon Friend (Sir R. Assheton Cross) on the important question he had raised in regard to the Suez Canal. Our interest in the Canal being paramount, it was the duty of the country to guard that interest. The noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill) had appealed to the Mover of the Amendment, as the Government would have a majority, not to divide the House on that occasion. Such an argument might be carried much further than the noble Lord himself would be prepared to see it pushed. Such an argument might be used against taking a division on any question, because the majority of the Government varied from 60 to 140 according to the course taken by the Gentlemen below the Gangway. It was all very well for the noble Lord, who was a great orator, to recommend them not to divide the House because they were in a minority; but in his view it was the duty of every Member of the House, however humble, to express his opinion, if not by speech at least by his vote, on important questions, even though he might be one of a minority. He remembered the late Sir W. Stirling Maxwell telling a story of his having once been in a minority of four alongwith the present Prime Minister, Lord Cardwell, and Lord Aberdare, who ultimately turned out to have been in the right, while the majority were in the wrong. He could not therefore endorse the doctrine of the noble Lord; but held that it was the duty of the Party, after the able speech of his right hon. Friend, to enforce their view on the House, even although they might now be in a minority.

MR. D. DAVIES, notwithstanding what had just fallen from the last speaker, joined in the appeal that had

been made to the right hon. Member for South-West Lancashire not to divide the House. An Agreement had been practically entered into with five or six other Powers; and if the House were now to make an alteration in that Agreement, which he understood had been partly acted upon, a portion of the money having been paid, they would have to apply to the other Powers to assent to such alteration. For the credit of the House of Commons itself, after the decision at which it had previously arrived, he trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would not press that Amendment to a division. Whether a better Agreement could or could not have been made a year ago was not now the question. The Agreement had been solemnly entered into, it had been acted upon, and by it they must abide; and if the Opposition went to a division, the country would come to the conclusion that they wanted to draw the Government into more serious trouble before the General Election.

Mr. WARTON said, that he should feel more inclined to be guided by the right hon. Member for North-West Lancashire, who was a better judge of how the Tory Party ought to act on that occasion, than by the hon. Member opposite who had kindly proffered them his advice on that point. The noble Lord the Member for Woodstock had argued that, whatever Convention the Government might enter into, the House had powerful weapons which it could always employ, among them being the right of putting Questions. But what was the use of putting Questions to any Member of the present Government, particularly regarding foreign affairs? What information did they obtain in that way from the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, or from the Prime Minister himself? The right hon. Gentleman always tried to put the Opposition in a corner, because while important matters were immature they were told that nothing could be said about them, and when they had become mature it was too late to say anything. It was most important that the House should know what the Government were going to do in regard to the Suez Canal, because the extraordinary propositions which they brought forward in July two years ago, and which they were compelled to withdraw in order to escape a defeat, were not calculated to inspire confidence in the action of the Ministry on that subject. There was no proposition, however wild, eccentric, or unjust to England, that this Government would not make if they possibly could, only withdrawing it if there seemed to be a danger of serious opposition from their own followers; and that was a common occurrence. What were the Opposition to do? Questions were of no use, and a Vote of Censure could not be carried on a Motion for the adjournment of the House. Money had gone and blood had been spilt, and yet for all that the Government were giving up everything. The real policy to pursue was an English policy, and not one of preference of every other nation to ourselves. It was all very well for hon. Members opposite to hug themselves with the idea that they had only to vote for the Government to be safe, and that they had only to escape through this Session. He thought that every opportunity the Opposition gave them of recording such a vote as that would tell against them in the country. They made a great mistake in supposing that the real feeling of the country was in favour of this cold, cruel, and un-English policy. It would have been better for their Party if hon. Members opposite had honestly and straightforwardly spoken out and told their Leaders what they thought of their policy.

Mr. H. S. NORTHCOTE said, the Prime Minister had contended that there was no connection between the questions of the Suez Canal and the Financial Convention. The right hon. Member for South-West Lancashire had very effectually disposed of the contention; but if it were necessary to prove it a second time, the proof would be found in the very title of the Parliamentary Paper, which described the document as relating to the financial arrangements with Egypt and the free navigation of the Suez Canal. He, therefore, considered that Ministers were stopped by their own act from separating the two questions. He did not propose to go into the merits of the Joint International Guarantee into which the Government had entered. He entertained a very strong opinion that the Multiple International Control was very dangerous, and was likely in the near future to lead to very unpleasant results; but as the

House had by a considerable majority sanctioned the arrangement, he did not think that was a fitting occasion for stating the grounds of his objection to it. The Prime Minister had, however, invited the House to express an opinion upon the merits of the Convention. He was quite aware that it was not in accordance with diplomatic usage, nor did he think it desirable or possible for the House of Commons to become in its corporate capacity a negotiator. Diplomatic proceedings of that nature had to be conducted by a small number of responsible statesmen. But when they had to consider how the commerce of a great highway like the Suez Canal was to be conducted, he thought it desirable that the House of Commons should have an opportunity of laying down in broad lines the grounds on which and the spirit in which the Government should enter upon such negotiations. Her Majesty's Government appeared to take it for granted that the House of Commons and the country at large sanctioned and approved of the doctrine laid down in Earl Granville's despatch of January, 1883; but he could not say that he shared in that view, and, at all events, he thought the country would require a great deal more explanation and amplification of the statement before they would be prepared to sanction it. There were several points on which the country would expect to be more fully informed of the views of the Government. The proposal of the French Government accepted by Her Majesty's Ministers was for the appointment of a Commission of seven or eight Powers to produce a formal Act for the free use of the Suez Canal; but there ought to be some explanation of what was meant by that phrase. The country wanted to know whether the Government would consent under any circumstances to free use being allowed to lead to the neutralization of the country of Egypt, or whether it was intended to lead to the neutralization of the Suez Canal? That the Canal should be free for all ships under all circumstances was a very proper provision; but he took exception to the limit of time for ships to be in the Canal being confined to ships of war, because if there was any question of the rapid transport of troops by us to India, it would be possible for a Power with which we might be on hostile terms to have the Canal blocked by a number of its merchant vessels, or a merchant vessel might be sunk. Then as to the prohibition of the landing of troops or munitions of war in the Canal, he wanted to know whether, in case a ship were sunk in the waterway, that prohibition would operate to prevent the landing of troops for re-embarking them beyond the obstruction? That was a very important and practical point to be considered, for it must make the greatest possible difference as to whether the second point could substantially be accepted by this country or not. The third point in the despatch was that no hostilities should take place in the Canal or its approaches, or elsewhere within the territorial waters of Egypt, even in the event of Turkey being one of the belligerents. Now, that seemed a most extraordinary and wide provision. The Canal or its approaches! Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who, he presumed, was about to reply for the Government, would inform the House what was meant by the "Canal and its approaches, or elsewhere within the territorial waters of Egypt." How far did the territorial waters of Egypt extend? How much of the Mediterranean on the one hand, or the Red Sea on the other, would be neutralized? If no hostilities were to take place within the ordinary International three-mile limit, did that apply to the whole Coast of Egypt, the Mediterranean, and the Red Sea? If it did, what was the meaning of the fourth point in Lord Granville's despatch — namely, "That neither of the two foregoing conditions shall apply to measures necessary for the defence of Egypt?" Did it mean the defence of Egypt against an attack from Abyssinia, from the Mahdi, or from any European Power? These were some points in the proposals of Lord Granville on which an answer should be forthcoming. He should like to give an instance. Would it be in violation of the letter or spirit of these conditions, supposing, as was stated in the papers a short time ago, it was considered desirable by Her Majesty's Government that General Graham's troops should be recalled from the Soudan and sent to Gallipoli? If a state of things should unfortunately arise to necessitate the recall of this Force and its transport elsewhere, would they be allowed to

pass through the Canal or embark elsewhere within the three-mile territorial limit, or would they have to be conveyed across the Indian Ocean and sent round through India? These were considerations in support of a demand for further information. But he would also say that, although he had stated one or two objections upon detail that had occurred to him, he did think that at the present moment there were considerable objections upon general grounds against entering into the proposals for the neutralization of Egypt, and certainly of the Suez Canal. He could not help thinking that at the present moment the affairs of the country were in a sufficiently critical state to render it very doubtful if the present were a moment for doing anything to shackle the free hand of the Government of England in the affairs of Egypt. He earnestly and devoutly trusted that the negotiations might continue with Foreign Powers in a way to secure the maintenance of a satisfactory peace. He had not the slightest scrap of Jingo spirit, and he earnestly desired that everything possible should be done to secure an honourable peace; but he could not help thinking that while grave events were pending in Central Asia, even if this Motion of his right hon. Friend were accepted—if this arrangement as to an Egyptian loan should be temporarily postponed until a satisfactory arrangement with regard to the Suez Canal were arrived at—he thought it would be a benefit alike to the cause of peace and the interest of this Empire. It would leave us much freer than if we entered into an arrangement with other Powers who would do little to befriend us, and might cripple us if this country were called upon to make serious sacrifices. For these reasons, and quite recognizing the courteous spirit with which the Prime Minister had appealed to his right hon. Friend, he thought the latter had done well to press his Motion, and for these reasons he should support it.

Dr. FARQUHARSON contended that this was not the time to discuss the question of the Suez Canal. He agreed with the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock that this Amendment was nothing more nor less than a veiled attack upon the Convention. It was quite clear, if the Bill were delayed, the position of Egypt would be most serious. It was said the position of Egypt was due to the operations of Her Majesty's Government. That seemed a most extraordinary proposition. It was well known the Debt of Egypt was largely contracted by Ismail Pasha. To say that it was due to the operations of Her Majesty's Government was a fallacy of the most transparent kind. This country had deliberately undertaken certain responsibilities towards Egypt, and they were bound to help her in this crisis. He rejoiced at the proposals Her Ma-Majesty's Government had brought forward, because they gave some prospect of retoring financial peace, order, and prosperity to the country. It was frequently said — After the amount of money this country had spent in Egypt, why not get the whole credit and profit of it? The great argument against it was, that if we were to take upon our shoulders the entire control of Egypt, we should be unable to resist the call to annex the country permanently, and everyone knew the responsibility which would fall upon us if we took any move of that kind. He would not have ventured to intervene in the debate had it not been that he had recently visited Egypt and spent some time at Cairo. Before that visit he confessed he somewhat inclined to the scuttle-out policy; but he was now opposed to it. He had not taken counsel with the Jingoes at Shepherd's Hotel in Cairo, but had conferred with men like Sir Evelyn Baring, Scott-Moncrieff, and Edgar Vincent, and with the people themselves; and, as the result of his inquiries he was convinced that England was doing a good and great work in Egypt. That country was making rapid progress, socially and morally, and to leave it before the completion of its reform could never have been satisfactory. The chief obstacle to our popularity in Egypt had been the non-payment of the indemnity. It was, therefore, a cause for congratulation that that obstacle was now to be removed. Among the benefits which we either had already conferred or were about to confer in Egypt were the abolition of the kourbash and of the *corvée*, the improvement of the administration of justice, and the admirable progress in the matter of irrigation.

Mr. ELTON said, that the question to be decided was whether the Convention should or should not hold good. If the

Suez Canal was to be looked upon as an arm of the sea it must be open to all for purposes of innocent navigation. But, by the common consent of the Powers, an arm of the sea which was in the dominions of a particular Power ought not, unless of very large dimensions, to be used for purposes of belligerent navigation without leave, the reason being that such an arm of the sea as the Suez Canal might be damaged by the belligerents, and that its use by them might involve in hostilities the neutral country in which it was contained. He approved this old rule. In 1883, however, Lord Granville suggested the expediency of allowing the Canal to be used for belligerent purposes. It was easy to understand why such a proposal was then made. The Government at that time kept announcing that the British were going to leave Egypt, and they felt that it would be ridiculous if, as the result of our Expedition to Egypt, England's highway to India should be closed against her in the event of war. That was the reason why the Government made this proposal, which most dangerously gave to all other Powers the same privilege which we derived for ourselves of passing ships of war through the Canal. But the situation was now changed. We were not likely to leave Egypt unless we were thrust out of it, and while we remained in possession of the country we could have no difficulty about obtaining leave to use the Canal for purposes of belligerent navigation should we desire to do so. Why, then, not leave matters as they were? When they gave a right to any man they also gave the full means of enjoying that right, and it would remain for the parties concerned to find out the best means of enjoying it. Was there anything to prevent a clever diplomatist from using his ability to find out, as this was a new question, new developments? If the control of the Canal was given to the Powers, the control of the whole of Egypt would fall into their hands. He hoped that even at this hour we should not advance another step without being made much more certain than we were now of the nature, he was going to say of the trap, into which we were about to fall. He did not see why we should be bound so strictly when other Powers thought themselves entitled to alter the conditions. He thought we should rather retire at once than do anything which might interfere with the security of our road to India.

MR. MAC IVER said, the hon. Member for West Aberdeenshire (Dr. Farquharson) told the House what he had learnt at Cairo, and his authorities were the eminent public servants who were acting there for Her Majesty's Government. He also knew Cairo, and he had many friends in Egypt; but not one of these thought that Her Majesty's Government was right, or that the people of Egypt were in any way the better for what they had done. He was one of those who, like a burnt child, dreaded the fire. He had some recollection of the most unbusinesslike arrangement with which Her Majesty's Government not long ago were satisfied with respect to the Canal. Their mismanagement of the business was so bad that even among their own political friends they had not, amongst shipowners, a single defender. Her Majesty's Government were not at this moment taking the House properly into their confidence. The Prime Minister had, indeed, said that he proposed to give the House an opportunity of raising its voice. Such a phrase might mean anything or nothing. What the House wanted, and ought to insist upon, was that it should have an opportunity of having its voice heard to some purpose, and that the terms of the Convention should be considered fully, not only in that House but throughout the country. There was, therefore, nothing in the language of the right hon. Gentleman which would justify the House in rejecting the proposition of the right hon. Member for South-West Lancashire. There was one point in the extremely valuable speech of the hon. Member for Exeter (Mr. H. S. Northcote) the importance of which the House seemed to have missed, and that was in regard to the ease with which the Suez Canal might be temporarily closed. He was not one of those who were disposed to minimize the importance of the Suez Canal. He agreed with Lord Palmerston, that if the Canal were dried up it would be an advantage to this country. But the Suez Canal being, unfortunately, there, and likely to continue to exist, it was undoubtedly of great importance to the country. They ought to know what was meant by the Canal. Because, while the actual water of the Suez Canal

might be free to our ships of war as long as it was open, we might, under Lord Granville's despatch, perhaps be debarred from landing troops on the banks of the Canal from those ships. He was not one of those who believed that the Canal could be permanently blocked up. But it would be a very easy matter to block the Canal absolutely for several weeks; and what he asked was, that the Convention should be so arranged that in the event of a temporary block it should be possible for this country to land troops on one side of the obstacle and to re-ship them on the other side. He thought the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire was perfectly justified in asking that the Government should tell them what they meant to do.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, it was impossible to deny the great importance of the question respecting the Suez Canal; but the House was in this difficulty—that the question, though akin to the other part of the declaration, was not the real question before the House. Undoubtedly the question of the Suez Canal was one most vital to the interests of this country, and it was of importance that they should know what the arrangement was in regard to it before the country was finally committed to the Convention. The remarks just made by the hon. Member for Birkenhead (Mr. Mac Iver) had some force in them, for unless care was taken in utilizing the Canal there might be, in the way he indicated, very great inconvenience to our ships in getting through it. But although this was the only way in which the right hon. Gentleman opposite could have mooted this question, it was not a convenient way of debating it, because the Guarantee Bill was not a Bill immediately affecting the Canal. He ventured to appeal to his right hon. Friend below him (Mr. Chamberlain) whether an assurance could not be given by the Government that before they finally committed the country to any arrangement about the Canal the Agreement with France should be brought before the House, so that an opinion could be given upon it. If that would satisfy the right hon. Gentleman opposite, he should very strongly appeal to his right hon. Friend to give the assurance. He thought that such an assurance would fully meet the difficulties of the case, and would be almost as much as the right hon. Gentleman opposite could expect to get out of this discussion.

Mr. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT observed, that the time might soon arrive when it would be of the utmost importance to this country that our troops should be landed in India at the earliest possible moment. He did not, however, believe any Government with whom we happened to be at war would find any difficulty in securing the blocking or a practical destruction of the Suez Canal for a period of several weeks. A Russian man-of-war could be very easily blown up in the Canal, and he believed that Russian sailors possessed sufficient patriotism for their country to take that step, which might have the effect of delaying the landing of British troops in India for several weeks. He should like to say one or two words about the Convention itself. They had now reached a completely new stage in the relations between this country and Egypt. During the whole of the last century British statesmen, and he might say the country as a whole, had been lavish in their efforts to maintain the predominance of England in Egypt. The sacrifices of the present Government in that direction had been greater than any ever before made. Since June, 1882, we had spent no less than £15,000,000 and lost thousands of valuable lives, and yet the results of this great expenditure and this great sacrifice of life had been absolutely flung away by the Agreement which had just been entered into with the Powers. This was the result of the £9,000,000 of Egyptian money and of the £15,000,000 of English money, and of the thousands and thousands of lives that had been sacrificed, that the people would be handed over to an International Control, which would be exercised in the interests of the bondholders, and would place our interests in Egypt at the mercy of all the other Powers in Europe. It was open to the Government by the exercise of the most obvious policy in the world to secure our permanent ascendancy in Egypt. The present Government, however, adopted a different policy. If Her Majesty's Government had taken the advice which was freely offered them by the great German Chancellor during the past three years, and had gone into Egypt as the lease-

holders of the Sovereign of that country, the Sultan of Turkey, no one could have said them nay, because they would not only have had the material resources of England and Turkey at their back, but a legitimate position which no intriguing could have destroyed. The Government, however, had chosen to adopt a contrary course, with the result all the world would now see. They now found themselves in a condition as miserable and as pitiable as the unfortunate Government of Turkey had been on various occasions with regard to the Great Powers. The President of the Board of Trade in an ingenious speech had totally misrepresented the advice of the German Chancellor. He was not surprised at the line the right hon. Gentleman took, for he occupied a peculiar position in this country, and had always been in the forefront with a policy of surrender of the interests of the country. No Member of the Government was so responsible as he for the prevalence of outrage and anarchy in Ireland, or for the surrender of the Transvaal, and now he was again in the forefront in advocating this miserable and pitiable surrender in Egypt. He did not think sufficient attention had been paid to the manner in which this Agreement had been forced on Her Majesty's Government, or to the fashion in which it had been pressed down the throat of Parliament. The House would remember the long series of notes with which the Ottoman Government was assailed by the present Administration, demanding that they should cede this, that, and the other portions of their territory; in fact, they were never so happy as when shooting Identic Notes at the Porte. On the 19th of January last it fell to the lot of Her Majesty's Government to receive an Identic Note from the Foreign Powers. The Ambassadors came one after the other to force upon Her Majesty's Government this ignominious Agreement, and the result was that Her Majesty's Government accepted it, although it involved the sacrifice of all this country had struggled for in the past. The Government forced the Agreement down the throats of Parliament before the Easter Recess, because they feared the action of public opinion. There never was a more unfortunate thing than that premature debate. If the discussion had been put off the Agreement would never have been submitted to the House, for within two or three days after the Agreement was ratified the French Ministry, which had been the main instrument in coercing Her Majesty's Government, fell. What were the ignominious words used by the Prime Minister as to this Agreement? He said the ratification was absolutely necessary; that we were at the end of our tether, and that if the Agreement were not endorsed by Parliament the management of Egyptian affairs would pass into other hands. Such words were more humiliating than anything which could be found in the pages of *Hansard*, and this at the very moment that we had 25,000 troops on Egyptian soil. It could only be concluded from those words that the Government were acting under the strong coercion of united Europe, disgusted at their blunders, and alienated by their pitiable conduct in Egypt. It should be remembered, too, that to prevent this International control and interference over Egyptian finance which was conceded by the Agreement was the very reason why Lord Granville broke up the London Conference last August. Now the Government had consented to an International Commission within two years, and to an International Control, which would either lead us into the greatest possible European complications or would drive us out of Egypt altogether. He sincerely wished it were possible for the House to undo the effects of the vote of a few days before Easter—a vote which he regarded as the most disastrous that had been given during the present Parliament. This Agreement would result in the destruction of British influence in Egypt, and would simply hand over Egypt to a Multiple Board of Control; it was a very serious misfortune to the people of England, and a disgrace to the country. But there was something worse than all behind it, and that was the neutralization of the Canal. There was absolutely no necessity for the neutralization of the Canal. If the Canal was worth anything to us as a means of communicating with India, then, by the Agreement, we were absolutely putting it in the power of any enemy of this country at a critical moment to block or destroy that means of communication; and for this reason, if for no other, he hoped the

House would agree to the Amendment of the right hon. Member for South Lancashire.

Mr. BOURKE said, that the debate had ranged over a very wide field. It was not his intention to go over the various points which had been discussed in the debate the week before last. The Prime Minister recently referred to the speeches which he made in 1855. The right hon. Gentleman had drawn a distinction between the Guarantee of 1855 and the present Guarantee. He said that in 1855 it was supposed that Turkey would not be able to pay either the principle or the interest of the Guaranteed Debt. That statement of the Prime Minister was utterly fallacious. In 1855 Turkey was practically without any external Debt whatever. She did not owe £5,000,000 to bondholders. Even in 1862, when Turkey had borrowed more than £20,000,000 in excess of what she borrowed in 1855, Lord Clarendon and Lord Russell both recommended that Turkish bonds were perfectly good security to lend money on. No doubt that was a very imprudent recommendation. But he had proved that the contention of the right hon. Gentleman was thoroughly untenable. Egypt was more heavily burdened than any country in Europe; while Turkey even now, in respect of her external Debt, was less burdened than any country in Europe. When the right hon. Gentleman said there was no danger in this case of International interference he seemed to have altogether forgotten the International Tribunals, which gave those who guaranteed the loan the most complete and easy machinery for interfering whenever they chose. That was the great danger which he apprehended from the Guarantee, and he ventured to enter his most earnest protest against it. With regard to the Suez Canal, the whole matter depended upon the details of this arrangement, which the House was most anxious to hear. The right hon. Gentleman some two years ago, alluding to the Internationalization of the Canal, had admitted the importance of that question, using the following words:—

> A still bolder suggestion is made by some, involving a great variety of points for consideration—that is, that the proper and ultimate arrangement of this great sea passage between the Mediterranean and the Red Sea can only be found when the Canal, instead of becoming the property of any private company whatever, or belonging to any nation whatever, shall be placed under the management of an International Commission. I shall not enter into that. I do not presume to give any opinion. There is a great deal that has to be said upon it both in regard to its difficulties and importance.

For his own part, he (Mr. Bourke) had always thought that the plan of Lord Granville seemed to be harmless in itself. He believed, however, that it would not stand the test of war, and that it would be impossible to get Egypt to carry out one-third of the engagements thrown upon her. They wanted to know what were the details, and from what they saw in the newspapers he thought they had just cause to be suspicious. They heard that the proceedings now going on were very antagonistic to English interests, and he thought they had good reason to ask the Government to lay this International Act or Instrument, whatever it might be called, on the Table of the House before its ratification. The right hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) had used the word "neutralization." If that word was used in its ordinary sense, as meaning the freedom of the Canal, it was exactly the thing which the country could not accept. The freedom of the Canal was the exact opposite of its neutralization. It was said that extraordinary demands were being made by the French Government with regard to the Sweet Water Canals. We were told that the French Government had said that as the Suez Canal was to be neutralized, and as the Sweet Water Canals were necessary to the Suez Canal, it followed that they also must be neutralized. That was a thing which we could not consent to, and it was subversive of the authority of the Suzerain Powers, which Her Majesty's Government had over and over again said they were determined to maintain. The territorial rights of the Sovereign of Egypt were, to a great extent, thereby compromised. Then, what were to be the relations between the Canal Company and the International Body which would be constituted? Suppose that the Company were to say to the Powers that great injuries had been inflicted upon them, and consequently upon the commerce of Europe at large for the benefit of which the Canal existed, would

the Powers of Europe be liable in damages? How was the Company to sue the Powers? That was no hypothetical case, because something like it had already happened in the Egyptian War. All those questions deserved the minute attention of the House. They had been told that this was not a time to weaken the Government. It was far from his desire to do so, and it would be admitted that the Opposition had abstained from all action which would tend to such a result. At the same time, he would like to ask the Government whether this was a time when we should tie the hands, not only of the country, but of the Government, for we should tie their hands for all time if we did not take care that the interests of this country in the Suez Canal were not compromised by what was now going on in Paris. Her Majesty's Government might, indeed, have some difficulty in giving the exact pledge that was asked for, as it appeared it was not a Treaty that was being prepared in Paris. It had been described as an International Act, though he did not see how it could be an International Act until Her Majesty's Government had given their assent to what was done. At all events, they had a right to ask the Government this question. Whatever it might be that was agreed to in Paris by the persons who were there now, they ought to know whether that Instrument would be submitted to the House of Commons before it became an International Act. He thought that if that question were clearly answered the House might be saved the trouble of going to a division on this Amendment.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: When the right hon. Gentleman rose to address the House I hoped he was going to refer at once to the question which has occupied the House, I think, about five hours in a somewhat desultory debate; but the right hon. Gentleman could not resist the temptation of endeavouring to prove the inconsistency of my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister with himself. Accordingly the right hon. Gentleman referred over and over again to the explanations of the Prime Minister, which, I think, are sufficient to satisfy any reasonable person. My right hon. Friend in 1855 opposed an International Guarantee; and he did so, as the reports show, distinctly upon the ground that there was, in his opinion, a probability that the funds would not be forthcoming to meet the interest upon the loan, and that thereupon there would arise an International right of control. Now, on the contrary, my right hon. Friend defends and supports an International Guarantee in the case of Egypt, on the ground that even in the opinion of Gentlemen opposite there is not the slightest probability that there will be any failure to pay the necessary interest, and that consequently no additional International right will ever arise. Then the right hon. Gentleman went on to ask a number of questions of detail as to what might arise under a hypothetical Convention with reference to the Suez Canal. All these questions are entirely premature. The only question before the House is this—whether or not the House will have an opportunity of considering the Convention before it is finally agreed upon. I do not know that I am able to add anything to what the Prime Minister said at the very outset of this debate. My right hon. Friend was understood by all of us on this side of the House to give an unqualified affirmative to that question. In anticipation my right hon. Friend did give the assurance which now, after five hours' debate, he is still asked to give, and which I now repeat in the plainest terms I can employ—namely, that before this International Act is adopted by the British Government the draft project and the Protocol shall be communicated to the House of Commons, so that they will have an opportunity of expressing an opinion upon it before it is ratified.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: The last words of the right hon. Gentleman are of very great importance, and I venture to think they carry the assurances of the Government very decidedly in advance of those which we received from the Prime Minister early in the evening. I think if we are to understand that the pledge of the Government is that which has now been notified by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, my right hon. Friend may be very well satisfied with the result of the discussion. His object has been, and our object has been, a practical one. We cannot exaggerate the enormous importance to this country of obtaining a satisfactory solution and settlement of

the question relating to the Suez Canal. If that was recognized as an important question last year, how much more important is it at the present time? If it was important a few weeks ago, how much more important is it now, when we know the very extreme importance which it will be to us within a short time to know that we have command of the highway to the East? The question is one which the Prime Minister has admitted to be in itself important, but which he and others have said ought not to have been brought forward at the present moment, as this was not the occasion on which it ought to be discussed. Indeed, the Prime Minister went so far as to say that this was a proceeding somewhat in the nature of tacking. Tacking has no particular connection with another measure which the House is bound to pass; but in this case there is the strictest possible connection between the Financial Arrangement and the Arrangement for the navigation of the Suez Canal. These two things are presented to us, and were presented to the Powers responsible for the Convention, as part of one Arrangement; and when we are told—"If you will only pass one part, you will afterwards be able to deal with the other," I wish to ask the Government, the House, and the country to bear in mind what a lever you are losing in this matter by deciding on the Financial Arrangement before you begin to deal with the Suez Canal itself. The right hon. Gentleman told us early in the evening we might be assured that the House will have an opportunity of pronouncing an opinion upon the Arrangement with regard to the Canal. He said it will be laid on the Table, and that there will be, at least, opportunities of moving the adjournment of the House in order to discuss the matter if we liked to do so. The noble Lord the Member for Woodstock admitted the great importance of the subject, and said it was a matter which would be discussed, because it so closely affected the great interests of the Empire that it was impossible to suppose the Arrangement would be allowed to come into operation without being properly criticized and decided upon by Parliament. What I would point out to the noble Lord is, that he probably was quite right in saying that sooner or later there must be a disscussion on any arrangement that may be arrived at; that if a matter of such great importance were allowed to pass, and then you were to challenge it, you might be told that you would run the risk of giving offence to the other Powers concerned. But the noble Lord says you will be able to pass a Vote of Censure, and that the Government would suffer from the consequences of such a Vote, which, of course, they would; and, further, the noble Lord added that the Treaty itself would thereby be set aside. But it would not. There is just the point. The Government might be censured. Parliament might say it was a bad Arrangement, and might turn out the Government; but there the Treaty would be, and all the Governments of this country would be bound by it—just as they are bound, whether they like it or not, by the Declaration of Paris. The important questions of privateering and so forth and other matters were decided without reference to Parliament; and though Parliament might have pronounced a different opinion on those subjects afterwards, and might have turned out the Government of the day, still the obligations incurred by the Government of the day would have been binding upon us. When you consider the enormous importance of a proper settlement of this question of the Suez Canal, I say we ought to act, and to act in time, and that it was the duty of my right hon. Friend, or of someone else in this House, to challenge the attention of this House while there is still time for us to consider the matter. What has just been said on the part of the Government has, I admit, placed us in a much better position. I understand that we have a distinct undertaking on the part of the Government that before this Arrangement is permitted to become binding upon this country and to become an International Act, it shall be submitted to Parliament, and that an opportunity will be given to us to make observations upon it, and to pronounce an opinion upon it.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I said "laid before Parliament;" the right hon. Gentleman said "submitted."

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I ought to have said "laid before Parliament." The word "submitted" might imply some infringement of Prerogative.

It will, I understand, be laid before Parliament, and there will be an opportunity for Parliament freely to express its opinion on the important points raised by it. That being the understanding which we have, I admit that we may, under the circumstances, be satisfied with that, and that it is not necessary for us to call on the House for any special vote on the subject. I hope that, under the circumstances, the Motion will be withdrawn, and that the matter will be left in the position in which the Government seem to place it.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Short Title).

Clause 2 (Power to Her Majesty to guarantee annuity of £315,000 for loan to be raised by the Egyptian Government).

MR. TOMLINSON said, he wished to propose an Amendment which would, in his opinion, enable the Government to join in the Guarantee, notwithstanding the limited liability of Russia under it. Under the clause, as it stood, the only Guarantee that the Government could enter into was a Guarantee jointly with the Foreign Governments named in Article VII. set forth in the Schedule to the Bill, and severally upon the terms and conditions set forth in the Articles in the said Schedule, for the purposes of a loan to be raised by the Government of Egypt. Therefore, if one of the Powers did not join in that Guarantee according to the terms of the Articles set forth in the Schedule, the Government would not be authorized to bind this country with regard to it. It appeared, on the face of the Guarantee itself, that one of the Powers was not to be bound by the Articles of the Guarantee, because there was a Declaration by the Russian Government appended to the Articles, but not forming part of them, in which the Russian Plenipotentiary stated that if in course of time the Guarantee stipulated in Article VII. of the present Convention should come in force, it was to be understood that in the accounts between the guaranteeing Powers the share falling to Russia should in no case exceed the sixth part of the annual interest guaranteed. What he proposed was to amend the clause by adding after the word "guarantee" in the first line, the words "either solely or," and at the beginning of line 15, after the words "jointly with" the words "any one or more of." The clause would then read—

"It shall be lawful for Her Majesty to guarantee either solely or jointly with any one or more of the Foreign Governments named in Article Seven, set forth in the schedule to this Act, and severally, upon the terms and conditions set forth in the Articles in the said schedule, the regular payment of the annuity of *three hundred and fifteen thousand* pounds sterling, mentioned in the said Article Seven, for the purpose of a loan to be raised by the Government of Egypt."

Amendment proposed, in line 14, after the word "guarantee," to insert the words "either solely or."—(*Mr. Tomlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): I cannot accept the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman, because this country is bound by the terms of the Convention to accept the Guarantee as it stands. The exception which the hon. Member regards as an exception in favour of Russia is really no exception at all, and it has been allowed by this country and the other Powers to be made.

MR. TOMLINSON said, that under those circumstances he would not press the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

Schedule.

MR. STAVELEY HILL said, that, by Article VII. of the Convention, the Governments of Great Britain, Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Italy, and Russia, undertook either to guarantee jointly and severally, or to ask authority from their Parliaments to guarantee jointly and severally, the regular payment of the stipulated Annuity of £315,000; but by the Declaration of the Russian Government, at the end of the Schedule, Russia excepted herself from a joint and several Guarantee by

providing that in the accounts between the guaranteeing Governments the share falling to Russia should in no case exceed the sixth part of the interest guaranteed. He wished to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer what would be the position of Russia under those circumstances? Of course, Turkey was excepted from the Guarantee; and, so far as Russia was concerned, it did not appear to be any joint and several Guarantee at all.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): The state of the matter is this—Under the terms of the Guarantee, Russia cannot be called upon to do more than pay one-sixth of the amount of the annual interest on the loan.

MR. STAVELEY HILL asked how, under the circumstances, Russia could remain in Article VII. as one of the guaranteeing Powers?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): It is, after all, a question of words.

Schedule *agreed to.*

Bill *reported*, without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (REDISTRIBUTION) (*re-committed*) BILL.—[BILL 49.]

(*Mr. Gladstone, The Marquess of Hartington, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Attorney General, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 15th April.*]

[FIFTEENTH NIGHT.]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

SEVENTH SCHEDULE.

COUNTIES AT LARGE.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS AND NAMES AND CONTENTS OF DIVISIONS.

PART I.

ENGLAND.

Amendment proposed, in page 84, line 29, to leave out the word "Morley," in order to insert the word "Batley,"—(*Mr. Serjeant Simon,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'Morley' stand part of the Schedule."

MR. WARTON said, that yesterday he was in possession of the Committee when, in accordance with the Rules of the House, Progress was reported. He wished to assure the Committee that he had not been animated by any desire to talk the Bill out; and what occurred was the result of the accident of his only being able to rise two minutes before the proper time for closing the discussion. He preferred to leave the Schedule as it stood, and maintained that the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon) had made out no case whatever for his proposal.

VISCOUNT LEWISHAM said, that he knew something of the facts of the case, and it appeared to him that the proposal of the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon) was a most extraordinary one, because he proposed to give to the new division, instead of the name of "Morley," the name of a district which at present formed a very important part of the borough of Dewsbury. It was well known that Batley chiefly lay in the Parliamentary borough of Dewsbury, and its population was something like 30,000. That fact might be a strong reason for adding the name of Batley to the borough of Dewsbury; but there was no reason whatever why it should give the name to a new division of the county, seeing that only 1,916 of the population of Batley would reside in the new division. All the rest would continue to reside in the borough of Dewsbury. So far as Morley itself was concerned, it possessed 15,000 inhabitants, and of its commercial importance there could be no doubt. There were 33 important cloth factories in Morley itself, five large colleries, seven stone quarries, and several important buildings. If they turned to the historical associations of Morley, they would find that it possessed much more interesting records than Batley. Therefore, from every point of consideration, its importance in the district, its commercial importance, and its historical associations, if the Committee had paid any attention to the subject, he was satisfied they would unanimously decide that the name of Morley, and not Batley, ought to be attached to the new division. He, therefore, felt bound to oppose most strongly the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he thought that in the designation of the

constituencies the chief fact which the Committee ought, as far as possible, to consider was the wish of the inhabitants. No fact could be of such great importance as that fact. Hon. Members knew very little about the position of either one place or the other, or of the wish of the large majority of the future electors of the division; but the population of the locality knew a good deal about it, and were much interested in the matter. It was quite true that a large majority of the inhabitants of Batley were already within the borough of Dewsbury; but the reason why he intended to vote for the proposal of his hon. and learned Friend was that he had taken the trouble to ascertain what the wishes of the people generally were, and he was forced to come to the conclusion that the great majority would prefer the name of Batley to that of Morley. Indeed, that was the opinion of almost the whole of them, except the 15,000 who lived in Morley. Their desire was that the new division should be called by the name of Batley; and that was a conclusive argument, in his mind, to induce him to vote for the Amendment.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 100; Noes 87: Majority 13.—(Div. List, No. 106.)

MR. W. H. LEATHAM moved an Amendment in line 10, the object of which was to change the "Peniston" to the "Holmfirth" Division. He stated that the population of Holmfirth was 17,000, while that of Peniston was only 10,000, and the size and importance of Holmfirth were very much greater than those of Peniston. Peniston had no importance at all except as the point of junction between the railways for the North and West.

Amendment proposed,

In page 85, line 10, to leave out the word "Peniston," in order to insert the word "Holmfirth,"—(*Mr. W. H. Leatham,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'Peniston' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that upon the whole he felt rather disposed to accept this Amendment. Peniston was a large parish, and a Poor Law Union; but it was a very small Poor Law Union. Indeed, the town of Peniston itself was a very small place, with not more than some 2,000 inhabitants; whereas Holmfirth was a Local Government Board district, with a population of about 9,000 in the town itself. Under these circumstances, he thought it had a very strong claim to give its name to the division. A Petty Sessions Court was held at Holmfirth, and also a County Court; and, seeing that it was a much larger and more important place than Peniston, he had no objection to accept the Amendment.

MR. STUART-WORTLEY said, he was sorry to find that in consequence of persistent and repeated demands from the other side of the House, the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill appeared to be disposed to throw over the recommendations of the Boundary Commissioners on every conceivable opportunity. Holmfirth might have the advantage in population over Peniston; but it was deficient in the essential element of position. He would ask any hon. Member who was acquainted with the locality whether Peniston or Holmfirth occupied the best known position, and he had no hesitation in saying that everybody would know exactly where Peniston was; whereas there would be a difficulty in finding out the position of Holmfirth without searching the map. As a matter of fact, it would require great industry, and the assistance of someone locally acquainted with the district, to discover Holmfirth, even with the aid of the map which had been presented to Parliament by Her Majesty's Commissioners. But there were other considerations which induced him to come to the conclusion that the question of the name to be given to the new division should be decided by position rather than by population. In the first place, Peniston was an important place, and was growing into greater importance every year. It contained an important railway station, where the trains proceeding to Manchester and the West and those going to the North separated, and it stood at a particular point where the river turned at a sharp angle from the hills. Then, again, Holmfirth stood a great deal further off from the centre of the proposed division than the town of Peniston; and, therefore, on the ground of convenience and position, he hoped the Committee would not accept

the Amendment of the hon. Member for the South-West Riding (Mr. W. H. Leatham).

MR. FIRTH supported the Amendment, and hoped that the Committee would accept it. Respecting the geographical position of the two places, he did not at all agree with the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Stuart-Wortley). The River Don, in the neighbourhood of Peniston, which had been alluded to by the hon. Member, was a stream which it would not be difficult to jump across without coming into contact with the water. The railway station was merely a junction for Huddersfield on the main line between Sheffield and Manchester, and lines running to Huddersfield, Halifax, Leeds, and other centres.

MR. STUART-WORTLEY remarked, that it was also the junction for Barnsley.

MR. FIRTH said, that, so far as a choice between the two places was concerned, Holmfirth might not be more central than Peniston; but it was a good deal larger, and much more important. He knew very well that if any traveller was asked which place he would prefer to stay at he would go at once to Holmfirth rather than stop at Peniston, because he would find in the former all the accommodation which modern civilization provided, but would not be able to do so at Peniston.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 63; Noes 125: Majority 62.—(Div. List, No. 107.)

On the Motion of Sir CHARLES W. DILKE, the following Amendment made: —In page 85, line 37, leave out "hundred" and insert "Wapentake."

MR. STUART-WORTLEY said, his reason for moving the next Amendment on the Paper in his name was to give the right hon. Baronet an opportunity of explaining certain curious points in the scheme of the Commissioners relating to the Otley Division of the county. In the first place, in the matter of the parish which was the subject of his Amendment, they had departed from their own original scheme, which had been supported by a large section of the inhabitants; secondly, they had departed from the principle of population; thirdly, they had departed from their Instructions with regard to the pursuits of the people in forming their schemes, Yeadon, which was a manufacturing district, having been placed by the Commissioners in an agricultural district. He understood that the whole proceeding on the part of the Commissioners had been followed by an enthusiastic telegram sent from the Liberal Party in Yeadon to the hon. Baronet who now represented that division of the county. He should be glad to hear from the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) an explanation of what had taken place; and in the event of that explanation not being satisfactory he should feel it his duty to divide the Committee on his Amendment, which he begged to move.

Amendment proposed, in page 86, line 9, after the word "Otley," to insert the words "less the parish of Yeadon."—(*Mr. Stuart-Wortley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he hoped the hon. Gentleman would disabuse his mind of the idea that the Commissioners had acted with any want of impartiality in this matter. The hon. Member would recollect that the Commissioners were unanimous in their decision; and he thought, from that fact alone, it would be seen that their proposal was entitled to consideration. After the local inquiry the Commissioners considered that Yeadon was more associated with Otley than any other division, and after careful deliberation they had placed it in the Otley Division—that was to say, after first placing it in the other division.

SIR ANDREW FAIRBAIRN pointed out that as Yeadon was connected with the Otley Division in respect of Union, Petty Sessions, County Court, and other arrangements, it was a great hardship that it should be separated from that division. He might remark that the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) was quite wrong as to Yeadon being an urban constituency, and therefore not rightly placed in the Otley Division, inasmuch as there were several other urban localities in the same division. Recently a poll had been taken, at which 904 householders voted in favour of Yeadon being in the Otley Division, and only 16 against it, from

which he thought the Committee would perceive that Yeadon ought to remain in the position assigned to it by the Commissioners.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, having lived at Yeadon for some years he could confirm the opinion which his hon. Friend had just expressed, that there was an overpowering feeling in the district in favour of Yeadon being placed in the Otley Division. There was the strongest objection on the part of the inhabitants to their having to cross a railway and river to get to a place with which they had no connection whatever.

MR. JACKSON said, he thought there must be some misconception as to the state of local feeling in this matter. His hon. Friend (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) had, in his opinion, correctly described Yeadon as an urban constituency. The hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir Andrew Fairbairn) had stated that about 900 householders out of 1,000 had voted in favour of joining Yeadon with Otley; but he would point out to the Committee that he had had the honour of presenting a Petition from Yeadon signed by about 300 persons in favour of its being attached to the other division. He thought, therefore, there must be some mistake in the figures which had been given; and if his hon. Friend went to a division he should feel it his duty to support him.

MR. WARTON said, he had in various clauses of the Bill introduced an Amendment substituting for the word "exclusively" the word "except," which had been used generally throughout the Bill. A similar point arose in relation to the Amendment before the Committee, which he proposed to amend by substituting the word "except" for the word "less," in order to bring the wording into conformity with the rest of the Bill.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment, to leave out the word "less," in order to insert the word "except."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

MR. STUART-WORTLEY said, there was a perfectly good answer to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), and the hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Andrew Fairbairn). He was not surprised at the great desire of the inhabitants of Yeadon to belong to the district of Otley, which was due to the fact that if they were taken out of that division they would be transferred to a district with a singularly ineuphonious name. He believed that everyone would object to be included in the "Pudsey" Division. He had risen, however, to obtain an explanation of the reasons which had induced the Commissioners to depart from the instructions laid down for them, and from the provisional scheme which had met with general approval. He thought that some explanation ought to be given; but, under the circumstances, he would not put the Committee to the trouble of dividing on his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. STUART-WORTLEY said, in the absence of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Raikes), who probably did not expect that this part of the Bill would have been reached so soon, he would take the responsibility of moving the Amendment standing in the name of the right hon. Gentleman.

Amendment proposed, in page 86, line 13, to leave out the words "Barkston Ash," and insert the word "Tadcaster."—(*Mr. Stuart-Wortley.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'Barkston Ash' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that "Barkston Ash" was certainly not a pretty name; but it was the name of a district, and Tadcaster was on the very border of the division. He would suggest that "Selby," or some other suitable name, might be given to the division; but he was not prepared to accept the name of "Tadcaster."

COLONEL GUNTER said, as a resident in the neighbourhood in question, he considered that the name of "Barkston Ash" was far more fitted to represent the division than any other of the small towns in the district, such as Tadcaster and Selby. He had not heard anything of weight urged against the name Barkston Ash, and he was bound to say there was nothing in favour of the other names.

SIR JOHN RAMSDEN said, that the name "Barkston Ash" had been adopted by the Boundary Commissioner on the joint recommendation of the representa-

tives of both political Parties; and he hoped the Committee would not agree to the proposed alteration.

Mr. STUART-WORTLEY thought that perhaps the best designation for the division would be that of Lower Wharfdale; but he would not press the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. STUART-WORTLEY said, before the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) moved his Amendment in line 34 he wished to raise the question as to whether it would not be well to substitute the designation of "Calverley" for that of "Pudsey" in respect of the 25th division of the county.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, that "Pudsey" was not a euphonious name for the division, and he was willing to follow the general wish with regard to it.

Mr. ILLINGWORTH pointed out that, although "Pudsey" might not be a very nice name, the place itself was a very important centre of trade.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he thought it was not desirable to agree to the proposed alteration without Notice being given, and therefore the question must be raised on the Report.

Amendment proposed,

In page 86, leave out line 34, and insert "the parishes of Drighlington, Hunsworth, and Tong, and so much of the parishes of Calverley with Farsley and Pudsey, as is not included in the municipal borough of Bradford."—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. ILLINGWORTH said, that Birstall was a town having only one-eighth of the population of the division, whereas Spen Valley represented a series of important townships. His proposal was to substitute the name of Spen Valley for that of Birstall as the designation of the 26th division of the county. His proposal, he believed, commanded by far the largest amount of approval in the district.

Amendment proposed,

In page 86, line 37, to leave out the word "Birstall," in order to insert the words "Spen Valley,"—(*Mr. Illingworth,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'Birstall' stand part of the Schedule.',

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, it was true that Birstall was not the largest town of the division, but it was the name of an ancient parish which covered the greater part of the division. There had been considerable difficulty with regard to naming the division, as no one town would on this question yield to another. Spen Valley was the name given to a district formed for drainage purposes by the Local Government Board, and it was well known in the neighbourhood. Under the circumstances, he was willing to consider the question between then and Report.

Colonel GUNTER said, he should strongly object to the name of Spen Valley being substituted for that of Old Birstall; and although he had little to do with the district now, he had no doubt that his view was shared by a large number of the inhabitants.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 98; Noes 102: Majority 4.—(Div. List, No. 108.)

Question put, "That the words 'Spen Valley' be there inserted."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 119; Noes 78: Majority 41.—(Div. List, No. 109.)

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE complained of the waste of time occasioned by challenging a second division, and moved to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said, the Government had obtained priority for this Bill; and it had been understood, therefore, that on the nights on which it was taken it would be pushed on to a reasonable hour with the view of making substantial progress. There were several contested Bills down on the Paper, either of which might be taken if this Motion were adopted; and if either of them were taken it would be unfair to hon. Members who were absent. The first subject on the Paper had somewhat abruptly terminated. Many hon. Members had thereupon gone away, believing that the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill would occupy the remainder of the Sitting. He thought that before reporting Progress they should make some further advance with the Committee stage.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he thought they would have finished the part of the Schedules dealing with Scotland that night; but the second division which had just been taken had shown a disposition on the part of some hon. Members to waste time. It was absolutely essential that the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill should be accompanied by Registration Bills. It would be impossible to take steps for hurrying on the General Election until those Bills had made some progress. As they had read the English Registration Bill a second time it was now proposed to proceed with the Irish Registration Bill, which was the ninth Order on the Paper.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, the Bill in question was one of the greatest importance to the Irish Conservative Members; and, though he would not say it would be opposed by them, it would certainly be considerably criticized from their side of the House. It was futile to suggest that the result of putting the Bill off that night would be to delay the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill. Delay would be caused by putting off the consideration of the Scotch Amendments. He had no doubt that if the Committee applied itself to the task it would be able to get through the Scotch Amendments that night.

MR. WARTON said, that to move to report Progress at that hour, and upon such a plea as that they had heard from the right hon. Baronet, was conduct unworthy of the Government. The right hon. Baronet had not given the Opposition credit for their kind intentions in finishing the important debate they had had on the Suez Canal so soon. There was important Business before the Committee, and the Committee—or a large part of it—wished to go on with it. The reason pleaded by the right hon. Baronet for postponing the further consideration of the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill was a very small and unsatisfactory one. He had accused hon. Members of wasting time by challenging a second division; but, surely, when the numbers were so close in the first division — the Government only securing a narrow majority of four—it was not unreasonable for Members to try the point again, especially as in so doing they were giving the Government a last opportunity of considering whether they could not find a better name than "Spen Valley." The motive of revenge which seemed to guide the right hon. Baronet in his Motion to report Progress was a most unworthy one.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES) said, he was sure the Committee would acquit the Government of any desire to waste time, and would readily believe that their anxiety, on the contrary, was to economize time as much as possible. The Government, on their part, gratefully acknowledged the consideration shown by the Opposition for those who had charge of the measure. At the present moment the position of affairs was this — the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill and the Registration Bills must, to some extent, proceed *pari passu*. It would be useless to proceed with the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill, if, at the same time, they did not make progress with the Registration Bills. They had made progress with the English Registration Bill. They had read it a second time and had referred it to a Select Committee, and now they desired to make progress with the Irish Bill. That was the whole position they found themselves in; and the Government, he thought, had taken the wisest course open to them for the purpose of making the best of their time. However hon. Members might differ from the opinion of the Government, he hoped they would not think the Government had neglected to do what they could to economize time.

MR. E. STANHOPE said, the Government could not certainly accuse the Opposition with a desire to delay the Registration Bill. He and his hon. Friends had endeavoured to do all they could to insure the rapid progress of that measure. They had considered with the Government the best means of facilitating its passing, and of so amending it as to meet any reasonable suggestions that might be made. But on the present occasion, as he understood it, hon. Members had come down to discuss the Egyptian Financial Arrangement, and it was arranged that when that was over they were to go on with the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill. He personally was aware of the fact that many hon. Members who had been in the House earlier in the evening had gone away under the impression that after

the discussion on the Anglo-Egyptian Arrangement the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill would be proceeded with; and it certainly seemed to him that, as the Government had monopolized almost the whole time of the House in order to enable them to make progress with the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill, it was extremely odd that they should not avail themselves of the opportunity of proceeding with it when they could.

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill had so far been conducted with a certain amount of mutual agreement between the two sides of the House; and he considered it a great pity that anything should happen that night to lead to a controversy upon a question of procedure. The right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board seemed to suggest that he had adopted the course of proposing to report Progress in consequence of a second division having taken place upon a subject upon which the Committee was supposed a few minutes before to have pronounced a decided opinion. The right hon. Baronet seemed to resent the loss of time. That loss of time, however, seemed to him (Lord John Manners) a very strong argument against the course the right hon. Baronet now proposed to take, for it amounted to this—they had lost a few minutes on a second division, therefore they should lose the rest of the night. Having lost a few minutes the best course would seem to be to endeavour to make more rapid progress in the time remaining. The Government must admit that the first division had been a very close one, the majority having been only some three or four, and that, therefore, there was some ground for again challenging the opinion of the Committee. But admitting that it was an unnecessary division, and that some minutes had been wasted in it, that was certainly no reason why they should not proceed to a reasonable limit of time to deal with the Scotch case. When the Scotch part of the Schedule was finished everyone, he thought, would admit that the right hon. Baronet could fairly close the Committee for the evening, and that the House should meet again to-morrow to proceed with it. If that was not the view of the right hon. Baronet he would point out that to travel over six or eight Bills on the Paper and then to say—"We will deal with this ninth Order" was not a satisfactory way of conducting Business. No one in the House had expected Order No. 9 to be taken after midnight; and he thought that under the circumstances it would be much better to go on with the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill. At any rate, it was not the proper time to proceed with the Registration Bill.

MR. MONK said, he was sure the right hon. Baronet would see that there was a good deal of force in what had fallen from the noble Lord who had just sat down. To take the ninth Order of the Day for discussion after 12 o'clock at night, when it had been announced earlier in the day that if the Egyptian Loan Bill was disposed of in sufficient time the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill would be taken, was, to say the least of it, springing a mine upon hon. Members. ["Question!"] He saw the House was impatient, and he did not wish to waste any further time. He would appeal to the right hon. Baronet.

MR. HEALY: Name, name! [*Cries of* "Order!"]

MR. MONK said, it was very evident ill-feeling was likely to arise if this debate were further continued; he, therefore, appealed to the President of the Local Government Board to withdraw the Motion to report Progress.

MR. GIBSON said, there seemed to be great danger in the course the Government were taking. It was obvious they were setting a precedent which might be used to the great disadvantage of Public Business, and which might expose the Government to charges, he would not say of breaches of faith, but unquestionably of unfair surprise. When the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister was interrogated that afternoon as to the course of Business he had given an answer which, coming as it did from a person in his position, was bound to be received. In that answer the right hon. Gentleman had not given the slightest intimation that after the Egyptian Loan discussion, and the further consideration of the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill, if there was time to bring it on, the Registration Bill would be taken up. Taking the right hon. Baronet's own language, it was understood that the

Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill would be dealt with, and that it would be considered until that part affecting Ireland was reached, and that part affecting Scotland was disposed of. Now, however, a different course was suggested, or rather two different courses. When the right hon. Baronet had commenced his observations, he had partly implied, and by his manner had seemed to hint, that the reason operating upon his mind, and inducing him so suddenly to break off the Committee on the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill, was the challenge of a second division by the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) on grounds which the right hon. Baronet had probably thought insufficient. That had been unquestionably the first ground the right hon. Baronet had put forward, and he had desired the House to adopt that as the reason. The right hon. Baronet appeared, however, to have abandoned that ground. It could not have been submitted altogether for the purpose of argument, because, having put it forward, the right hon. Baronet had now abandoned it. Later on he had given an altogether different ground—namely, that it was so desirable, so important, and so necessary to make progress with the Registration Bill, that the Committee on the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill must be interrupted. Surely if the Prime Minister had seen the importance of this arrangement, and had had it in his mind when he was addressing the House, he would have ventured to make a statement similar to that of the right hon. Baronet. Surely he would have seen the fairness and reasonableness of taking the House into his confidence. The precedent, if persisted in by Her Majesty's Government, would, no doubt, lead to surprise, and possibly to retaliation.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he was not a party to the arrangement that the Registration Bill should be taken that evening; but he was informed that it would be taken. He thought, however, it would be useless, in the face of the opposition which had been raised, to attempt to proceed with it. There were a considerable number of Bills which it was essential to pass—the English Registration Bill, the Scotch Registration Bill, the Bill in connection with the expenses of the Returning Officers, and possibly a separate Bill in regard to the expenses of the elections. There were, he thought, five Bills which depended upon the passing of this Bill, which would have to be pushed on; but he might point out to hon. Members that nothing would be gained by hurrying this Bill unless the other Bills which would have to be taken were pushed on also. He felt, however, that there was considerable force in the argument of hon. Members opposite that there might be hon. Gentlemen interested in the Registration Bill who were not aware that the Bill was coming on that night, and he thought he ought to yield to it.

MR. HEALY said, he thought it was hard, as it only wanted a quarter of an hour to half-past 12, that the other right hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Plunket) had not had an opportunity of distinguishing himself. It was a pity that all the talent of the Opposition had not been employed in wasting the other quarter of an hour; and it was much to be regretted that the President of the Local Government Board had interposed, seeing that the matter would then have been settled by the efflux of time. There was no intention of discussing the merits of the question, but simply of getting over the next 15 minutes; and he was sorry that the Government had felt it necessary to waste any argument whatever upon the Front Opposition Bench. The Irish Members sitting below the Gangway had sometimes been charged with Obstruction. [Mr. WARTON: No, no!] The hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) said "No." Certainly, no one ever dreamt of accusing the hon. and learned Member of Obstruction—[Mr. WARTON: Hear, hear!]—but the Irish Members were often charged with entering into that last department of Parliamentary resource; but whenever they did, they acted fairly, openly, and avowedly, and did not conceal their real object by wasting an additional quarter of an hour after midnight. He would tell the Tory Party that if they thought for a moment that the Irish Members would allow themselves, on occasions of this kind, to be treated with contempt, they were very much mistaken.

THE CHAIRMAN reminded the hon. and learned Member that the Question

before the Committee was the Motion to report Progress.

MR. HEALY admitted that he had been travelling slightly outside the Motion for reporting Progress; but he hoped, with the general assent of the Committee, to be permitted to make one further remark. If the Tory Party imagined for one moment that the Irish Members could be humbugged by the Front Opposition Bench, they would fall into a grievous error; and when, upon other occasions, negotiations were entered into to secure their votes, and the Irish Members were consulted with the object of bringing the Tory Party into Office, if it were imagined that they were any longer to be fooled, right hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House would find themselves very much out of their reckoning. For his part, he thought the Irish Members had seen enough of the tactics of the Tory Party; and, as far as he could see, their policy was this —["Question!"] Well, perhaps he was a little out of Order, and, therefore, to quote words that were once used on a memorable occasion, he would withdraw what he was going to say. He regretted that the Government were not allowed to bring on the Irish Registration Bill that night. They had allowed the Committee on the English Registration Bill to be appointed. That Committee was now sitting, and, as the House had expressed an intense desire to see 700,000 Irish labourers in the enjoyment of the franchise, he failed to see what the object of this Obstruction was. He would tell the Tory Party that when the General Election came, the Nationalists would give them a great deal more trouble than they would be able to give the Nationalists.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

PART II.
SCOTLAND.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE moved an Amendment in page 87, line 5, to describe the first division of the county of Fife as the "Eastern" instead of the East Division. He thought it was desirable to make the Scotch county names correspond with those which had been applied to the English counties; and he therefore proposed, in the case of the county of Fife, to call the divisions "Eastern" and "Western," instead of "East and West."

Question, "That the word 'East,' in page 87, line 5, stand part of the Schedule," put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That the word 'Eastern' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE moved, on the same ground, to substitute "Western" in the second division for "West."

Question, "That the word 'West,' in page 87, line 14, stand part of the Schedule," put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That the word 'Western' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR) moved, in page 88, line 3, in the Partick Division of Lanarkshire, to describe the contents of the division as so much of the parish of Govan as lies north of the Clyde and beyond the present boundary of the municipal burgh of Glasgow, and "so much of the parish of Barony as lies" to the west of the present main line of the North British Railway between Glasgow and Edinburgh.

MR. WARTON rose to Order. An Amendment preceding the present one stood on the Paper in the name of the right hon. and learned Gentleman—namely, to insert "s" at the beginning of the Govan Division.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR) said, the Amendment had reference simply to a printer's error, which had already been corrected.

Amendment proposed,

In page 88, line 3, after the word "and," to insert the words "so much of the parish of Barony as lies."—(*The Lord Advocate.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

On the Motion of THE LORD ADVOCATE, the following Amendment made:—Page 88, line 6, after "Railway," insert "and beyond the present boundary of the Municipal Burgh of Glasgow."

On the Motion of Mr. JOHN HAMILTON, the following Amendment made:—Page 88, line 7, leave out "West."

MR. JOHN HAMILTON moved an Amendment to describe the fourth division of Lanarkshire as the "Eastern" instead of the "North-East" Division.

Amendment proposed, in page 88, line 12, to leave out the word "North."—(*Mr. John Hamilton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'North' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he knew that his hon. Friend had a strong opinion in favour of calling this division "Eastern" instead of "North-Eastern;" but he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) could not agree to the Amendment, because the greater portion of the division lay to the east of the county of Lanark, and one of the points they had already settled was that even local opinion should not be allowed to prevail if it were not in accord with geographical facts. Therefore he would move, as an Amendment to the proposal of his hon. Friend, to substitute the words "North-Eastern."

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed, in page 88, line 12, to leave out the word "East," and insert "Eastern." — (*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

On the Motion of The LORD ADVOCATE, the following Amendment made:—Part 2, page 88, line 13, leave out "Dalzell," and insert "Dalziel."

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR) moved Amendments describing the fifth division as "The Mid Division," and the sixth as "The Southern Division."

Amendments *agreed to.*

On the Motion of The LORD ADVOCATE, the following Amendments made:—Page 88, line 17, leave out "the parishes of;" line 19, leave out "and the parishes of;" line 35, leave out "and Dunblane," and insert "Dunning."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE moved an Amendment in page 88, line 31, to describe the first division of the county of Perth as "Eastern" insead of "East."

Amendment *agreed to.*

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR) moved, in page 89, lines 1, 3, and 4, to leave out "the parishes of;" in line 7, to leave out "Rynd," and insert "Rhynd;" in line 11, to leave out "Crief," and insert "Crieff."

MR. HEALY asked why these changes were being made?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE explained that nothing was being done in regard to the county of Perth which had not already been done in the English counties.

SIR DONALD CURRIE remarked that, if hon. Members would look at the map of Perthshire, they would see that the county was cut up in an extraordinary way. It was now proposed to take the parish of Dunning from the Western Division and insert it in the Eastern, and to remove Dunblane from the Eastern Division for the purpose of placing it in the Western. He objected to the way in which the county had been divided.

Amendments *agreed to.*

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the Boundary Commissioners had consented to alter their original scheme in the case of the county of Perth on the ground that the changes would be more suitable as regarded the number of population. Considerable alterations had been made, and he believed the result had been to irritate to a considerable extent the Liberal Party in the county, who thought they were deprived of advantages they would otherwise have enjoyed. He thought, however, that the Committee were bound to carry out the recommendations of the Boundary Commissioners, who had acted only in accordance with the Instructions given to them. He moved, in line 9, to omit "West," and substitute "Western."

Amendment proposed, in page 89, line 9, to leave out the word "West."—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'West' stand part of the Schedule."

MR. CALLAN said, he did not understand why they should change "West" into "Western." At present they all knew the Member for North Lincoln; but who would know the right hon. Gentleman as the Member for Northern Lincoln? In this case, were hon. Members to address the hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Donald Currie) as the Member for the Western Division of the county of Perth? The change appeared to him (Mr. Callan) to be ridiculous and nonsensical. It would be much more simple and sensible to speak of him as the Member for West Perth, although in the Writ he might

be returned as the Member for the Western Division of that county. If it were hereafter necessary to give such long names to hon. Members, the only effect would be obstruct the transaction of Business and prolong the debates unnecessarily. When the Committee came to discuss the Irish counties, which he presumed would be reached in a few moments, he should certainly prefer North, South, East, and West to Northern, Southern, Eastern, and Western. Why should it not be North Antrim and North Fermanagh, instead of Northern Antrim and Northern Fermanagh? He wished to know, therefore, why, in the case of the county of Perth, "Western" should be substituted for "West?"

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the view of the Government was that which had been expressed by the hon. Member; but the Committee, generally, had taken a different view, and had accused the Government of being guilty of using bad grammar. The whole of the English names had therefore been altered, and "Northern" adopted instead of "North." The hon. Member said the names would be very long; but, in this instance, the name was one of the shortest in the Bill. In some instances, the Committee had inserted names which covered two lines of print, very much against the protest of the Government. For himself, he should still continue to call the Member for the Western Division of the county of Perth the Member for Perthshire.

MR. HEALY thought the Committee had adopted a very odd way of naming the county divisions.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had put the matter clearly before the Committee, and he would not now waste time by fighting the question. When they came to the Irish counties, he did not know why they should adopt a different grammatical construction from that which had been adopted in England and Scotland. In former Acts of Parliament, as a matter of fact, both forms had been adopted—for instance, East and West Sussex and the Northern and Southern Divisions of the West Riding of Yorkshire.

MR. SEXTON said, that in Ireland the Commissioners had adopted the compass points in naming the counties. Personally, he entertained a strong opinion that the name inserted in the Schedule should be as brief as possible, and that it ought to correspond with the name given by the Commissioners. Upon the map the county of Armagh was divided into North Armagh, Mid Armagh, and South Armagh, and he thought the same names should appear in the Schedule. The question would have to be discussed when they proceeded with the Irish counties to-morrow; but he should not be prepared to fight it at any length. "North Armagh" would certainly be shorter than "The Northern Armagh Division."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed, in page 89, line 2, to leave out the word "Dunning," and insert the word "Dunblane."—(*The Lord Advocate.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Dunning' stand part of the Schedule."

MR. HEALY said, he should like to ask what was the explanation for this proposed change?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR) said, that these places had been transposed in the Bill, and the Amendment was therefore of a merely clerical character.

MR. HEALY: Yes; but why were they transposed? Probably the people in the locality desired that the thing should be reversed.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: No; that is not the case. Objection has been raised to what has been called the jerrymandering of Perth; but no objection is raised upon this particular point, which relates to a mere accidental error in printing the contents of the Schedule. It is a geographical necessity that Dunning and Dunblane should change places in the Schedule.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. WARTON said that in page 89, line 14, he saw, after "Kippen," this sentence in parenthesis—namely, "except the detached part locally situate in Stirlingshire." He would propose to omit "the detached part locally" in order to insert "so much as is." They might as well be consistent so far as they could in this Bill; and as those words had been adopted in previous cases, he thought that they should be inserted here. They had never yet had in any part of the Bill "the detached part locally situate," and all through

the Bill they had had the expression "so much as is."

Amendment proposed,

In page 89, line 14, after the word "except," to leave out the words "the detached part locally," in order to insert "so much as is."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR) said, the difference of phraseology in this case was attributable to the different conditions of the district the words described. The district was not physically joined to any other, but was an Island, so to speak, or an oasis situated in another place.

MR. WARTON: Then I withdraw.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

PART III.

IRELAND.

MR. HEALY said, he believed they now came to the Irish part of the Schedule, and he wished to call attention to the innumerable inaccuracies in the Bill as printed. In looking down the Paper of Amendments, he saw there was not a single Amendment standing in the name of the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill; and he would therefore ask what steps were to be taken by the Government to insure accuracy in the measure?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he was afraid that in the case of Ireland there had been greater liability to make mistakes than in the case of England or Scotland. People in Ireland were not so much alive to the Bill, owing to causes which must be patent to everybody, as were the people of England and Scotland. He had received a great many communications from various parts of England with regard to the proper names of places; and there could be no doubt that the best way of checking errors was for people locally interested to call attention to such mistakes as occurred. The best way of correcting such inaccuracies as remained would be for hon. Members to look at that part of the Bill which affected the district they represented. If there was anything wrong, it would then be easy to rectify it. Very often small errors, particularly in spelling, were very difficult to detect.

MR. HEALY said, the matter was one for the consideration of the Government themselves. He wished to ask whether there was any fear that geographical errors of a substantial kind made in this Bill would interfere with the right of a person to vote? For instance, supposing a Sheriff had a Writ issued excluding by mistake a certain place which ought to have been in a constituency, would he be entitled to allow voters in the place so excluded to vote?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, there would be very little danger of anything of that kind arising if they set out the whole list of parishes. If the whole of the parishes were given, no doubt electors would have a right to vote; but they might not in all cases exercise the right in the proper divisions.

MR. WARTON said, he proposed now to move to report Progress. Earlier on in the evening an expression had fallen from the right hon. Baronet's lips to the effect that it would be as well to finish Scotland before terminating the Committee for that night. Well, that part of the Schedule affecting Scotland had been disposed of in a very short space of time, and a great many hon. Members who had heard the right hon. Baronet's expression had felt themselves at liberty to go home. Personally, he was not particular to what hour he stayed there. He would gladly remain until 3 or 4 o'clock for any useful purpose; but he did not think it would conduce to any very useful purpose to make further progress with the Bill under existing circumstances. To his mind it would be much better to have a clean start for Ireland to-morrow. He knew the Irish Members always liked to have a clean start if they could get one, and to-morrow they would be able to have it with a much fuller attendance than they had now. There were very few Members present at that moment, and as everybody had understood that nothing would be taken after the Scotch part of the Schedule, hon. Members, not only on the Conservative but also on the Ministerial side, had left in large numbers. It so happened that the very first counties to be dealt with in the Irish part of the Schedule were those in which Conservative and Liberal Members were much more interested than Home Rule

Members. The counties of Antrim and Armagh should not be discussed in the absence of Conservative and Liberal Members, because those hon. Members were more largely interested than anybody else. He did not say that with any feeling of hostility to any part of the House; but he certainly thought that it would be too bad to go on with the Irish part of the Bill now, instead of having a clean start to-morrow, when they could enjoy themselves thoroughly.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had communicated privately with the Whips of the Conservative Party, as well as with those of the Irish Party, about 8 o'clock that evening, and had informed them that he proposed only to take the Irish part of the Schedule until some seriously contested case was reached. They would reach that contested case, he thought, in the county of Armagh; and it was therefore proposed to go on now with the county of Antrim.

MR. WARTON: I withdraw at once.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Gibson), who had now left the House, had been thoroughly aware of the course he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) proposed to adopt.

MR. WARTON: Very good. I withdraw.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. SEXTON said, he wished to propose in page 90, to leave out "Ballymoney," and insert "North Antrim." He might explain in a few words that the Boundary Commissioners had received Instructions to frame divisions with the names either of merged boroughs or of points of the compass. Localities were first proposed as the names of divisions; but these were opposed, and the Commissioners had then seen the desirability of making another arrangement. In only five or six cases, one of which being the case of the county now under consideration, it had been proposed to have the divisions named after towns. The reason why in Antrim the Boundary Commissioners had departed from their ordinary practice, and proposed to name divisions after places, was explained by there being two merged boroughs in the county, and their names being adopted in the divisions in which they were situated, and the adoption of other local names for the sake of uniformity. He had ascertained that there was no strong opinion in favour of retaining for the divisions the names of towns, even in the case of the merged boroughs. The four towns which he was now dealing with were Ballymoney, Lisburn, Ballymena, and Carrickfergus, and those places had between them a population of somewhere about 25,000. It was proposed, therefore, to create divisions with territorial names in a district containing somewhere about 250,000, notwithstanding that the population of the four towns was only about 25,000 people. The first town giving its name to a division—namely, Ballymoney, was a very small place, situated very inconveniently at the extremity of the division; and to his mind there was no reason in the world why it should give its name to so extensive a territory. Probably it would be as well for him to move his Amendment in a slightly altered form—that was to say, to leave out the words "the Ballymoney Division," in order to insert the words "North Antrim." The Irish Members had not taken part in the discussion on the names of English and Scotch divisions, and they thought that their opinions as to the names of Irish districts should therefore have more force. He thought it would be enough in this case to call the Gentleman who would be returned by the constituency the Member for North Antrim.

Amendment proposed,

In page 90, line 5, to leave out the words "the Ballymoney Division," in order to insert the words "North Antrim."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'the Ballymoney Division' stand part of the Schedule."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he only wished the hon. Gentleman could have given him this statement privately some time ago, for it might have saved him (Sir Charles W. Dilke) an hour or so of consideration and investigation. The matter was one not worth fighting over, and he should content himself by merely protesting in favour of the scheme of the Commissioners, and then yield.

He trusted the hon. Gentleman would remember that, and when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Raikes) attacked him for the course he had adopted that he (Mr. Sexton) would defend him. As to what had fallen from the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton), he trusted that, looking at the circumstances of these alterations, he (Mr. Warton) would not, in his love for consistency, urge upon him the desirability of altering the whole of the titles in the English and Scotch parts of the Bill. If they were to attempt to do such a thing as that, they might be occupied until Doomsday — certainly until Christmas. He trusted the hon. and learned Member would allow them here, at all events, to indulge in a little breach of uniformity. Probably there was no case to be made for Ballymoney as against the proposed alteration of title; but he certainly thought there was in the cases of Lisburn and Carrickfergus.

COLONEL NOLAN said, he desired to save the time of the right hon. Baronet in charge of the Bill; and he, therefore, wished to say that it would be as well in one or two cases where there were towns possessing ancient names that those names should be attached to divisions coupled with titles derived from points of the compass. In his own county—Galway—there were one or two names which he should desire to see used in that way.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he might inform the hon. and gallant Gentleman that in England there had been no consistency with regard to taking local names and points-of-the-compass names. In some cases they had taken both the one and the other. No regard to consistency, he thought, need be had in this matter.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed,

"In page 90, line 9, to leave out the word "Ballymena," in order to insert the words "Mid Antrim."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Ballymena' stand part of the Schedule."

MR. WARTON said, he did not know whether, when the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) conveyed the intimation to which he had referred to the Conservative Whips, he had also conveyed to them any intimation that, so far as the Divisions of Carrickfergus and Lisburn were concerned, he was going to agree to an alteration in the names. He (Mr. Warton) thought that in the absence of the hon. Members for Carrickfergus (Mr. Greer) and Lisburn (Sir Richard Wallace), who were very highly respected Members of the House, they ought to stop after the present Amendment was adopted and report Progress. This course should be adopted, in order that hon. Members from Ireland representing the eight or nine boroughs which were to be disfranchised might be present to say what they thought about this part of the Bill. He was strongly of opinion that the shorter names of "North Antrim" and "Mid Antrim" were superior to the names "Ballymoney Division," and "Ballymena Division." He should also be in favour of "East Antrim" and "South Antrim," if such points of the compass could be applied to those districts; but he thought that those hon. Members who were interested in the places should have an opportunity of saying what they thought about the change. He was not opposing the present Amendment.

MR. HEALY said, he trusted the hon. and learned Member would not be more Catholic than the Pope. The Members for Antrim were well able to defend themselves, yet they had not expressed any opinion against the alterations it was proposed to effect. The hon. Member interested in the North of Antrim, who enjoyed the respect of his Party, entirely approved the Amendments. If the hon. and learned Gentleman desired, under the circumstances, to report Progress, he would, perhaps, find it difficult to carry his object, as the hon. and learned Member would not be able to find 20 supporters. He would not be able to take the Committee into the Lobbies; but would be asked to stand up, so that his vote might be taken in the House. He (Mr. Healy) hoped the hon. and learned Member would not press his Motion, as he was anxious not to put the hon. and learned Member to the trouble of standing up.

MR. SEXTON said, that an hour ago, when the Government proposed to report Progress on the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill, and go on with the Registration Bill, the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Warton) and

his Friends were as loud in opposition to that proposal as they were now in favour of reporting Progress. The Tory Members for Ireland knew what had taken place; and the right hon. and learned Gentlemen the Members for the University of Dublin would have been quite competent to state the case before their Party left the House, if they had had any case to state.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. WARTON said, he now begged to move to report Progress. He had not 20 Members to support him he knew, and without them he could not take a division in the ordinary way, since the ancient rights and privileges of hon. Members had been very largely done away with. He knew that in some cases the Chairman could call on Members to stand up in their places. Considering, as he had said, that there were some seven or eight boroughs in Ireland—two of which happened to be in the county they were discussing—which had been disfranchised, he thought the Members for those places had a right to be heard before those arrangements were effected. The Members for distinguished ancient boroughs might like to argue that it would be well that they should not die altogether, but that the name of their constituency should, at least, survive.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, it had been perfectly known to the Party opposite, an intimation to that effect having been conveyed to them, that this county was to be dealt with that night—the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Gibson) had been thoroughly aware of the fact. As to names, the Amendment had been on the Paper, and the hon. and learned Gentleman knew very well that he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) was not altogether in favour of the proposed changes—in fact, that he had voted in minorities on those questions several times. Under those circumstances, he thought there was every reason why they should now go on and make further progress with the Bill.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Mr. HEALY said, that before the next Amendment was proceeded with, he should like to point out that there was a great portion of the Carrickfergus Division in which he could raise the point as to the inclusion of the entire district. They would find, beginning in line 22, the words "Antrim, Lower (except so much as is comprised in Division No. 2, as herein described)." He had observed, on a former occasion, that any person who bought a copy of the Bill ought to be in possession of full information as to the entire areas covered by it. If they turned to the map of the Boundary Commissioners they would find exactly what had been done. The right hon. Baronet had declared that to set out the entire description of areas in these cases would take up too much space, and lengthen the Bill; but he (Mr. Healy) had pointed out that the alteration he desired, and which he considered essential, would not occupy more than a very few additional pages of the measure. In this particular instance, on page 16 of the Report of the Commissioners, they found the full description which he desired to see inserted under the heads "Divisions;" and he would, therefore, repeat his question—why should not those descriptions be in the Bill? If the Bill in its present form was scientific drafting, then all he could say was, that it was scientific drafting gone mad. The Bill should be a whole Bill, and not a part of a Bill. It was a monstrous thing that when a person had paid his 1*s.* 2½*d.* for the Bill, in order to find where he was, he should have to pay a further 17*s.* 6*d.* for the Report of the Boundary Commissioners. They must bear in mind that before long this Report of the Commissioners would become obsolete, whereas the Bill might always stand on the Statute Book. In Ireland they were situated in this matter differently to England, and perhaps Scotland, because it was pretended there to go by definite divisions like baronies. If that were so, why should they leave out certain parishes, and after describing the districts in one division go on to say that so much should be included in No. 1 Division, and so much comprised in No. 2 Division? It was most absurd to put the thing in that way. He quite admitted that by the method pursued the drafters of the Bill were in less danger of being inaccurate

in the matter of spelling or the matter of names; but those small difficulties could be got over with care. If they were careful about one thing they could be careful about another; and he maintained that those who bought the Bill when it became an Act of Parliament were entitled to find in it a full and complete description of the districts dealt with, instead of being compelled to find it out by some rule of subtraction. People who bought this Bill did not want to find out what it meant by a rule of three sum. It was not a rule of three Bill.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had promised the hon. and learned Member that he would consider this matter in consultation with the gentlemen responsible. Now, they had pointed out to him that the Schedule, was framed on the principle that where a Petty Sessional division or barony was divided in Ireland between two Parliamentary divisions the names of the parishes in one of those divisions were set out. That had been adopted for two reasons—one for the purpose of shortening the Schedule, and the other in order to make it certain that all the barony or parish was included in one division or the other. If all the names were put into the Schedules the length of the Bill would be very considerable indeed. On a former occasion the hon. and learned Member said that only a few additional pages would be needed; but that was not the case, and the description of Armagh, for instance, would be more than doubled. The Bill would be increased in size from 100 pages to more than 200. Any change of the kind indicated which might be carried out at that time would involve an enormous amount of alteration in the Bill, and the risk of error would be further increased.

MR. HEALY admitted there was force in what the right hon. Baronet had stated. But he must look at the question from this point of view—the people in Ireland who took an interest in politics were of a class different from that to which the people who took an interest in politics in England belonged. In England they belonged to the intelligent classes — in Ireland everyone took an interest in politics. And he said they were entitled to see by the Bill the exact position they were in, and that nothing in the shape of a tax ought to be placed upon them. He had raised this question on the very first opportunity that presented itself in the discussion on the Bill—namely, when Kensington was under consideration—and he did so again that evening when they reached the description of the first Irish county. It was not correct to say that it was too late to make any alteration; it was very early; and he would ask the right hon. Baronet if he would distribute this information gratis, and whether he would reduce the price of the Report of the Commissioners from 17*s.* 6*d.* to 7*s.* 6*d.*? Why not publish with each Bill a little map, so that the whole thing should be *en bloc*, and people saved the trouble of looking from one page to another? It was very difficult for Irish Members familiar with the places and districts in Ireland to construe this Bill, and it would be absolutely impossible for the humble people who took an interest in the matter in Ireland to decipher it. As to the cost of producing the Bill in the form he wished, it was a mere bagatelle. The National Debt amounted to £800,000,000, and here was the right hon. Baronet, in a matter of this great importance to the bulk of the people, haggling over a few shillings.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE reminded the hon. and learned Member that the number of maps published by the Government was enormous, and the cost of Acts of Parliament was an immense item in the accounts. He would point out that the lists of the overseers must be placed on the church doors, and persons interested could see the names of the places included in any one division, even if the names of their own localities were not mentioned.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN asked if the maps could not be published separately at a small price?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the maps had not yet been published in the case of Ireland; but he had given orders that they should be.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN asked if the maps would be purchaseable at a low price?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the cost of the maps would be, as in the case of English counties, 1*s.* each.

MR. WARTON said, he must refer again to a point on which he had been insisting from the very first. This was

a question of the proper and decent drafting of an important Bill, and he said that no expense should have been spared by the Government in having it presented in a complete and proper form. A great deal of the obscurity and difficulty complained of had arisen from the determination of the Government to chop up divisions which might better have been left as they were. In his opinion, it was disgraceful that the views of a paid official should be taken as against the opinion of Members of that House. The hon. and learned Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy) had put before the right hon. Baronet the exact information which he wished inserted in the Bill; and, therefore, he (Mr. Warton) objected altogether to the opinion of the draftsman being forced upon the Committee. The materials were ready at hand, and he should do his best to see that they were inserted, and that the will of Sir H. Craven was not forced upon the Members of that House.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, there was not the slightest difficulty in the Government ascertaining the names in the various districts. That was not the point. He had said it would require the addition of over 100 pages to the Bill; that it would involve an enormous risk of error; and he was not prepared to undertake that responsibility.

Mr. WARTON asked what was the risk of error? Why should the Government describe a division as consisting of so much of a particular district as was not included in another division? The only risk that he could see was that some places might escape the attention of the clerks.

Mr. HEALY strongly appealed to the right hon. Gentleman that the book which cost 17*s.* 6*d.* should be translated for the information of the public. It would be 20, perhaps 40, years before another Bill of this kind was passed through Parliament; and it would not be too much to have a Bill of this length presented in an intelligible form, even if it did cost the country a little more money. Here was a very trifling matter, and yet, because his proposal would have the effect of adding another 100 pages to the Bill, it was not to be granted.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

POST OFFICE SITES [PURCHASE OF LAND AND EXPENSES].

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Mr. SEXTON said, he understood that the operations to be undertaken under this Bill were very extensive, and would cost a great deal of money, both with regard to London and Newcastle. He would like to know what sum the Government intended to spend in those works? He desired to see how far the general policy of the Department with regard to England compared with the niggardly policy which the right hon. Gentleman pursued with regard to Ireland. He should feel it his duty to oppose this Bill, unless he received some more generous intimation as to the operations of the Department in Ireland. He had been endeavouring for some time to get the Mail Service between Dublin and the West of Ireland put upon a footing more in accordance with the necessities of the Public Service of a civilized country; and a Memorial with that object had been presented to the right hon. Gentleman on that subject, signed by Members of that House of all shades of opinion. It appeared that for the sake of £3,000 the Postmaster General intended to allow the Mail Service between Dublin and the West of Ireland to remain in a state obstructive both of trade and of the interests of the country. At the very moment when, for the sake of £3,000, the right hon. Gentleman refused to agree to the wishes of Members of that House, and to submit the matter to arbitration, he was proposing to spend millions of money on palatial buildings in England. But the right hon. Gentleman would find that that was a policy to which Irish Members could not assent, and which they would feel justified in using all the Forms of the House to oppose.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he doubted whether it was in Order to raise the question of conveyance of mails upon that Motion; but he thought there was no reason to complain of the action of the Government in respect of the Mail Service in Ireland, which, at the proper time, he should be prepared

to defend. He might say, however, that the sum asked for by the Railway Company, for accelerating the mails between Dublin and the West of Ireland, was so large that he did not think he should be justified in acceding to the demand.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, the right hon. Gentleman began his remarks by observing that he did not know whether his hon. Friend the Member for Sligo was in Order in referring to the general policy of the Post Office on the Motion for going into Committee on this Bill. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman was dissatisfied with the healthful discipline which Mr. Speaker extended to Irish Members on points of Order; but whatever his opinion might be upon a point of Order which he himself raised, the right hon. Gentleman had not hesitated to follow the hon. Member for Sligo in the course he had taken. He thought that hon. Members on those Benches might fairly challenge the right hon. Gentleman as to the generosity of the Department in respect to Ireland. The line running through the county which he had the honour to represent——

MR. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. Member that the question of the carriage of mails is not relevant to the Question before the House. The remarks made upon that subject up to this point of the discussion I understood to be made by way of illustration.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, in that case he envied the dexterity of the Postmaster General in making use of his illustration with regard to the carriage of mails in Ireland. He also, by way of illustration, would like to show the manner in which the Post Office dealt with money voted for the Irish Postal Service. Year after year that House voted sums of money for Post Office purposes in England and Ireland, and year after year the money so voted with respect to Ireland returned into the Exchequer unexpended, while the sums voted for England were not only expended, but exceeded, and the excess was often effected out of savings at the expense of the Irish Service. This Bill proposed certain powers of expenditure for the Post Office Department in connection with sites. He objected to the way in which the Post Office could expend this money on sites in England——

MR. HEALY: Order, Order!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. and learned Member should not be so demonstrative in his remarks.

MR. HEALY: Am I to understand that it is out of Order to cry "Order" in this House?

MR. SPEAKER: The tone and the way in which the hon. and learned Member expressed himself is out of Order.

MR. HEALY: In that case——

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. and learned Member in not in Order in addressing the Chair in this way. If the hon. and learned Member continues I shall have to take notice of his interruption.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he was in Order in referring to the expenditure of public money; and he would like to know what portion of the money to be expended under this Bill would be applied in Ireland?

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at a quarter before Two o'clock.

[INDEX.

LONDON: CORNELIUS BUCK, 22, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

INDEX

TO

HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.

VOLUME CCXCVI.

FOURTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1884-5.

EXPLANATION OF THE ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills, Read 1°, 2°, 3°, or 1ª, 2ª, 3ª, Read the First, Second, or Third Time.—In Speeches 1R., 2R., 3R., Speech delivered on the First, Second, or Third Reading.—*Amendt.*, Amendment.—*Res.*, Resolution.—*Comm.*, Committee.—*Re-Comm.*, Re-Committal.—*Rep.*, Report.—*Consid.*, Consideration.—*Adj.*, Adjournment or Adjourned.—*cl.*, Clause.—*add. cl.*, Additional Clause.—*neg.*, Negatived.—*M. Q.*, Main Question.—*O. Q.*, Original Question.—*O. M.*, Original Motion.—*P. Q.*, Previous Question.—R. P., Report Progress.—*A.*, Ayes.—*N.*, Noes.—*M.*, Majority.—1*st. Div.*, 2*nd. Div.*, First or Second Division.—*l.*, Lords.—*c.*, Commons.

When in this Index a * is added to the Reading of a Bill, it indicates that no Debate took place upon that stage of the measure.

When in the Text or in the Index a Speech is marked thus *, it indicates that the Speech is reprinted from a Pamphlet or some authorized Report.

When in the Index a † is prefixed to a Name or an Office (the Member having accepted or vacated office during the Session) and to Subjects of Debate thereunder, it indicates that the Speeches on those Subjects were delivered in the speaker's private or official character, as the case may be.

Some subjects of debate have been classified under the following "General Headings:"—ARMY—NAVY—INDIA—IRELAND—SCOTLAND—PARLIAMENT—POOR LAW—POST OFFICE—METROPOLIS—CHURCH OF ENGLAND—EDUCATION—CRIMINAL LAW—LAW AND JUSTICE—TAXATION, under WAYS AND MEANS.

ABERDEEN, Earl of
Minister for Scotland — Scotch National Schools, 211

ACKERS, Mr. B. St. John, *Gloucestershire, W.*
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 741, 746
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 6, 1351, 1353; Schedule 7, 1682, 1683, 1688, 1689, 1691
Supply—Surveys of the United Kingdom, 1249, 1260

ACLAND, Mr. C. T. D., *Cornwall, E. Div.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, Amendt. 1650, 1651, 1776

Africa (*South*)
LORDS
Bechuanaland, Questions, Lord Harris, The Marquess of Salisbury; Answers, The Earl of Derby *Mar* 26, 621

COMMONS
Bechuanaland — Murders of British Subjects, Questions, Mr. R. N. Fowler, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answers, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *Mar* 27, 842
Trade of the Zambesi, Question, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *Mar* 26, 656

Sir Charles Warren's Mission, Question, Mr. William Redmond; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *Mar* 20, 53

Africa (West Coast)—The West African Settlements—Sir Samuel Rowe
Question, Sir William M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *Mar* 24, 379

AGNEW, Mr. W., *Lancashire, S.E.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1726, 1729

Agricultural Statistics
British Barley, Question, Mr. Hicks; Answer, Mr. J. Holms *Mar* 24, 377
Return of Estimated Produce, 1884 — *Correction*, Question, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon; Answer, Lord Carlingford *Mar* 20, 36

AINSWORTH, Mr. D., *Cumberland, W.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1566; Amendt. 1639, 1640, 1646, 1648

ALEXANDER, General C., *Ayrshire, S.*
Army—Dress of the Army—The Highland Feather Bonnet, 1456
Egypt (War in the Soudan)—Camel Corps, 1308
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 4, Amendt. 471, 475, 489

Allotments Extension Act, 1882 — *The Charity Commission—Flawton Charity Land*
Questions, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answers, Mr. Mundella *Mar* 27, 845

ARGYLL, Duke of
Asia (Central)—The Russo-Afghan Frontier, 805, 806
Opening of Museums on Sundays—Natural History Museum, South Kensington, Res. 30

ARMY (*Questions*)
Army Contracts, Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, Mr. Brand *April* 16, 1872
Army List—Officers of Colonial Forces, Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 13, 1465
Defence of the Military and Naval Stations—Coaling Stations—The Straits Settlements, Question, Mr. Chaplin; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 27, 840
Dress of the Army — The Highland Feather Bonnet, Question, General Alexander; Answer, Mr. Brand *April* 13, 1456
Longford Barracks, Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 31, 1098
Non-Commissioned Officers' Pensions, Question, Mr. Stewart Macliver; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 13, 1478
Payment for Additional Kit, Question, Sir Frederick Milner; Answer, Mr. Brand *April* 16, 1869
Roman Catholic Chaplains at Suakin, Questions, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 30, 987
Staff Appointment of Deputy Commissary General, Question, Mr. Greer; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 27, 832

[*cont.*

ARMY—*cont.*
The 82nd Regiment—Promotion by Purchase, Questions, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 27, 829; *Mar* 31, 1107
The 5th Royal Irish Lancers, Question, Sir Joseph Bailey; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 20, 50; Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 16, 1869
The Royal Irish Fusiliers, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 31, 1105
The 1st Life Guards — Catholic Soldiers, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 30, 974

The Royal Arsenal, Woolwich—Extra Hours, &c., Questions, Mr. Boord; Answers, Mr. Brand *April* 10, 1301; *April* 16, 1872
The Royal Military Academy, Woolwich—New Buildings, Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, The Earl of Morley *Mar* 26, 645

Ordnance Department
Report on Machine Guns and Rifles, Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Mr. Brand *Mar* 30, 976
Small Arms—The Martini-Henry Rifle—Defective Ammunition, Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. Brand *Mar* 27, 841
The Military Expedition to the Soudan—Defective Ammunition, Question, Observations, Viscount Bury; Reply, The Earl of Morley *Mar* 26, 642; Question, Sir Henry Wilmot; Answer, Mr. Brand *Mar* 27, 832

General Graham's Force — The Transport Department, Questions, Viscount Newport; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 27, 839

Auxiliary Forces
Examinations of Officers, Question, Lord Arthur Hill; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington; Question, Sir Herbert Maxwell [no reply] *Mar* 20, 49
Militia Officers, Question, Viscount Emlyn; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 16, 1871
Militia Officers Serving in the South African Irregular Force under Sir Charles Warren, Questions, Captain Aylmer; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 27, 834

Army and Militia Reserve Forces
LORDS
Message from the Queen delivered by The Earl of Kimberley *Mar* 26, 622
Ordered, That the said Message be taken into Consideration To-morrow
Message considered accordingly *April* 14, 1600
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, thanking Her Majesty for informing this House that the present state of public affairs and the extent of the demands on the military forces of Her Majesty for the protection of the interests of the Empire having constituted, in the opinion of Her Majesty, a case of great emergency within the meaning of the Acts of Parliament

[*cont.*

Army and Militia Reserve Forces — LORDS — cont.

in that behalf, Her Majesty deems it proper to provide additional means for Her Military service, and that, therefore, in pursuance of those Acts, Her Majesty has thought it right to communicate to the House of Lords that Her Majesty is about to cause Her Reserve Force and Her Militia Reserve Force, or such part thereof as Her Majesty shall from time to time think necessary, to be called out for permanent service" (*The Earl Granville*); after short debate, Motion agreed to, *nemine dissentiente*

Army and Militia Reserve Forces

COMMONS

Message from Her Majesty brought up, and read by Mr. Speaker *Mar* 26, 648

Ordered, That Her Majesty's Most Gracious Message be taken into Consideration upon Monday next

Her Majesty's Most Gracious Message considered *April* 13, 1478

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, thanking Her Majesty for Her Most Gracious Message communicating to this House that Her Majesty was about to cause Her Reserve Force, and Her Militia Reserve Force, or such part thereof, as Her Majesty shall, from time to time, think necessary, to be called out for permanent Service" (*The Marquess of Hartington*)

After short debate, Amendt. to add, at end of Question "and at the same time expressing a hope that the available forces of Her Majesty will be speedily strengthened by the prompt withdrawal of the troops from the Soudan" (*Mr. Labouchere*); Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after debate, Question put; A. 39, N. 148; M. 109 (D. L. 95)

Main Question put, and agreed to

The Calling Out of the Reserves — Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 27, 848; Questions, Colonel Stanley, Sir R. Assheton Cross; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington, Sir William Harcourt *Mar* 30, 975

The Reserve Men, Question, Colonel Nolan; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 30, 991

Officers of the Reserve — Equipment Money, Question, Mr. Molloy; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 16, 1863

Embodiment of the Militia, Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 26, 681

The Militia Reserves, Question, Mr. Greer; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 30, 986

The Militia and Army Reserves, Questions, Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Ritchie; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 30, 998

[cont.

Army (Annual) Bill

(*The Marquess of Hartington, The Judge Advocate, Sir Thomas Brassey*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 20 [Bill 104]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 23, 366
After short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Kenny*); after further short debate, Motion withdrawn
Original Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee; Report *Mar* 26, 767
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *Mar* 27, 957
Amendt. to leave out from "be," add "re-committed in respect of a new Clause" (*Mr. Kenny*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 3°
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Morley*) *Mar* 28 (No. 62)
Read 2ª * *April* 13
Committee *; Report *April* 14
Read 3ª * *April* 16

ARNOLD, Mr. A., *Salford*
Egypt (War in the Soudan)—General Graham's Force, 995
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 899
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 5, 551; Schedule 6, 1430; Schedule 7, 1813
Supply—Admiralty and War Office, The New, 1187, 1212
Parks and Pleasure Gardens, 1062, 1065
Surveys of the United Kingdom, 1249, 1250

ASHLEY, Hon. E. M. (Under Secretary of State for the Colonies), *Isle of Wight*
Africa (South) — Bechuanaland — Murders of British Subjects, 842; — Trade of the Zambesi, 656
Sir Charles Warren's Mission, 53
Africa—West African Settlement—Sir Samuel Rowe, 379
British Guiana—Alleged Cession of Territory by Venezuela, 654
Cyprus—Reported Revenue Frauds, 1630, 1852
Egypt—Zebehr Pasha, 1629
Fiji—Mortality, &c. 232
Gibraltar—Post Office, 1466
Islands of the Western Pacific—Labuan, 380
Jamaica—Revenue Department, 846
West India Islands — Grenada Highways, &c. Improvement, 667

ASHMEAD-BARTLETT, Mr. E., *Eye*
Africa (South) — Bechuanaland — Murders of British Subjects, 842; — Trade of the Zambesi, 656
Asia (Central)—Questions
England and Russia — Preparations for Hostilities, 984
Herat—Action of England in case of Sudden Seizure by Russia, 1864, 1865, 1867, 1868
Russia and Afghanistan—Russian Advances, 1633, 1634

[cont.

ASHMEAD-BARTLETT, Mr. E.—*cont.*
Russian Mission to Cabul—M. Lessar, 51
Russo-Afghan Frontier, 1108, 1109;—Reported Disturbance at Penjdeh, 233;—Negotiations, 1469, 1472, 1474, 1475
Russo-Afghan Frontier Commission, 390, 994, 995
Egypt—Questions
Convention, 1101
Events in the Soudan—Kassala, 980
Finance, &c.—International Arrangement, 264; — Receipts and Payments, 386;—Suez Canal, 679
Slave Trade in the Soudan — Prisoners of the Mahdi, 392, 393
War in the Soudan — General Graham's Force — Actions at Suakin, 667; — Prisoners of the Mahdi, 51, 52;—Withdrawal of the Forces, 1140, 1141
Zebehr Pasha, 836
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 867, 1918
Parliament — House of Commons — Ladies' Gallery, Res. 1004
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 5, 513
Supply—Royal Palaces, 1056, 1057, 1058

ATTORNEY GENERAL, The (Sir H. JAMES), *Taunton*
Egypt—Zebehr Pasha, 986
High Court of Justice — Chancery Division, 214, 215
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Act, 1883—Breakfasts to the Unemployed, 1861, 1862
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 147; Schedule 7, 1771, 1940
Parliamentary Elections — Representation of the People Act, 1884 — Deputy Returning Officers, 662

AYLMER, Captain J. E. F. *Maidstone*
Army and Militia Reserve — Consideration of H.M. Message, 1482
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Militia Officers Serving in the South African Irregular Force under Sir Charles Warren, 834
Gibraltar—The Post Office, 1466
Supply—Surveys of the United Kingdom, 1249, 1251, 1255

BAILEY, Sir J. R., *Herefordshire*
Army—5th Royal Irish Lancers, 50

BALFOUR, Right Hon. J. B. (Lord Advocate for Scotland), *Clackmannan, &c.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 66, 72, 93, 97, 110, 112, 116; Schedule 4, 473; Schedule 5, 578; Schedule 7, Amendt. 1946, 1947, 1950, 1951
Scotland—Questions
Boundary Commission—Instructions to the Commissioners, 379
Education Department — Cumnock School Board Election, 830

BALFOUR, Right Hon. J. B.—*cont.*
Law and Justice—Magistracy—Commission of the Peace — Dumfries Borough and County, 837
Trawling, 672
Universities (Scotland), Motion for Leave, 962

BALFOUR, General Sir G., *Kincardineshire*
India—Permanent Settlement of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa, 1793, 226
North British Railway, 2R. 1448
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 6, 1397
Public Buildings—Estimated Cost, 1844
Supply—Admiralty and War Office, The New, 1201, 1214

BALFOUR, Mr. A. J., *Hertford*
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 726

BALFOUR, Mr. J. Spencer, *Tamworth*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1792; Amendt. 1810

BARCLAY, Mr. J. W., *Forfarshire*
Education Department (Muir's School, &c. Scheme), Motion for an Address, 1761
North British Railway, 2R. 1449
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 90, 91

BARNES, Mr. A., *Derbyshire, E.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, Amendt. 1649, 1650

BARRY, Mr. J., *Wexford Co.*
Ireland—Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Proclamations—Prohibition of Meeting at Burroughtown, Co. Wexford, 1145
Royal Irish Constabulary — Sergeant Delaney, 665, 993, 1100

BARTTELOT, Colonel Sir W. B., *Sussex, W.*
Egypt (War in the Soudan) 680;—General Graham's Force—Actions on the 20th and 22nd March, 391
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 706
India—Banda and Kirwee Prize Money, 972
Parliament—Business of the House, 847
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1807

BASS, Sir M. A., *Stafford, E.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1788; Amendt. 1796

BASS, Mr. A. J., *Tamworth*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1813

BATESON, Sir T., *Devizes*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Comm. Schedule 5, Amendt. 579, 587, 592,

[*cont.*

BAXTER, Right Hon. W. E., *Montrose, &c.*
Egypt (Affairs of the Soudan)—General Gordon's Mission, 1305
Madagascar—Postal Communication, 1626
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 85

BEACH, Right Hon. Sir M. E. HICKS-*Gloucestershire, E.*
Asia (Central)—Herat—Action of England in Case of Sudden Seizure by Russia, 1867
Cape of Good Hope (Advance), 2R. 348
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—International Arrangement, 62, 227, 228, 229
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 850
Heligoland—Proposed Cession to Germany, 1017
Parliament—Business of the House, 66, 847
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, Amendt. 1520, 1522, 1546, 1675, 1679, 1684, 1685, 1686, 1687, 1689, 1741, 1750, 1801, 1812, 1818

BENTINCK, Right Hon. G. A. F. Cavendish, *Whitehaven*
Contagious Diseases Acts—Returns, 1628
Supply—Admiralty and War Office, The New, 1174
Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens, 1062, 1064

BERESFORD, Mr. G. De La Poer, *Armagh*
Ireland—Newspaper Press—The "United Ireland"—Offensive Cartoons, 48

BIDDULPH, Mr. M., *Herefordshire*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1702, 1705

BIGGAR, Mr. J. G., *Cavan Co.*
County Officers and Courts (Ireland) [Pensions], Comm. 366
India (Madras)—Outbreak of Moplahs in the Malabar District, 823
Ireland—Questions
Crime and Outrage — Catholic Chapel, Hillsborough, Co. Down, 1464
Law and Justice—Clerk of the Peace, Co. Donegal—Alleged Abstraction of Public Records, 1086;—Industrial School of Saint Joseph, Dundalk, 1458
Magistracy—Bailieborough Petty Sessions, 1099;—Colonel Forbes, R.M., Belfast, 41
National Education—Report of the Commissioners, 1088
Poor Law—Cootehill Union—Robert Graham, Clerk to the Guardians, 41;—Election of Guardians—Newry Union, 1632
Post Office—Mr. Mathews, Postmaster of Ballymena, 1847
Registration of Births and Deaths, Belfast, 41, 42
Royal Irish Constabulary—District Inspector Murphy, 1019
Royal Irish Fusiliers, 1105
Ways and Means—Financial Statement—Licence Duties, 648

[*cont.*

BIGGAR, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Comm. Schedule 1, 114, 133; Schedule 3, 438; Schedule 5, 548, 582, 586, 589, 615; Schedule 6, 1398
Post Office—Irregular Deliveries at West Brompton, 1087
Irish Mails, 1846
Supply—Admiralty and War Office, The New, 1215
British Museum, &c. 1269, 1273
Fire Brigade in the Metropolis, 1282, 1285
Furniture of Public Offices, Great Britain, 1224
Metropolitan Police Court Buildings, 1243
Royal Palaces, 1058, 1060; Amendt. 1061
Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens, 1061

BIRKBECK, Mr. E., *Norfolk, N.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Importation from Germany — Foot-and-Mouth Disease, 1302, 1303
Customs—North Sea Fishermen—Duty-Free Tobacco, 966
North Sea Fisheries—Belgian Trawlers, 990
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, Amendt. 1740, 1741

BOLTON, Mr. J. C., *Stirling*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 93

BOORD, Mr. T. W., *Greenwich*
Army—Extra Work—The Royal Arsenal, Woolwich, 1301, 1872

BORLASE, Mr. W. C., *Cornwall, E.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, Amendt. 1551, 1552, 1561, 1563, 1564

BOURKE, Right Hon. R., *Lynn Regis*
Asia (Central)—Herat—Action of England in case of Sudden Seizure by Russia, 1868
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—International Arrangement, 259
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 731, 740, 741, 760, 1921
France and China—Hostilities—Contraband of War—Rice, 995, 1101, 1103
International Law—Right of Search, 48, 230
General Gordon's Diaries, 230

BRAMWELL, Lord
Opening of Museums on Sundays—National History Museum, South Kensington, Res. 15
Trinity College (Perpetuity Grants), 2R. 207

BRAND, Hon. H. R. (Surveyor General of the Ordnance), *Stroud*
Army—Questions
Contracts, 1872
Dress of the Army—The Highland Feather Bonnet, 1456
Extra Work—Royal Arsenal, Woolwich, 1302, 1873

[*cont.*

BRAND, Hon. H. R.—*cont.*
Military Expedition to the Soudan—Defective Ammunition, 832
Payment for Additional Kit, 1869
Small Arms—Martini-Henry Rifle, 841
Army (Ordnance Department)—Report on Machine Guns and Rifles, 977
Egypt (Military Expedition)—Canned Meat, 969
War in the Soudan—General Graham's Force—Actions at Suakin, 667, 668;—The Zerebas, 672
Post Office Clothing Contracts, 1452

BRASSEY, Sir T. (Secretary to the Admiralty), *Hastings*
Colonial Defences—The Colonial Naval Forces, 1457
Egypt (Military Expedition)—Royal Marines at Suakin, 650
Navy—Questions
Baltic — Preparations for Hostilities on breaking up of the Ice, 663
Experiments at Eastney, 664
H.M.S. "Camperdown," 981
H.M.S. "Canada," 664
Merchant Steamers as Transport Cruisers, 1302, 1850, 1851
Portsmouth Dockyard — H.M.S. "Mercury," 976
Protection of the Black Sea and Baltic, 1301
Ships—Building and Repairs, 1452
Torpedoes, 981
North Sea Fisheries—Belgian Trawlers, 991

BRETT, Mr. R. B., *Penryn, &c.*
Egypt (Military Expedition)—Naval Brigade, 380

BRIGHT, Mr. J., *Manchester*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 6, 1365

British Guiana—Cession of Territory by Venezuela
Question, Dr. Kinnear; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *Mar* 26, 654

BROADHURST, Mr. H., *Stoke-on-Trent*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 4, 463
Supply—Royal Palaces, 1055
War Office and Admiralty, The New, 1182, 1183, 1207, 1211
War Office and Admiralty, The New, 1106

BROWN, Mr. A. H., *Wenlock*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1768

BRUCE, Hon. R. P., *Fifeshire*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 81, 99

BRUCE, Hon. T. C., *Portsmouth*
Egyptian Loan, Comm. Amendt. 698

BRUCE, Sir H. H., *Coleraine*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 5, 590

BRYCE, Mr. J., *Tower Hamlets*
London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway, 2R. 1619
Metropolis—Parks—Victoria Park, 835
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 98; Schedule 3, 329; Schedule 4, 465; Amendt. 466, 467; Schedule 7, 1671
Turkey—European Provinces — Disturbances in Albania, 979

BUCHANAN, Mr. T. R., *Edinburgh*
North British Railway, 2R. 1447
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 70, 105; Schedule 4, 485, 487; Schedule 6, 1395

BULWER, Mr. J. R., *Cambridgeshire*
Contagious Diseases Acts—Returns, 1627
H.R.H. the Prince and Princess of Wales, Visit of, to Ireland—Disturbance at Mallow, 1638
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1531, 1532, 1540, 1541, 1542

Burgh Police and Health (Scotland) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Dalhousie*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Mar* 26 (No. 57)
2R. discharged * *April* 13

Burial Boards (Contested Elections) Bill
(*Mr. Stuart-Wortley, Mr. Arnold Morley*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 20 [Bill 106]
Read 2° * *April* 15

BURY, Viscount
Army (Military Expedition to the Soudan)—Defective Ammunition, 642, 643
Metropolitan Improvements (Parliament Street, &c.), Motion for Papers, 376
Navy—China Station, 817, 818, 819

BUXTON, Mr. F. W., *Andover*
Cape of Good Hope (Advance), 2R. 357
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution)—The Boundary Maps, 51
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 325, 326

BUXTON, Mr. S. C., *Peterborough*
Parliament — House of Commons — Ladies' Gallery, Res. Amendt. 999
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 141, 145, 146

CAINE, Mr. W. S. (Civil Lord of the Admiralty), *Scarborough*
Egypt (Military Expedition)—Naval Brigade, 380

[*cont.*

CAINE, Mr. W. S.—*cont.*
Navy—Questions
Ericson Torpedo Boat, 51
H.M.S. "Garnet," 381
Naval Discipline Act—Cases of Endersby and Quinn, 988
Troopships, 653

CAIRNS, Earl
Opening of Museums on Sundays—National History Museum, South Kensington, Res. Amendt. 8
Trinity College (Perpetuity Grants), 2R. 203

CALLAN, Mr. P., *Louth*
Army—5th Lancers, 1869
Egypt (Expedition up the Nile)—Sir Charles Wilson's Voyage from Metemneh to Khartoum, 1477
Ireland—Questions
Charges against Irish Officials—Case of James Ellis French—Colonel Bruce, 1454, 1455, 1456, 1855
Fisheries—Board of Conservators—Free Fishing Licences, 1094
Fishing Board—Payment of Coast Guardsmen employed on Special Duty, 1094
Royal Irish Constabulary—Mr. Fleury, District Inspector of Lisburn, 1453;—District Inspector Murphy, 1025, 1026, 1035, 1036, 1038, 1042, 1043, 1044
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 113; Amendt. 121, 128, 136; Schedule 3, 447; Schedule 5, 561, 575; Schedule 6, 1430; Schedule 7, 1948
Supply—County Court Buildings, 1231, 1235, 1239
Fire Brigade in the Metropolis, 1283

CAMERON, Dr. C., *Glasgow*
Education (Muir's School, &c. Scheme), Motion for an Address, 1751
Egypt (Military Expedition)—Biscuit Stores at Korti, 833
War in the Soudan—Indian Contingent—Veterinary Arrangements, 44;—Offers of Military Co-operation by Indian Princes, 43
Parliament—Business of the House, 847
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 73; Schedule 3, Amendt. 332, 340
Post Office—Sixpenny Telegrams, 234
Scotland—Education Department—Questions
Ayr (Landward) and Ayr (Burgh), 216
Cumnock School Board Election, 830
Kirkintilloch School Board, 1303
School Accommodation in Caithness, 1624
Supply—Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens, 1068
Telegraph Acts Amendment, Motion for Leave, 1079

CAMPBELL, Sir G., *Kirkcaldy, &c.*
Army—Queen's Message—The Reserves, 849
Army and Militia Reserve Forces—Consideration of H.M. Message, 1492
Asia (Central)—Questions
England and Russia—Preparation for Hostilities, 983
[*cont.*

CAMPBELL, Sir G.—*cont.*
Russian Attack on the Afghans at Penjdeh, Ministerial Statement, 1164, 1166, 1309
Russo-Afghan Frontier Commission, 389 668
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—New Loan, 1885, 388
War in the Soudan—Osman Digna, 1106
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 709
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 92, 99; Schedule 4, 480; Schedule 5, Amendt. 577, 579; Schedule 6, 1398
Scotland—Tenure of Land in the Highlands, &c. 968
Supply—British Museum, &c. 1264, 1265, 1269
Fire Brigade in the Metropolis, 1281
Land Forces at Home and Abroad (Exclusive of India), 174

CAMPBELL, Mr. J. A., *Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities*
Education (Muir's School, &c. Scheme), Motion for an Address, 1756, 1759
Elementary Education—Revised Code, 1885, Motion for an Address, 1589
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 95; Amendt. 114; Schedule 3, 346; Schedule 4, 481
Public Health Acts—Medical Officer of Health, Cheltenham—Appointment of Mr. Roch, 1860

CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Right Hon. H. (Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland), *Stirling, &c.*
County Officers and Courts (Ireland) [Pensions], Comm. 365
Ireland—Questions
Borough Funds Act—The Dublin Collector General of Rates, 993
Charges against Irish Officials—Case of James Ellis French—Colonel Bruce, 1455, 1456, 1855
Crime and Outrage—Catholic Chapel, Hillsborough, Co. Down, 1464
Fisheries—Encroachment of French Fishermen, 1463
Fishery Board—Payment of Coast Guardsmen employed on Special Duty, 1095
Fishery Piers and Harbours—Greystones Pier, 658
Government Officials, 1456
Highways—Payment of Road Contractors, Co. Galway, 1465
Industrial Schools Act—Female Schools, 1461
Irish Land Commission—Appeals in Co. Kerry, 1089;—Sub-Commissioners, 978;—Mr. Greer, 1459
Landlord and Tenant—Sir Gilbert King's Tenants, 219;—Turf Rights, 1625
Local Government Board—Surcharge on the Corporation of Dublin for Expenses in attending Cork Industrial Exhibition, 983
Lunatic Asylums—Insufficient Accommodation, 978
Meetings of the National League—Action of the Police at Roscrea, 988, 989
[*cont.*

CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Right Hon. H.—*cont.*
Newspaper Press—The "United Ireland"—Offensive Cartoons, 49
Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Arrests in Killarney, 839;—Proclamations—Prohibition of Meeting at Burroughtown, Co. Wexford, 1145
Prisons, 822, 823
Registration of Births and Deaths, Belfast, 42
Registration of Parliamentary Electors—Cost of Preparing Lists, 1852
Registration of Voters, 1090, 1091
State of Ireland—Police Protection to the Rev. Francis Dobbing, Columbkill, Co. Longford, 1849
Supreme Court of Judicature, 1097
Tenement Valuation, 982
Tramways and Public Companies Act, 1883—The Proposed Connemara Railway, 674

Ireland—Law and Justice—Questions
Charge of Assault against George Barker (Grange Petty Sessions), 1462
Claim for Malicious Burning—Trial at Wicklow Assizes, 1451
Clerk of the Peace, Co. Donegal—Alleged Abstraction of Public Records, 1087
Death of Denis Murphy, 220
Election of Petty Sessions Clerk, Toome Bridge District, Co. Antrim—Mr. Kelly, 45
Industrial School of Saint Joseph, Dundalk, 1458
Ligoneil Petty Sessions, Co. Antrim, 1464
Nenagh Assizes—Dr. M. J. Cahalan's Claim for attending as a Witness, 660
Thurles and Templemore Petty Sessions Districts—Appointment of Clerk, 661

Ireland—Law and Police—Questions
Case of Owen Patrick and Thady Lang *v.* Patrick Lynch, 989
Detective Department—Mr. Jenkinson, 1463
False Charge of Firing at the Person—Case of Mr. Spunner, 657
Riots at Derry—Firing at a Procession, 1086

Ireland—Magistracy—Questions
Bailieborough Petty Sessions, 1099
Ballymena—Mr. Mallaghan, 655
Borris in Ossory Petty Sessions District, 971
Colonel Forbes, R.M., Belfast, 41
Grand Jury and the "Free Force," Co. Kilkenny, 387
Mr. Hardman, J.P., Newtownstewart, 1094
Mr. Samuel Donaldson, J.P., Co. Donegal, 223, 224
Trim Petty Sessions—Major Traill, R.M., Co. Meath, 218

Ireland—National Education—Questions
Degree Qualifications, 970
Model School at Bailieborough, Co. Cavan, 221
National Schools—Teachers' Examinations, 221
National School Teachers—Case of Mrs. Sophia Howe, Ballycastle, Co. Mayo, 967;—Delay of Payments, 977
National School Teachers Act, 1875—Workhouse Teachers, 1814

[*cont.*

CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Right Hon. H.—*cont.*
Non-vested National Schools, 380
Report of the Commissioners, 1038
Ireland—Poor Law—Questions
Amalgamation of Westport and Newport Unions, Co. Galway—Compensation to Officers for Abolition of Office, 1628, 1629
Ballyshannon Union—Appointment of Relieving Officer, 828, 829
Cootehill Union—Robert Graham, Clerk to the Guardians, 41
Edenderry Union—Clerk to the Guardians, 662
Night Nursing in Workhouses—Return of Attendants, 653
North Dublin Board of Guardians, 977, 1462
Ireland—Poor Law—Election of Guardians—Questions
Drumfin (Sligo Union) and Tyholland Division (Monaghan Union), 972
Dunfanaghy Union, 226
Monaghan Union—Mr. William Ancketill 1845
Newry Union, 1632
Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary—Questions
Case of Sergeant Delaney, 666, 993, 1100
District Inspector Murphy, 1021, 1026, 1032, 1036, 1037, 1044
Extra Pay for Acting as Inspectors of Weights and Measures, 651, 827
Fishing Irregularity, Lismore District, 43, 825
Irish National League Meeting at Roscrea, 834
Mr. Fleury, District Inspector of Lisburn, 1454
Sergeant M'Canley and others, 47
Special Draft for Maghera, Co. Londonderry, 982
National Education (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 518, 524, 537
Parliament—Business of the House—Irish Bills, 63, 64
Prince and Princess of Wales—Royal Visit to Ireland—Offensive Speeches, 1453;—Riot at Mallow, 1636, 1637, 1638, 1857, 1859
Royal Irish Constabulary Redistribution, 2R. 801; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. 1083; *add. cl.* 1084
Ways and Means, Report, 182, 183, 188, 189, 190, 191

CAMPERDOWN, Earl of
Water Companies—Regulation of Powers, Nomination of Select Committee, 40

CANTERBURY, Archbishop of
Opening of Museums on Sundays—Natural History Museum, South Kensington, Res. 24

Cape of Good Hope (Advance) Bill

(*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Hibbert*)

c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 23, 347
Amendt., to leave out "now," add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Monk*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

[*cont.*

Cape of Good Hope (Advance) Bill—cont.
Committee*; Report *Mar* 24 [Bill 101]
Read 3° * *Mar* 25
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl Granville*) *Mar* 26 (No. 59)
Read 2ª; Committee negatived; read 3ª *Mar* 27, 807
Royal Assent *Mar* 28 [48 *Vict.* c. 7]

CARLINGFORD, Lord (Lord President of the Council)
Agricultural Statistics—Correction, 36
Educational Endowments (Ireland), 2R. 207
Education Department—Higher Education in Wales, 821
Trinity College (Perpetuity Grants), 2R. 205

CARNARVON, Earl of
Post Office—Telegraphic Communication with Hong Kong, 1605

CARTWRIGHT, Mr. W. C., *Oxfordshire*
Spain — Commercial Negotiations — Declaration of December 21, 1884, 1627

CAUSTON, Mr. R. K., *Colchester*
Parliament — Palace of Westminster — Westminster Hall, 234
Supply—County Court Buildings, 1235
Fire Brigade in the Metropolis, 1277, 1281
Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens, 1072
Ways and Means—Inland Revenue—Stamps on Bills of Lading, 661

Central Asia
LORDS
Russia and Afghanistan — Articles in the "Times" Newspaper, Questions, Observations, The Duke of Marlborough; Replies, Earl Granville *Mar* 23, 196; *Mar* 27, 802
The Russo-Afghan Frontier, Questions, Observations, The Marquess of Salisbury, The Duke of Argyll; Reply, Earl Granville *Mar* 27, 803
Russian Attack on the Afghans at Penjdeh—The Fight at Ak Tépé—The Negotiations, Question, The Marquess of Salisbury; Answer, Earl Granville *April* 13, 1442
Russian Advances on the Murghab, Questions, Earl De La Warr, The Marquess of Salisbury; Answers, Earl Granville, The Earl of Kimberley *April* 14, 1600; Questions, The Marquess of Salisbury, Earl Stanhope, Lord Ellenborough, The Earl of Jersey; Answers, The Earl of Derby, Earl Granville *April* 16, 1839

Central Asia
COMMONS
The Russo-Afghan Frontier—Reported Disturbance at Penjdeh, Question, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 23, 233; Questions, Mr. M'Coan, Mr. Onslow; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 24, 382; Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 27, 838
Russian Attack on the Afghans at Penjdeh—The Fight at Ak Tépé—Ministerial Statement, Questions, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. O'Kelly, Mr. Norwood, Sir George Campbell, Mr. Macfarlane, Mr. Onslow; Answers, Mr. Gladstone, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice; Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor [no reply] *April* 9, 1158; Question, Sir R. Assheton Cross; Answer, Mr. Gladstone, 1286; Questions, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. O'Kelly, Sir George Campbell; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *April* 10, 1308
The Negotiations, Questions, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, Mr. O'Kelly, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. E. Stanhope, Mr. Onslow, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. O'Donnell, Baron Henry De Worms, Mr. Gray; Answers, Mr. Gladstone, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *April* 13, 1469

The Russo-Afghan Frontier
Questions, Mr. Macfarlane, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 23, 231

The Afghan Boundary Commission
Questions, Mr. E. Stanhope, Sir George Campbell, Mr. Onslow, Sir H. Drummond Wolff, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 24, 389; Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 26, 668; Questions, Mr. E. Stanhope, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 30, 994
Instructions to Sir Peter Lumsden, Questions, Mr. Onslow, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 20, 53
Sir Peter Lumsden's Mission, Question, Mr. Tomlinson; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *April* 16, 1862

Russian Advances
Questions, Mr. Onslow; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 26, 675; Questions, Mr. Onslow, Mr. Edward Clarke, Mr. Macfarlane, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Chaplin; Answers, Mr. Gladstone, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *April* 14, 1633
Seizure of the Salt Lakes by the Russians, Questions, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 31, 1108

The Negotiations
Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Mar* 25, 621; Question, Observations, Sir Stafford Northcote; Reply, The Marquess of Hartington; short debate thereon *Mar* 31, 1110

The Russian Railway from the Caspian to Sarakhs, Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 20, 53
Russian Mission to Cabul—M. Lessar, Question, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 20, 51
Preparations for Hostilities, Questions, Sir George Campbell, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. J. K. Cross *Mar* 30, 983

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

Central Asia—Commons—cont.
Herat—Action of England in Case of sudden Seizure by Russia, Questions, Mr. Montagu Scott, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Sir William Hart Dyke, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Bourke, Mr. Healy, Sir Henry Holland; Answers, Mr. Gladstone, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *April* 16, 1864

Afghanistan—Arrest of Ayoob Khan, Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *April* 14, 1636; *April* 16, 1854

Chamberlain, Right Hon. J. (President of the Board of Trade), *Birmingham*
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 864, 867
Egyptian Loan, 2R. 1295; Comm. 1923
Electric Lighting Act, 1457
Foreign and Colonial Labour Statistics, 1864
Gold and Silver Plate—Hall-Marking, 652
Harbour Accommodation — Recommendations of the Select Committee, 965
Lighthouse Illuminants, 826, 827
Merchant Shipping — Registry of Shipping, 653
Railway Rates and Charges, 1853

Chancellor, The Lord (Earl of Selborne)
Lunacy Acts Amendment, 1R. 623
Metropolitan Improvements — Parliament Street, &c. Motion for Papers, 374
Navy—The China Station, 818, 819
Opening of Museums on Sundays — Natural History Museum, South Kensington, Res. 35

Chancellor of the Exchequer, The (Right Hon. H. C. E. Childers), *Pontefract*
British Museum — Lighting and Hours of Opening, 1854
Cape of Good Hope (Advance), 2R. 355, 360
Civil Service (Parliamentary Candidature)—Sir W. Brampton Gurdon, 1155
Customs—North Sea Fishermen — Duty-Free Tobacco, 966
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—Questions
Deductions from the Coupons, 1476
Egyptian Preference and Unified Debts, 1465
International Arrangement, 62, 227, 228, 229, 249, 252
Receipts and Payments, 385, 386
Revenue and Expenditure, 383
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 740, 942, 943
Egyptian Loan, 2R. 1287, 1291, 1292, 1294; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1928; Schedule, 1929
Egyptian Loan—Messrs. Rothschild, 1458
Friendly Societies Acts, 1876 and 1877—Disputes between Head Societies and Branches, 216
Ireland—Purchase of Land Bill, 993
Law and Justice—Office of Sheriff, 1467
Local Taxation, Ministerial Statement, 1466, 1467

Chancellor of the Exchequer, The—*cont.*
Parliament—Business of the House, 1158
Savings Banks Act—Belfast (King Street) Savings Bank, 1151
Supply—Admiralty and War Office, The New, 1204
British Museum, &c. 1271, 1272, 1273, 1274
Supply—Supplementary Estimates—Ways and Means, 63
Ways and Means — Financial Statement, 680; —Licence Duties (Ireland), 649
Inland Revenue—Income Tax—Half-Yearly Payments, 1850; — Stamps on Bills of Lading, 661

Chaplin, Mr. H., *Lincolnshire, Mid*
Army—Defence of the Coaling Stations — The Straits Settlements, 840
Army (Auxiliary Forces) — Militia and Army Reserves—Queen's Message, 998
Asia (Central) — Russian and Afghanistan—Russian Advances, 1635
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1884—Foot-and-Mouth Disease, 1631
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—International Arrangement, 61
France and China—International Law — Hostilities—Contraband of War — Rice, 1104, 1105

Childers, Right Hon. H. C. E. (*see* Chancellor of the Exchequer)

Churchill, Lord R. H. S., *Woodstock*
Army and Militia Reserve Forces—Consideration of H.M. Message, 1487
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 1896
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Act, 1883—Breakfasts to the Unemployed, 1862

Civil Service (Parliamentary Candidature)—Sir William Brampton Gurdon
Questions, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 9, 1155

Clarke, Mr. E. G., *Plymouth*
Asia (Central) — Russia and Afghanistan—Russian Advances, 1633
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 145, 147; Schedule 3, 325, 326; Schedule 7, 1564, 1565

Clarke, Mr. J. C., *Abingdon*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1526

Cohen, Mr. A., *Southwark*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 322

Colebrooke, Sir T. E., *Lanarkshire, N.*
Education (Muir's School, &c. Scheme), Motion for an Address, 1760
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 88; Schedule 3, 310

[*cont.*

COLERIDGE, Lord
Parliament—House of Lords — The late Earl Cairns, 1436

COLLINGS, Mr. J., *Ipswich*
Allotments Extension Act, 1882 — Charity Commission—Flawton Charity Land, 845
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 719, 725, 746

Colonial Defences—The Colonial Naval Force
Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey *April* 13, 1457

COLTHURST, Col. D. La Zouche, *Cork Co.*
National Education (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 533
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 5, 614

COMMINS, Mr. A., *Roscommon*
Ireland — Law and Police — Case of Owen Patrick and Thady Lang *v.* Patrick Lynch, 989
Royal Irish Constabulary — Special Draft for Maghera, Co. Londonderry, 981

Commons
Select Committee appointed, "to consider every Report made by the Land Commissioners for England, certifying the expediency of any Provisional Order for the inclosure or regulation of a Common, and presented to the House during the last or present Sessions, before a Bill be brought in for the confirmation of such Order" *Mar* 27; List of the Committee, 960; short debate thereon

Consolidated Fund (No. 2) Bill
(*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Hibbert*)
c. Resolutions [March 19] reported, and, after debate, agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 20, 178
Read 2° * *Mar* 23
Committee *; Report *Mar* 24
Read 3° * *Mar* 25
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl Granville*) *Mar* 26
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived; read 3ª *Mar* 27, 821
Royal Assent *Mar* 28 [48 *Vict.* c. 6]

Contagious Diseases Acts—Returns
Questions, Mr. Bulwer, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck; Answers, Sir Arthur Hayter *April* 14, 1627

Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1884 —*Foot-and-Mouth Disease*
Importation from Germany, Questions, Mr. Birkbeck; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *April* 10, 1302; Questions, Mr. Duckham, Mr. Chaplin; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *April* 14, 1631

CORBET, Mr. W. J., *Wicklow*
Army Contracts, 1872
Ireland—Questions
Law and Justice — Claim for Malicious Burning — Trial at Wicklow Assizes, 1450, 1451
Piers and Harbours—Arklow Breakwater, 670;—Greystones Piers and Breakwater, 658, 990
Public Works Loans—Arklow Breakwater, 213
Law and Justice — Sentence on Mrs. Weldon, 1851
Poor Rates and Pauperism—The Insane Poor, 658
Post Office Clothing Contracts, 1451

CORRY, Mr. J. P., *Belfast Co.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 5, 585

County Justices Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl Beauchamp*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Mar* 24 (No. 55)
Bill withdrawn * *April* 13

County Officers and Courts (Ireland) (Pensions) Bill (*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Res. considered in Committee, and, after short debate, agreed to *Mar* 23, 365
Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 24 [Bill 112]

COURTNEY, Mr. L. H., *Liskeard*
Cape of Good Hope (Advance), 2R. 352, 355 359
Law and Justice — Convictions of Innocent Men—Establishment of a Court of Criminal Appeal, 1009
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, Amendt. 1550, 1551, 1563, 1564, 1565

COWEN, Mr. J., *Newcastle-on-Tyne*
Egypt (Events in the Soudan)—Kassala, 980
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—International Arrangement, 254
Merchant Shipping—Registry of Shipping, 653
National Gallery Catalogue, 1095
Parliament—Business of the House, 847
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 6, 1394; Schedule 7, Amendt. 1655, 1658, 1659
Suez Canal—The Proposed Commission, 225

COWPER, Earl
Opening of Museums on Sundays — Natural History Museum, South Kensington, Res. 27

CRAIG, Mr. W. Y., *Staffordshire, N.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 4, 462

CRICHTON, Viscount, *Fermanagh*
Ireland — Poor Law — Ballyshannon Union—Appointment of Relieving Officer, 823
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 121, 133 ; Amendt. 137

Criminal Law Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Dalhousie*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *Mar* 26 (No. 58)
Read 2ª, after short debate *April* 13, 1439

CROPPER, Mr. J., *Kendal*
Cape of Good Hope (Advance), 2R. 357
Fiji—Mortality, &c. 232
Protection of Young Girls, 393

CROSS, Right Hon. Sir R. A., *Lancashire, S.W.*
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Calling out of the Reserves, 976
Asia (Central)—Russian Attack on the Afghans at Penjdeh, 1286
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 740 ; Report, 1084
Egyptian Loan, 2R. 1287 ; Comm. Amendt. 1885, 1891
Ireland—Prisons, 822
Parliament—Business of the House, 680, 847
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 2, 154, 164, 165, 168 ; Schedule 5, 513, 516 ; Schedule 7, 1550, 1567, 1694, 1714, 1721, 1729
Railways (India)—Quetta Railway, 1850
Supply — British Museum, &c. 1261, 1262, 1263, 1271
Fire Brigade in the Metropolis, 1278, 1280
Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens, 1065

CROSS, Mr. J. K. (Under Secretary of State for India), *Bolton*
Asia (Central)—England and Russia—Preparations for Hostilities, 985
Egypt (War in the Soudan)—Indian Contingent—Veterinary Arrangements, 44
Offers of Military Co-operation by Indian Princes, 44
India—Questions
Aden Harbour, 1624
Banda and Kirwee Prize Money, 973
Education—Director of Public Instruction, 1630
Madras — Outbreak of Moplahs in the Malabar District, 824
Permanent Settlement of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa, 1793, 226
Railways—Bhopal, Gwalior, and Cawnpore Railway, 217 ;—Railway from Quetta to Candahar, 1632, 1850
Parliament—Business of the House, 65

CRUM, Mr. A., *Renfrew*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 343

CUBITT, Right Hon. G., *Surrey, W.*
Education Department—School Board Divisions (Metropolis), 972

CURRIE, Sir D.; *Perthshire*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1948

Customs
Galway Docks, Question, Colonel Nolan ; Answer, Mr. Hibbert *April* 16, 1848
North Sea Fishermen—Duty-Free Tobacco, Question, Mr. Birkbeck ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 30, 966

Cyprus—Reported Revenue Frauds
Questions, Mr. Gorst ; Answers, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *April* 14, 1630 ; *April* 16, 1851

DALHOUSIE, Earl of
Criminal Law Amendment, 2R. 1439
Industrial and Reformatory Schools, 820
Minister for Scotland — Scotch National Schools, 211

DALRYMPLE, Mr. C., *Buteshire*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 109, 117 ; Schedule 4, 475 ; Schedule 6, 1393

DAVENPORT, Mr. H. T., *Staffordshire, N.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 4, 462

DAVEY, Mr. H., *Christchurch*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, Amendt. 1696, 1697, 1769, 1783

DAVIES, Mr. D., *Cardigan, &c.*
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 1908

DAWNAY, Colonel Hon. L. P., *Thirsk*
Asia (Central)—Russo-Afghan Frontier, 1120
Egypt (War in the Soudan)—General Graham's Force—The Zerebas, 672

DAWNAY, Hon. G. C., *York, N.R.*
Egypt (War in the Soudan), 680

DAWSON, Mr. C., *Carlow*
Borough Funds Act—The Dublin Collector General of Rates, 992

DEASY, Mr. J., *Cork*
H.R.H. the Prince and Princess of Wales, Visit of, to Ireland—Disturbance at Mallow, 1860

Defences of the Empire
Defence of the Military and Naval Stations—Coaling Stations—The Straits Settlements, Question, Mr. Chaplin ; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 27, 840
Defence of the Coaling Stations, Question, Viscount Sidmouth ; Answer, The Earl of Derby *April* 16, 1838
[See title *Colonial Defences*]

De La Warr, Earl
Asia (Central) — Russia and Afghanistan — Russian Advances on the Murghab, 1600
France and China—Hostilities—International Law—Right of Search, 372

Denbigh, Earl of
Opening of Museums on Sundays—National History Museum, South Kensington, Res. 33

Derby, Earl of (Secretary of State for the Colonies)
Africa (South)—Bechuanaland, 621, 622
Asia (Central)—Russia and Afghanistan — Advance of the Russians — Negotiations, 1839
Defences of the Empire — Defence of the Coaling Stations, 1838
Federal Council of Australasia, 1R. 1840
Navy—The China Station, 819
Post Office—Telegraphic Communication with Hong Kong, 1604, 1607

de Ros, Lord
Egypt (War in the Soudan)—General Graham's Force—Action on march near Suakin, 640

De Worms, Baron H., *Greenwich*
Asia (Central)—Russian Attack on the Afghans at Penjdeh—Negotiations, 1474
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 877
Egyptian Loan, 2R. 1293
France—Ministerial Crisis, 998
France and China — Hostilities — English Mails, 1156
International Law—Contraband of War—Rice, 1103
Navy—H.M.S. "Canada," 663

Dickson, Mr. T. A., *Tyrone*
Ireland—Questions
Prisons, 823
Purchase of Land Bill, 993, 994
Registration of Parliamentary Voters — Extension of Time for Preparing the Lists, 985
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 5, 592, 593

Digby, Mr. J. K. D. W., *Somerset, Mid*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1791, 1792, 1814

Dilke, Right Hon. Sir C. W. (President of the Local Government Board), *Chelsea, &c.*
Asia (Central) — Russia and Afghanistan — Negotiations, 621
Boundary Commission — Parliamentary Divisions of the Co. Down (Ireland)—Report of the Commission, 987
Commons, Appointment and Nomination of Select Committee, 961
Local Taxation and Local Government, 378
Parliament—Adjournment, 963
Business of the House, 680, 846, 847

Dilke, Right Hon. Sir C. W.—*cont.*
Parliamentary Elections—County Boundaries (Warwickshire, &c.), 673
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) — Boundary Maps, 51;—Wimbledon Division, 1626
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 83, 84, 94, 104, 126, 128, 130, 131, 138; Schedule 2, 148, 151, 154, 156, 158, 162, 165, 169, 274, 275; Schedule 3, 296, 300, 315, 320, 321, 325, 326, 329, 330, 331, 338; Motion for reporting Progress, 346, 398, 403, 404, 406, 407, 408, 409, 411, 412, 428, 429; Schedule 4, 448, 449, 453, 457, 458; Amendt. 459, 460, 461, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 471, 484, 491; Schedule 5, 494; Amendt. 498, 499, 502, 506, 514; Motion for reporting Progress, 516, 517, 546, 548, 549, 550, 555; Amendt. 576, 581, 584, 585, 591, 592, 601, 1319, 1320, 1321, 1323, 1327, 1331, 1336, 1338; Schedule 6, 1339, 1340, 1343, 1344, 1345, 1348, 1349, 1351; Amendt. 1353, 1354, 1356, 1362, 1371, 1372, 1373, 1376, 1377, 1390, 1393, 1394, 1399, 1400, 1410, 1411, 1412, 1430; Schedule 7, 1501, 1502, 1503, 1508, 1517, 1519, 1522; Amendt. 1523, 1524, 1526, 1527, 1529, 1530, 1532, 1538, 1540, 1541, 1542, 1543, 1544, 1545, 1546, 1547, 1548, 1549, 1551, 1559, 1561, 1564, 1565, 1566, 1567, 1568, 1569, 1639, 1640, 1641, 1643, 1644, 1646, 1648, 1651, 1652, 1653, 1654, 1655, 1658, 1660, 1661, 1663, 1664, 1665, 1667, 1668, 1669, 1671, 1672, 1674, 1675, 1678, 1679, 1685, 1686, 1687, 1688, 1689, 1690, 1691, 1692, 1694, 1695, 1696, 1697, 1698, 1699, 1701, 1703, 1704, 1705, 1707, 1708, 1709, 1711, 1720, 1724, 1725, 1729, 1730, 1731, 1732, 1733, 1734, 1735, 1737, 1738, 1739, 1740, 1741, 1742, 1743, 1744, 1746, 1749; Motion for reporting Progress, 1750, 1766; Amendt. 1774, 1775, 1776, 1778, 1779, 1780, 1784, 1786, 1788, 1789, 1795, 1796, 1798, 1801, 1802, 1803, 1804, 1805, 1806, 1810, 1811, 1812, 1818, 1820, 1821, 1822, 1826, 1827, 1831, 1833, 1834, 1835, 1837, 1931, 1933, 1934, 1936, 1937; Motion for reporting Progress, 1938, 1939, 1943; Amendt. 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1957, 1959, 1960, 1963
Poor Rates and Pauperism—The Insane Poor, 659

Dillwyn, Mr. L. L., *Swansea*
Supply—Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens, Amendt. 1065, 1071

Diplomatic Service—Secretaries of Embassies
Question, Lord Lamington; Answer, Earl Granville *Mar* 27, 807

Dodds, Mr. J., *Stockton*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1517, 1657; Amendt. 1659, 1660, 1662, 1663, 1664, 1665

Dorchester, Lord
Army—Military Expedition to the Soudan—Defective Ammunition, 645

[*cont.*

DOUGLAS, Mr. A. AKERS-, *Kent, E.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1711

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Orders Bill
(*Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Read 2° * *Mar* 27 [Bill 100]
Report * *April* 13
Read 3° * *April* 14
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *April* 16 (No. 70)

DUCKHAM, Mr. T., *Herefordshire*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1884—Foot-and-Mouth Disease, 1631
Local Taxation and Local Government, 378
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1518, 1702; Amendt. 1703, 1705

DUNDAS, Hon. J. C., *Richmond*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, Amendt. 1826, 1828, 1830

DYKE, Right Hon. Sir W. H., *Kent, Mid*
Army and Militia Reserve Forces—Consideration of H.M. Message, 1498
Asia (Central)—Herat—Action of England in Case of Sudden Seizure by Russia, 1866

East India (Loan) Bill
(*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Kynaston Cross*)
c. Resolution in Committee *Mar* 19
Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 23 [Bill 109]

East India (Unclaimed Stocks) Bill
(*Mr. Kynaston Cross, Mr. Hibbert*)
c. Ordered * *April* 9
Read 1° * *April* 10 [Bill 125]

ECKERSLEY, Mr. N., *Wigan*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 2, Amendt. 158

ECROYD, Mr. W. F., *Preston*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 2, 169; Schedule 7, 1705; Amendt. 1714, 1722, 1725

Educational Endowments (Ireland) Bill
[H.L.] (*The Lord President*)
l. Read 2ª *Mar* 23, 207 (No. 44)
Committee * *Mar* 27
Report * *April* 16

Education Department (*England and Wales*)
Education Grants, Question, Mr. Loder; Answer, Mr. Mundella *Mar* 31, 1096
The Revised Code, 1885, Questions, Mr. J. G. Talbot, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answers, Mr. Mundella *Mar* 26, 671; Question, Mr. R. H. Paget; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 13, 1467

[*cont.*

Education Department (*England and Wales*)—cont.
Science Teachers, Question, Mr. Justin Huntly M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Mundella *Mar* 30, 967
Higher and Intermediate Education in Wales, Question, Lord Norton; Answer, Lord Carlingford *Mar* 27, 820
Brailes Endowed School—A Political Schoolmaster, Question, Mr. Wills; Answer, Mr. Mundella *Mar* 23, 221
Croydon School Board, Question, Mr. Grantham; Answer, Mr. Mundella *April* 14, 1625
School Board Divisions (*Metropolis*), Question, Mr. Cubitt; Answer, Mr. Mundella *Mar* 30, 972

Education Department—Education (*Muir's School, &c. Scheme*)
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to withhold Her consent from section 3 of the Scheme, now lying upon the Table of the House, for the management of the Endowments known as Muir's School Fund, Millar's and Peadie's School, Wilson's Charity School, M'Lachlan's Free School, and Graham's Free School, all in the County of Lanark and burgh of Glasgow" (*Dr. Cameron*) *April* 14, 1751; after short debate, Question put; A. 8, N. 50; M. 42 (D.L. 100)

Education Department—Elementary Education—Revised Code, 1885
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty that She will be graciously pleased to withhold Her consent from the Education Code in respect of Article 109 (a), with a view of providing that a larger proportion of the grant now given to public elementary schools should be allotted in the form of a fixed payment on average attendance" (*Mr. J. G. Talbot*) *April* 13, 1569; after debate, Question put; A. 53, N. 117; M. 64 (D.L. 99)

Education Department — School Board Elections (*Voting*)
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and Report on the best mode of Voting in School Board Elections" (*Sir John Lubbock*) *Mar* 24, 517; after short debate, Motion agreed to

EGERTON, Hon. A. F., *Wigan*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 2, 161, 168; Schedule 5, 565; Schedule 7, Amendt. 1725

Egypt
LORDS
Finance, &c
Cost of the Army of Occupation, Question, Observations, The Earl of Jersey; Reply, The Earl of Morley *Mar* 20, 2
The Egyptian Loan—The International Agreement—Joint Guarantee, Questions, Observations, The Marquess of Salisbury, The Duke of Marlborough; Replies, Earl Granville, The Earl of Kimberley *Mar* 27, 808

[*cont.*

Egypt—Lords—*Finance, &c.*—cont.

War in the Soudan—Military Co-operation of the Colonies

Her Majesty's Answer to the Address of March 16 brought up, and read by the Earl Sydney *Mar* 23, 196 (*P.P.* No. 52)

General Graham's Force—Action near Suakin (*March* 22), Question Observations, Lord Greville, Lord de Ros, Lord Napier of Magdala ; Reply, The Earl of Kimberley *Mar* 26, 639

Egypt

Commons

Finance, &c

The International Agreement (*Egyptian Loan*), Questions, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Chaplin, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Onslow ; Answers, Mr. Gladstone, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 20, 58 ; Questions, Mr. M'Coan, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Gibson ; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 23, 227 ; Questions, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Gibson ; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 23, 235 ; Question, Mr. M'Coan ; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 26, 676

The New Loan, 1885, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 24, 388

The Suez Canal, Questions, Sir H. Drummond Wolff, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Gorst, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett ; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 26, 677

The Convention of London—Alleged Refusal of the Porte, Question, Mr. M'Coan ; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice; Questions, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, Mr. Arthur O'Connor [no reply] *Mar* 31, 1100 ; Question, Mr. Raikes ; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *April* 9, 1157

The Egyptian Loan — Messrs. Rothschild, Question, Mr. W. H. Smith ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 13, 1457

(See title *Egyptian Loan*)

Revenue and Expenditure, Question, Sir John Lubbock ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 24, 383

Receipts and Payments, Questions, Lord George Hamilton, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett ; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 24, 385

Egyptian Preference and Unified Debts—Deductions from the Coupons, Questions, Mr. M'Coan ; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 13, 1464, 1476

Events in the Soudan

Lord Wolseley and the Soudan, Question, Mr. Puleston ; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 20, 54

Mr. Frank Power, Question, Mr. William Redmond [no reply] *Mar* 20, 64

Kassala, Questions, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett ; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 30, 980

The Suakin-Berber Railway, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff ; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 16, 1871

[*cont.*

Egypt—Commons—cont.

General Gordon

General Gordon's Diaries, &c., Question, Mr. Bourke ; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 23, 230

General Gordon's Mission, Questions, Mr. Baxter, Mr. O'Kelly ; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *April* 10, 1305

The Military Expedition

The Army in Egypt — Small-Pox, Question, Mr. Hopwood ; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 23, 218

The Naval Brigade, Question, Mr. Brett ; Answer, Mr. Caine *Mar* 24, 386

The Royal Marines at Suakin, Question, Colonel North ; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey *Mar* 26, 650

The Biscuit Stores at Korti, Question, Dr. Cameron ; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 27, 833

Canned Meat, Questions, Mr. Ritchie, Sir Alexander Gordon ; Answers, Mr. Brand *Mar* 30, 968

The Camel Corps, Questions, General Owen Williams ; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 30, 992 ; *Mar* 31, 1098 ; Question, General Alexander ; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 10, 1308

The Expedition up the Nile — Sir Charles Wilson's Voyage from Metemneh to Khartoum, Question, Mr. Callan ; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 13, 1477

War in the Soudan

Questions, Mr. Guy Dawnay, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. O'Kelly, Sir Walter B. Barttelot ; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington ; Question, Mr. Onslow [no reply] *Mar* 26, 680

Offers of Military Co-operation by Indian Princes, Question, Dr. Cameron ; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *Mar* 20, 43

The Indian Contingent—Veterinary Arrangements, Question, Dr. Cameron ; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *Mar* 20, 44

Osman Digna, Question, Sir George Campbell ; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 31, 1106

Withdrawal of the Forces, Observations, Mr. Samuel Smith *Mar* 31, 1128 ; Observations, Mr. W. Fowler ; short debate thereon, 1138

The Suakin and Red Sea Forces

General Graham's Advance

Action near Suakin, March 20, Question, Mr. W. H. Smith ; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 20, 170

Action near Suakin, March 22, Question, Colonel Stanley ; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 23, 233 ; Questions, Mr. Gourley, Mr. Storey, Sir H. Drummond Wolff ; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 27, 843

The Actions on the 20th and 22nd March, Questions, Sir Walter B. Barttelot, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. T. P. O'Connor ; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 24, 391 ; Questions, Captain Maxwell-

[*cont.*

Egypt—Commons — *The Suakin and Red Sea Forces—General Graham's Advance*—cont.

Heron, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Herbert Maxwell, Lord Elcho; Answers, Mr. Brand *Mar* 26, 667

Withdrawal of the Force, Question, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 30, 995

The Zerebas—The Camel Transport, Question, Colonel Dawnay; Answer, Mr. Brand *Mar* 26, 672

The Transport Department, Question, Viscount Newport; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 27, 839

The Army of Occupation—The Cost, Question, Mr. M'Coan; Answer, Sir Arthur Hayter *Mar* 26, 672

The Slave Trade in the Soudan—Prisoners of the Mahdi, Questions, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 20, 51; Question, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Mar* 24, 392

Zebehr Pasha, Questions, Sir Henry Holland, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 27, 836; Questions, Mr. Gorst; Answers, The Attorney General *Mar* 30, 985; Question, Mr. J. W. Lowther; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 31, 1100; Questions, Mr. Gorst; Answers, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Question, Mr. O'Donnell [no reply] *April* 14, 1629

Suppression of the "Bosphore Egyptien"

Questions, Mr. O'Donnell, Mr. O'Kelly; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *April* 9, 1166; Question, Mr. O'Kelly; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *April* 10, 1304; Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *April* 13, 1468

Egyptian Loan Bill

(*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Hibbert*)

c. Resolution in Committee *Mar* 30

Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 31 [Bill 122]

Read 2°, after short debate *April* 9, 1287

Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *April* 16, 1874

Amendt., to leave out from "That," add "this House, taking into consideration the terms of the Declarations of the Great Powers of the 17th March, declines to proceed to the discussion of the details of this Bill until it shall have before it the Convention which is to be concluded with regard to the Suez Canal" (*Sir R. Assheton Cross*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c." put, and agreed to; Committee; Report

Egyptian Loan—The Convention of March, 18, 1885

Considered in Committee *Mar* 26, 681

Moved, "That Her Majesty be authorised to guarantee the payment of an annuity of three hundred and fifteen thousand pounds sterling for the purpose of a loan, to be raised by the Government of Egypt, in pursuance of the Convention signed at London on the eighteenth day of March 1885, between Her Majesty and the Governments of Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Italy, and Russia, with the authority of Turkey; and that provision be made out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, or the growing produce thereof, for the issue of such sums of money from time to time, as may be required, to pay any sums which may at any time be required to fulfil the guarantee of Her Majesty in respect of such annuity, conformably to the tenor of Her Majesty's engagement as specified in the said Convention" (*Mr. Gladstone*)

Amendt., to leave out from "That," add "the proposals for adjusting the finances of Egypt contained in the Convention of March 18th, and the collateral arrangement, indicated in the Papers presented to Parliament, for regulating, without any previous communication to Parliament, the international position of the Suez Canal are unsatisfactory, and do not warrant the agreement into which the Government have provisionally entered" (*Mr. Thomas Bruce*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long time spent therein, Committee—R.P.

Considered in Committee *Mar* 27, 849

Question and Amendt. again proposed; after long time spent therein, Question put; A. 294, N. 246; M. 48

Div. List, A. and N., 953

Main Question put, and agreed to

Res. reported, and agreed to *Mar* 30, 1048

Moved, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill upon the said Resolution" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); after short debate [House counted out]

Elcho, Lord, *Haddingtonshire*

Army—Small Arms—Martini-Henry Rifle, 841

Egypt (War in the Soudan)—General Graham's Force—Actions at Suakin, 668

Scotland—Trawling, 672

Elections in Counties (Hours of Poll) Bill

(*Lord Carrington*)

l. Read 2ª * *Mar* 23 (No. 43)

Committee * *Mar* 26

Report * *April* 16

Electric Lighting Act—Legislation

Question, Mr. E. Stanhope; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *April* 13, 1457

Ellenborough, Lord

Asia (Central)—Russia and Afghanistan—Advance of the Russians—The Negotiations, 1839, 1840

[*cont.*

ELLIOT, Hon. A. R. D., *Roxburgh*
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 925
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, Motion for reporting Progress, 68, 111

ELLIOT, Sir G., *Durham, N.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1661

ELLIOT, Mr. G. W., *Northallerton*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1661, 1663

ELTON, Mr. C. I., *Somerset, W.*
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 714, 1906
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 311; Schedule 5, 591; Schedule 7, Amendt. 1750, 1763, 1768, 1774

EMLYN, Viscount, *Carmarthenshire*
Army—Militia Officers, 1871
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 5, Amendt. 502, 515

ENFIELD, Viscount
Army—Royal Military Academy, Woolwich—New Buildings, 645

England and Turkey
The Special Mission, Question, Mr. J. Lowther; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 30, 997
The Anglo-Turkish Convention, Questions, Mr. M'Coan, Mr. Raikes; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 31, 1095

EWING, Mr. A. ORR-, *Dumbarton*
North British Railway, 2R. 1445, 1447
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 79, 81; Schedule 3, 344; Schedule 4, 488

FAIRBAIRN, Sir A., *York, W. R., E. Div.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1934

FARQUHARSON, Dr. R., *Aberdeenshire, W.*
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 1913
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 6, 1391

FAY, Mr. C. J., *Cavan Co.*
Dynamite Explosions at Westminster Hall—Constables Cole and Cox, 52

Federal Council of Australasia Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Derby*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *April* 16 (No. 69)

FERGUSON, Mr. R. C. MUNRO-, *Ross and Cromarty*
Harbour Accommodation—Recommendations of the Select Committee, 965

FIFE, Earl of
Minister for Scotland—Scotch National Schools, 210

Fiji—Mortality, &c.
Question, Mr. Cropper; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *Mar* 23, 232

FINCH-HATTON, Hon. M. E. G., *Lincolnshire, S.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1733, 1736; Amendt. 1738

FIRTH, Mr. J. F. B., *Chelsea*
Heligoland—Proposed Cession to Germany, 1013
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 323, 331; Schedule 7, 1933

FITZGERALD, Lord
Trinity College (Perpetuity Grants), 2R. 205

FITZMAURICE, Lord E. G. P. (Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs), *Calne*
Afghanistan—Arrest of Ayoob Khan, 1636, 1854
Asia (Central)—Questions
Herat—Action of England in Case of Sudden Seizure by Russia, 1868
Russia and Afghanistan—Penjdeh, 382, 838;—Russian Advances, 1635
Russian Attack on the Afghans at Penjdeh—Statement of H.M. Ministers, 1164;—Negotiations, 1473, 1474, 1475
Russian Mission to Cabul—M. Lessar, 51
Russian Railway from the Caspian to Sarakhs, 53
Russo-Afghan Boundary, 54, 231, 232, 233, 1108, 1109, 1117
Russo-Afghan Boundary Commission, 669, 994, 995;—Sir Peter Lumsden's Mission, 1862
Declaration of Paris, 1856, 1156
Egypt—Questions
Affairs of the Soudan—Lord Wolseley and the Soudan, 54
Convention, 1100
Events in the Soudan—Kassala, 980
Finance, &c.—The Porte—The Convention of London, March 18, 1885, 1157
Suppression of the "Bosphore Egyptien," 1166, 1304, 1468
War in the Soudan—Prisoners of the Mahdi, 52
Zebehr Pasha, 836, 1100
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 748, 760
England and Turkey, 997;—Anglo-Turkish Convention, 1095, 1096
Foreign Office—German Colonial Policy—The Western Pacific, 836
France—Ship Brokerage, 980;—Ministerial Crisis, 998
France and China—Hostilities—Questions
International Law—Contraband of War—Rice, 828, 996, 1102, 1104, 1105, 1158, 1300, 1301

FITZMAURICE, Lord, E. G. P.—*cont.*
Right of Search for Contraband of War, 88, 230, 1300
The English Mails, 1157
Heligoland—Proposed Cession to Germany, 1015
Islands of the Pacific—Samoa, 63
Islands of the Western Pacific—Administration of Justice, 997
Madagascar—Postal Communication, 1627
Spain—Commercial Negotiations, 979;—Declaration of December 21st, 1884, 1627
Suez Canal—Navigation of the Canal—International Arrangements, 225
Proposed Commission, 224, 225, 384, 385
Trade and Commerce—Chinese Duties on Tea—"The Li-kin Dues," 1304, 1468
Turkey—European Provinces—Disturbances in Albania, 979
The Franco-English Loan of 1855—The Convention, 383, 384
Venezuela—Revolutionary Expedition against the Government, 1469
West India Islands—Communication with the United States and Canada, 1849

FITZ-WYGRAM, Lieut.-General Sir F. W. J., *Hants, S.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1692; Amendt. 1693

FLOWER, Mr. C., *Brecknock*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1521

FLOYER, Mr. C., *Dorsetshire*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1513

Foreign and Colonial Labour Statistics
Question, Mr. Albert Grey; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *April* 16, 1863

Foreign and Colonial Telegraphs—Telegraphic Communication with Hong Kong
Question, Observations, Viscount Sidmouth; Reply, The Earl of Derby; short debate thereon *April* 14, 1603

Foreign Office—German Colonial Policy—The Western Pacific
Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 27, 835

FORSTER, Right Hon. W. E., *Bradford*
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 1917
Elementary Education—Revised Code, 1885, Motion for an Address, 1588
France and China—Hostilities—International Law—Contraband of War—Rice, 827, 1103, 1104
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1834, 1930, 1935

FORSTER, Sir C., *Walsall*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1799

FOWLER, Right Hon. R. N. (†Lord Mayor), *London*
Africa (South)—Bechuanaland—Murders of British Subjects, 842
Cape of Good Hope (Advance), 2R. 356, 359
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 766
Egyptian Loan, 2R. 1294; †Comm. 1907
Parliament—Business of the House, 848
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 303, 326, 767
Supply—Fire Brigade in the Metropolis, 1281
Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens, 1062, 1067

FOWLER, Mr. H. H. (Under Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Wolverhampton*
London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway, 2R. 617
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 6, 1377
Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers), 2R. 360
Supply—Fire Brigade in the Metropolis, 1278, 1279, 1280
Trawling Commission—The Report, 837

FOWLER, Mr. W., *Cambridge*
Egypt (War in the Soudan)—Withdrawal of the Forces, 1138
Law and Justice—Sentence on Henry Williams at Winchester Assizes, 381

France
Ship Brokerage, Question, Mr. Charles Palmer; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 30, 979
The Ministerial Crisis, Question, Baron Henry De Worms; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 30, 998

France and China
Hostilities—Rights of Neutrals—The Right of Search, Questions, Mr. Gorst, Mr. Bourke; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 20, 47; Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 23, 230; Question, Earl De La Warr; Answer Earl Granville *Mar* 24, 372; Question, Mr. Coleridge Kennard; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *April* 10, 1300
International Law—Contraband of War—Rice, Question, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 26, 674; Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 27, 827; Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 30, 995; Questions, Mr. Bourke, Mr. Magniac, Colonel Nolan, Baron Henry De Worms, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Chaplin, Mr. O'Kelly, Sir H. Drummond Wolff, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Mr. Speaker *Mar* 31, 1101; Question, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *April* 9, 1153

[*cont.*

France and China—cont.
The Treaty of Peace—Contraband of War—Rice, Questions, Mr. Gourley; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *April* 10, 1300

The English Mails, Question, Baron Henry De Worms; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *April* 9, 1156

FREMANTLE, Hon. T. F., *Buckinghamshire*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1518; Amendt. 1528

FRENCH-BREWSTER, Mr. R. A. B., *Portarlington*
Navy—H.M.S. "Inflexible"—The 81-ton Gun, 65

Friendly Societies Acts, 1876 *and* 1877—*Disputes between Head Societies and Branches*
Question, Mr. Tomlinson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 23, 215

FRY, Mr. L., *Bristol*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 6, Amendt. 1350, 1352

Gas Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
(*Mr. Holms, Mr. Chamberlain*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 14 [Bill 126]

Germany, Austria, and Russia—Meeting of the Emperors at Skiernevice
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for any diplomatic correspondence which exists from Her Majesty's Representatives abroad as to the new concert or alliance between the Courts of Germany, of Austria, and of Russia" (*The Lord Stratheden and Campbell*) *Mar* 26, 630; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Gibraltar—The Post Office
Question, Captain Aylmer; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *April* 13, 1466

GIBSON, Right Hon. E., *Dublin University*
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—International Arrangement, 228, 235
Ireland—Pharmacy and Poisons Acts, 42
Supreme Court of Judicature Bill, 1096
Parliament—House of Commons—Ladies' Gallery, Res. 1005, 1006
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1942
Suez Canal—Proposed Commission, 224, 225, 384
Turkey—The Franco-English Loan of 1855—Convention, 383, 384

GIFFARD, Sir H. S., *Launceston*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 5, 509

GLADSTONE, Right Hon. W. E. (First Lord of the Treasury), *Edinburghshire*
Army and Militia Reserve Forces—Consideration of H.M. Message, 1481, 1486
Asia (Central)—Questions
Herat—Action of England in case of Seizure by Russia, 1865, 1866, 1867, 1868, 1869
Russia and Afghanistan—Advance of the Russians, 675, 676, 1633, 1634, 1635
Russian Attack on the Afghans at Penjdeh, Ministerial Statement, 1159, 1160, 1163, 1164, 1165, 1286, 1308, 1309, 1310;—Negotiations, 1469, 1471, 1472, 1473, 1474, 1475, 1476
Russo-Afghan Frontier Commission, 389, 390
Education Department—The Revised Code, 1885, 1468
Egypt (Affairs of the Soudan)—General Gordon's Mission, 1305, 1307
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—Questions
International Arrangement, 58, 61, 62, 235, 236, 239, 243, 266, 676;—Suez Canal, 677, 678, 679
New Loan, 1885, 388
Egypt (War in the Soudan)—General Graham's Force—Action near Suakin, 22nd March, 843, 844
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 681, 741, 937
Egyptian Loan, 2R. 1289; Comm. Motion for Adjournment, 1874, 1887, 1891, 1895, 1904, 1926
France and China—Hostilities—Contraband of War—Rice, 675
Local Taxation and Local Government, 388
Parliament—Business of the House, 56, 846, 847, 848, 1158, 1873, 1874
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution)—Representation of the City of London, 55
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 2, 168
Western Pacific—New Guinea, 57, 58

GLADSTONE, Mr. H. J. (Lord of the Treasury), *Leeds*
Metropolis—Parks—Victoria Park, 835
Parliament—Palace of Westminster—Smoking Room, 230
Westminster Hall, 234, 235
Parliament—House of Commons—Ladies' Gallery, Res. 1003
Supply—British Museum, &c. 1261, 1262, 1264, 1265
County Court Buildings, 1231, 1234
Fire Brigade in the Metropolis, 1284
Furniture of Public Offices, Great Britain, 1219, 1223, 1224
Public Buildings, Great Britain, 1167
Revenue Department Buildings, Great Britain, 1228, 1229
Royal Palaces, 1055, 1059, 1060, 1061
Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens, 1065, 1067, 1068, 1071
Sheriff Court Houses, Scotland, 1245
Surveys of the United Kingdom, 1249, 1250, 1251, 1252, 1255, 1257, 1260

Gold and Silver Plate—Hall-Marking
Question, Mr. Slagg; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *Mar* 26, 651

GOLDNEY, Sir G., *Chippenham*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1816, 1822

GORDON, General Hon. Sir A. H., *Aberdeenshire, E.*
Army (Annual), Comm. *cl.* 5, 769; *cl.* 6, 775, 778, 780; *add. cl.* 783, 784, 791
Egypt (Military Expedition)—Canned Meat, 969
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 6, 1397
Trawling Commission—The Report, 837

GORST, Mr. J. E., *Chatham*
Army List—Officers of Colonial Forces, 1465
Colonial Defences—Colonial Naval Forces, 1457
Cyprus—Reported Revenue Frauds, 1630, 1851
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—International Arrangement, 229, 255, 257;—Suez Canal, 679
Zebehr Pasha, 836, 985, 986, 1629
Foreign Office — German Colonial Policy—Western Pacific, 835
Heligoland—Proposed Cession to Germany, 1010, 1013
International Law—Hostilities between France and China—Right of Search, 47, 48
Islands of the Pacific—Samoa, 62
Islands of the Western Pacific—Administration of Justice, 996
Labuan, 380
Navy—H.M.S. "Garnet," 381
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 91; Schedule 5, 506, 516; Schedule 7, 1723, 1828
Supply—Admiralty and War Office, The New, 1186
British Museum, &c. 1266, 1267, 1274
Fire Brigade in the Metropolis, 1278, 1284

GOSCHEN, Right Hon. G. J., *Ripon*
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 906

GOURLEY, Mr. E. T., *Sunderland*
Egypt (War in the Soudan)—General Graham's Force — Action near Suakin, March 22, 843
France and China—Treaty of Peace—Contraband of War—Rice, 1300, 1301
Navy — Merchant Steamers as Transport Cruisers, 1302
Suez Canal — Navigation — International Arrangements, 225

GRANT, Mr. A., *Leith, &c.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 87; Amendt. 99, 111

GRANT, Mr. D., *Marylebone*
British Museum — Lighting and Hours of Opening, 1853, 1854

GRANTHAM, Mr. W., *Surrey, E.*
Education Department (England and Wales)—Croydon School Board, 1625
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 895

GRANTHAM, Mr. W.—*cont.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 4, Amendt. 457
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution)—Wimbledon Division, 1626

GRANVILLE, Earl (Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs)
Army and Militia Reserve Forces—Consideration of the Queen's Message, 1600
Asia (Central)—Questions
Articles in the "Times" Newspaper, 198, 803
Russia and Afghanistan — Russo-Afghan Frontier, 804, 806
Russian Advances on the Murghab, 1600
Russian Attack on the Afghans at Penjdeh—Negotiations 1442, 1443, 1839, 1840
Diplomatic Service—Secretaries of Embassies, 808
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—New Egyptian Loan—International Guarantee, 813, 815
France and China—Hostilities—International Law—Right of Search, 372
Navy—The China Station, 818
Opening of Museums on Sundays — Natural History Museum, South Kensington, Res. 29
Parliament — Adjournment—Easter Recess—Statement, 1
House of Lords—The late Earl Cairns, 1435
Science and Art — National Gallery — Annual Grant, 39

GRAY, Mr. E. D., *Carlow Co.*
Army — Ordnance Department — Report on Machine Guns and Rifles, 976
Asia (Central)—Russian Attack on the Afghans at Penjdeh—Negotiations, 1475, 1476
Ireland—Local Government Board—Surcharge on the Corporation of Dublin for Expenses in attending Cork Industrial Exhibition, 983
Lighthouse Illuminants, 825, 827
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 439; Schedule 6, 1426
Savings Banks Act — Belfast (King Street) Savings Bank, 1151
Supply—Fire Brigade in the Metropolis, 1284

GREER, Mr. T., *Carrickfergus*
Army—Staff Appointment of Deputy Commissary General, 832
Army (Auxiliary Forces) — Militia Reserves, 986

GREGORY, Mr. G. B., *Sussex, E.*
Heligoland—Proposed Cession to Germany, 1014
London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway, 2R. 1621
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 147; Schedule 6, 1395; Schedule 7, 1544, 1776, 1808
Supply—Admiralty and War Office, The New, 1177

GREVILLE, Lord
Egypt (War in the Soudan)—General Graham's Force — Action on march near Suakin, 639, 642

[*cont.*

GREY, Mr. A. H. G., *Northumberland, S.*
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 723, 867
Foreign and Colonial Labour Statistics, 1863

GROSVENOR, Right Hon. Lord R. (Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury), *Flintshire*
Ireland—Industries—Select Committee, 844, 998
Law and Justice—Craughwell Murder Case—Compensation, 1149

GUEST, Mr. M. J., *Wareham*
Parliament — House of Commons — Ladies' Gallery, Res. 1008
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1653, 1654

GUNTER, Colonel R., *Knaresborough*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1936, 1938

HALSEY, Mr. T. F., *Herts*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1654; Amendt. 1706, 1707

HAMILTON, Right Hon. Lord G. F., *Middlesex*
Boundary Commission — Parliamentary Divisions of the County Down (Ireland) — Report of the Commissioner, 987
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—International Arrangement, 262
Receipts and Payments, 385, 386
Elementary Education — Revised Code, 1885, Motion for an Address, 1585
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1938
Poor Law (Metropolis) — Pauper Married Couples, 1842

HAMILTON, Lord C. J., *Liverpool*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 6, 1365, 1366, 1369, 1372

HAMILTON, Mr. J. G. C., *Lanark, S.*
Boundary Commission (Scotland)—Instructions to the Commissioners, 378
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, Amendt. 1946

Harbour Accommodation — Recommendations of the Select Committee
Question, Mr. Munro-Ferguson; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *Mar* 30, 965

HARCOURT, Right Hon. Sir W. G. V. (Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Derby*
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Calling out of the Reserves, 976
Dynamite Explosions at Westminster Hall—Constables Cole and Cox, 52
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—International Arrangement, 256, 257

[*cont.*

HARCOURT, Right Hon. Sir W. G. V.—*cont.*
Law and Justice—Questions
Conviction of Innocent Men—Establishment of a Court of Criminal Appeal, 1124
Ex-Police Inspector Minahan, 1853
Sentence on Henry Williams at Winchester Assizes, 382, 991
Sentence on Mrs. Weldon, 1851
Law and Justice (Ireland)—Case of Mr. John Boyle O'Reilly, 1132, 1135, 1136, 1137
Law and Police—Boy Acrobats, 1097, 1098
Metropolis—Sham Clubs, 652
Local Authorities (Expenses of Conferences), Comm. 1433
Mines, Accidents in—Report of the Royal Commission, 232
Protection of Young Girls, 393
Scotland—Suspension of Evictions, 980
Tenure of Land in the Highlands, &c. 968
Supply—British Museum, 1263
Metropolitan Police Court Buildings, 1242
Suspension of Evictions (Scotland), 231
Venezuela—Revolutionary Expedition against the Government, 1469

HARDINGE, Viscount
Science and Art—National Gallery—Annual Grant, 39

HARRINGTON, Mr. T., *Westmeath*
Army (Annual), Comm. *cl.* 6, 779
Ireland—Questions
Irish Land Commission — Appeals in Co. Kerry, 1088
Law and Justice — Crown Solicitor, Co. Kilkenny, 1089;—The Craughwell Murder Case—Compensation, 1149, 1150
Law and Police—False Charge of Firing at the Person—Case of Mr. Spunner, 657
Meetings of the National League — Action of the Police at Roscrea, 988, 989
Poor Law—Ballyshannon Union—Appointment of Relieving Officer, 829
Post Office—Mail Service to Kerry, 657;—Mount Temple, Co. Westmeath, 824
Registration of Voters Bill, 1090, 1091
Royal Irish Constabulary — District Inspector Murphy, 1034, 1040, 1041, 1043
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 5, 593, 613
Post Office—Letter Sorters on the Irish Packet Boats, 974

HARRIS, Lord
Africa (South)—Bechuanaland, 621

HARROWBY, Earl of
Industrial and Reformatory Schools, 820
Opening of Museums on Sundays — Natural History Museum, South Kensington, 19

HARTINGTON, Right Hon. Marquess of (Secretary of State for War), *Lancashire, N.E.*
Army—Questions
Army List — Officers of Colonial Forces, 1465

[*cont.*

HARTINGTON, Right Hon. Marquess of—*cont.*
Defence of the Coaling Stations — The Straits Settlements, 840
82nd Regiment — Promotion by Purchase, 830, 1107
5th Royal Irish Lancers, 50, 1870
First Life Guards — Catholic Soldiers, 975
Longford Barracks, 1098
Military Expedition — The Camel Corps, 992
Military Expedition to Suakin—Transport Department, 839, 840
Militia Officers, 1871
Non-Commissioned Officers' Pensions, 1478
Roman Catholic Chaplains at Suakin, 987, 988
Royal Irish Fusiliers, 1106
Staff Appointment of Deputy Commissary General, 832
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Questions
Calling out of the Reserves, 975 ;—Reserve Men, 992
Examinations, 49
Militia Officers serving in the South African Irregular Force under Sir Charles Warren, 834, 835
Militia Reserves, 987
Militia and Army Reserves—Queen's Message, 999
Officers of the Reserve—Equipment Money, 1863
Queen's Message — Embodiment of the Militia, 681
Queen's Message—The Reserves, 848
Army and Militia Reserve Forces—Consideration of Her Majesty's Message, 1478, 1483, 1493
Army (Annual), 2R. 370; Comm. *add. cl.* 787, 798, 799; 3R. 959
Asia (Central) — England and Russia — Preparations for Hostilities, 984
Russo-Afghan Frontier, 1112
Cape of Good Hope (Advance), 2R. 357
Egypt (Expedition up the Nile)—Sir Charles Wilson's Voyage from Metemneh to Khartoum, 1477
Slave Trade in the Soudan—Prisoners of the Mahdi, 392
Egypt (Military Expedition)—Questions
Biscuit Stores at Korti, 833
Camel Corps, 1099, 1308
Small-Pox, 218
Egypt (War in the Soudan)—Questions 680, 681
General Graham's Advance—Action near Suakin, 170, 233, 391, 392, 843
General Graham's Force, 995
Osman Digna, 1106
Suakin-Berber Railway, 1872
General Gordon's Diaries, 230
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. 767
Supply—Land Forces at Home and Abroad (Exclusive of India), 173

HASTINGS, Mr. G. W., *Worcestershire, E.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1799, 1824, 1825

HAY, Admiral Right Hon. Sir J. C. D., *Wigtown, &c.*
Navy—Questions
Ericson Torpedo Boat, 50
Experiments at Eastney, 664
H.M.S. "Camperdown," 980
Purchase of Merchant Steamers, 1850, 1851
Torpedoes, 981
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 72; Schedule 3, 343
Railways (India) — Bhopal, Gwalior, and Cawnpore Railway, 217

HAYTER, Colonel Sir A. D. (Financial Secretary to the War Office), *Bath*
Contagious Diseases Acts — Returns, 1627, 1628
Egypt—Army of Occupation, 672
Navy — H.M.S. "Inflexible" — The 81-ton Gun, 65
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1780

HEALY, Mr. T. M., *Monaghan*
Asia (Central)—Herat—Action of England in Case of Seizure by Russia, 1868
Russian Attack on the Afghans at Penjdeh —Negotiations, 1476
Ireland—Questions
Fishery Piers and Harbours—Checkpoint Pier, Co. Waterford, 1153
National School Teachers Act, 1875—Workhouse Teachers, 1844
Poor Law—Amalgamation of Newport and Westport Unions, Co. Galway—Compensation to Officers for Abolition of Office, 1628, 1629
Poor Law—Election of Guardians—Monaghan Union—Mr. W. Ancketill, 1845
Representation of the People Act, 1884—Registration of Parliamentary Electors, 1459
Local Authorities (Expenses of Conferences), Comm. Motion for Adjournment, 1432, 1433; *cl.* 1, 1434; *cl.* 2, Motion for reporting Progress, *ib.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 5, 1311, 1320, 1321, 1331; Schedule 6, 1354, 1356, 1366, 1373, 1413, 1424, 1425; Schedule 7, 1834, 1942, 1944, 1945, 1947, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1956, 1958, 1959, 1961
Post Office Sites [Purchase of Land and Expenses], Comm. 1964
Prince and Princess of Wales—Royal Visit to Ireland—Disturbance at Mallow, 1637, 1859, 1860;—Offensive Speeches, 1453
Supply — Public Buildings, Great Britain, 1166, 1167

Heligoland—Proposed Cession to Germany
Observations, Mr. Gorst; short debate thereon *Mar* 30, 1010

HENEAGE, Mr. E., *Great Grimsby*
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 893
Heligoland—Proposed Cession to Germany, 1015
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1737

HENRY, Mr. M., *Galway Co.*
Asia (Central)—Russo-Afghan Frontier—Penjdeh, 838
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—International Arrangement, 261, 262
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 928
Ireland—Post Office—Acceleration of Mails to the West, 650

HERSCHELL, Sir F. (*see* SOLICITOR GENERAL, The)

HIBBERT, Mr. J. T. (Financial Secretary to the Treasury), *Oldham*
Admiralty Retirement, 1477
Brewers, &c., and Brewers' Licences (Parl. P. 311, 1885)—Beer Manufacture, 829
Cape of Good Hope (Advance), 2R. 347, 359, 360
Customs—Galway Docks, 1848
Inland Revenue Department—Extra Payments, 1108
Ireland—Questions
Board of Works—Payment of Drainage Instalments, Loughill, Co. Limerick, 827
Friendly Societies—Distribution of Funds, 46
Inland Navigation and Drainage—River Bann, 649
Inland Revenue—Mr. R. Harvey, Stamp Distributor at Drogheda, 46
Labourers' Act, 1883—Operation of the Act, 671
Public Works Loans—Arklow Breakwater, 214
Relief of Distress Act—Loans to Landlords for Public Works in Donegal, 989
Sligo Harbour Board—Repayment of Loan, 1152
Ireland—Fishery Piers and Harbours—Questions
Checkpoint Pier, Co. Waterford, 1154
Cleggan Pier, Co. Galway, 1154
Clogher Head, Co. Louth, 1299
Culdaff Pier, Co. Donegal, 670
Greystones Pier, 638
Ireland—Piers and Harbours—Questions
Arklow Breakwater, 670
Greystones Breakwater, 990
Malin Head Pier, 669
Sligo Harbour Board, 1843
Works at Easky and Aughris, 223
National Gallery Catalogue, 1095
Parliament—Business of the House, 66
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1713
Public Buildings—Estimated Cost, 1845
Supply—Admiralty and War Office, the New, 1212
British Museum, &c. 1260, 1261
County Court Buildings, 1234, 1238
Fire Brigade in the Metropolis, 1284, 1285
Furniture of Public Offices, Great Britain, 1222, 1223, 1224
Revenue Department Buildings, Great Britain, 1228
Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens, 1072
Sheriff Court Houses, Scotland, 1245, 1248
Surveys of the United Kingdom, 1251, 1252, 1253, 1257, 1258, 1259

HIBBERT, Mr. J. T.—*cont.*
War Office and Admiralty, the New, 1106
Ways and Means, Report, 193

HICKS, Mr. E., *Cambridgeshire*
Agricultural Statistics—British Barley, 377
Brewers, &c., and Brewers' Licences (Parl. P. 311, 1885)—Beer Manufacture, 829
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 5, 510; Schedule 7, 1503, 1534, 1537; Amendt. 1538, 1796, 1815

HILL, Lord A. W., *Downshire*
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Examinations, 49

HILL, Mr. A. S., *Staffordshire, W.*
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 1905; Schedule, 1927, 1928
Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers), 2R. 363
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Comm. Schedule 5, 496; Schedule 7, 1769, 1787, 1788; Amendt. 1789, 1796

HOLLAND, Sir H. T., *Midhurst*
Asia (Central)—Herat—Action of England in Case of Sudden Seizure by Russia, 1868
Cape of Good Hope (Advance), 2R. 351
Egypt—Zebehr Pasha, 836
Heligoland—Proposed Cession to Germany, 1012, 1013
Supply—Admiralty and War Office, the New, 1203
Sheriff Court Houses, Scotland, 1246, 1247

HOLMS, Mr. J. (Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade), *Hackney*
Agricultural Statistics—British Barley, 378
Supply—Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, 1276

Honorary Freedom of Boroughs Bill [H.L.]
(*The Marquess of Ripon*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Mar* 27 (No. 61)

HOPE, Right Hon. A. J. B. Beresford, *Cambridge University*
Supply—Admiralty and War Office, the New, Amendt. 1167, 1173, 1182, 1206, 1215

HOPWOOD, Mr. C. H., *Stockport*
Army (Annual), Comm. *cl.* 5, 769; *cl.* 6, 771, 773; *add. cl.* 787
Egypt (Military Expedition)—Small-Pox, 218
Law and Justice—Conviction of Innocent Men—Establishment of a Court of Criminal Appeal, 1008, 1123
Parliament—Orders of the Day, Res. 849
Poor Law (England and Wales)—Small-Pox—Re-vaccination as a Preventive, 1092
Trade and Commerce—Chinese Duties on Tea—"The Li-kin Dues," 1304, 1468

HOWARD, Mr. E. S., *Cumberland, E.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1826

[*cont.*

HOWARD, Mr. G. J., *Cumberland, E.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1640; Amendt. 1641, 1646

HOWARD, Mr. J., *Bedfordshire*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1511, 1521

HUBBARD, Right Hon. J. G., *London*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) — Representation of the City of London, 55, 56
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 4, Amendt. 454

ILLINGWORTH, Mr. A., *Bradford*
Army and Militia Reserve Forces—Consideration of H.M. Message, 1496
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, Amendt. 1937
Supply—Royal Palaces, 1060
Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens, 1066

INCE, Mr. H. B., *Hastings*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 2, 153

INDIA (*Miscellaneous Questions*)
Aden Harbour, Question, Mr. Norwood; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *April* 14, 1624
Bengal Tenancy Act—The Bengal Landlords, Observations, The Earl of Wemyss, The Marquess of Salisbury; Reply, The Earl of Kimberley *Mar* 20, 36
Education—The Director of Public Instruction in India, Question, Mr. Slagg; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *April* 14, 1630
Madras—Outbreak of Moplahs in the Malabar District, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *Mar* 27, 823
The Banda and Kirwee Prize Money, Question, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *Mar* 30, 972
The Permanent Settlement of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa, 1793, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *Mar* 23, 226

Railways—Bhopal, Gwalior, and Cawnpore Railway, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *Mar* 23, 217
Railway from Quetta to Candahar, Questions, Mr. Onslow; Answers, Mr. J. K. Cross *April* 14, 1632; Question, Sir R. Assheton Cross; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *April* 16, 1850

Industrial and Reformatory Schools
Question, Observations, The Earl of Harrowby; Reply, The Earl of Dalhousie *Mar* 27, 820

IRELAND (*Miscellaneous Questions*)
Borough Funds Act — The Dublin Collector General of Rates, Question, Mr. Dawson; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 30, 992

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*
Charges against Irish Officials—Case of James Ellis French—Colonel Bruce, Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *April* 13, 1454
Friendly Societies — Distribution of Funds, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Hibbert *Mar* 20, 46
Government Officials, Questions, Mr. Lalor, Mr. Sexton; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *April* 13, 1456
Highways—Payment of Road Contractors, Co. Galway, Question, Colonel Nolan; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *April* 13, 1465
Industrial Schools (Ireland) Act — Female Schools, Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *April* 13, 1460
Inland Revenue—Mr. Richard Harvey, Stamp Distributor at Drogheda, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Hibbert *Mar* 20, 45
Labourers' (Ireland) Act, 1883 — *Operation of the Act*, Question, Mr. John O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Hibbert *Mar* 26, 670
Landlord and Tenant — Sir Gilbert King's Tenants, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 23, 218;—*Turf Rights*, Question, Mr. Lea; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *April* 14, 1625
Local Government Board—Surcharge on the Corporation of Dublin for Expenses in attending Cork Industrial Exhibition, Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Gray; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 30, 982
Meetings of the National League—Action of the Police at Rosscrea, Questions, Mr. Harrington; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 30, 988
Pharmacy and Poisons Acts (Ireland)—Legislation, Questions, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Warton; Answers, Mr. Mundella *Mar* 20, 42
Purchase of Land (Ireland) Bill, Question, Mr. T. A. Dickson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 30, 993
Registration of Births and Deaths, Belfast, Questions, Mr. Biggar; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 20, 41
Registration of Parliamentary Electors—Extension of Time for Preparing the Lists, Questions, Mr. T. A. Dickson, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Mar* 30, 985;—*Cost of Preparing Lists*, Question, Mr. Sheil; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *April* 16, 1852
The Boundary Commission (Ireland) — Parliamentary Divisions of the Co. Down — Report of the Commissioner, Question, Lord George Hamilton; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Mar* 30, 987
Relief of Distress (Ireland) Act — Loans to Landlords for Public Works in Donegal, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Hibbert *Mar* 30, 989
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Bill, Question, Mr. Gibson; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 31, 1096
Tenement Valuation, Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 30, 982

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

The Newspaper Press—The "United Ireland"—Offensive Cartoons, Questions, Mr. Beresford, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman; Question, Mr. Sexton [no reply] *Mar* 20, 48

Tramways and Public Companies (Ireland) Act, 1883—*The Proposed Connemara Railway*, Question, Colonel Nolan; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 26, 673

Board of Public Works (Ireland)

Payment of Drainage Instalments, Loughill, Co. Limerick, Question, Mr. Synan; Answer, Mr. Hibbert *Mar* 27, 827

Public Works Loans — Arklow Breakwater, Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, Mr. Hibbert *Mar* 23, 213

Sligo Harbour Board—Repayment of Loan, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Hibbert *April* 9, 1152

Fishery Piers and Harbours (Ireland)

Checkpoint Pier, Co. Waterford, Question, Mr. Healy; Answer, Mr. Hibbert *April* 9, 1153

Cleggan Pier, Co. Galway, Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Hibbert *April* 9, 1154

Clogher Head, Co. Louth, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Hibbert *April* 10, 1299

Culdaff Pier, Co. Donegal, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Hibbert *Mar* 26, 669

Greystones Pier, Co. Wicklow, Questions, Mr. W. J. Corbet, Colonel Nolan; Answers, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 26, 658; Questions, Mr. W. J. Corbet, Mr. M'Coan; Answers, Mr. Hibbert *Mar* 30, 990

Piers and Harbours (Ireland)

Arklow Breakwater — Inspection by the Chairman of the Board of Works, Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, Mr. Hibbert *Mar* 26, 670

Malin Head Pier, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Hibbert *Mar* 26, 669

Sligo Harbour Board, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Hibbert *April* 16, 1843

Works at Easky and Aughris, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Hibbert *Mar* 23, 222

Lunatic Asylums (Ireland)

Insufficient Accommodation, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 30, 978

National Education (Ireland)

Degree Qualifications, Question, Mr. Justin Huntly M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 30, 969

Model School at Bailieborough, Co. Cavan, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 23, 220

Non-Vested National Schools, Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 24, 380

Report of the Commissioners, Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Biggar; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 31, 1087

Teachers

Case of Mrs. Sophia Howe, Ballycastle, Co. Mayo, Question, Mr. Justin Huntly M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 30, 967

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*Teachers*—cont.

Delay of Payments, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 30, 977

Teachers' Examinations, Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 23, 221

Workhouse Teachers, Question, Mr. Healy; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *April* 16, 1844

Poor Law (Ireland)

Amalgamation of Newport and Westport Unions, Co. Galway — Compensation to Officers for Abolition of Office, Questions, Mr. Healy; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *April* 14, 1628

Ballyshannon Union—Appointment of Relieving Officer, Questions, Viscount Crichton, Mr. John O'Connor; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman; Question, Mr. Harrington [no reply] *Mar* 27, 828

Cootehill Union—Robert Graham, Clerk to the Guardians, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 20, 41

Edenderry Union—The Clerk to the Guardians, Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 26, 661

Night Nursing in Workhouses—Return of Attendants, Question, Mr. John Redmond; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 26, 653

Election of Guardians

Drumfin (Sligo Union), and Tyholland Division (Monaghan Union), Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 30, 971

Dunfanaghy Union, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 23, 225

Monaghan Union—Mr. William Ancketill, Question, Mr. Healy; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *April* 16, 1845

The Newry Union, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *April* 14, 1632

North Dublin Board of Guardians, Questions Mr. Sexton; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 30, 977; *April* 13, 1462

Post Office (Ireland)

Acceleration of Mails to the West, Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *Mar* 26, 650

The Mail Service to Kerry, Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *Mar* 26, 657

Kilkenny and Waterford Mail, Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *Mar* 27, 831

Mr. Mathews, Postmaster of Ballymena, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *April* 16, 1847

Mount Temple, Co. Westmeath, Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *Mar* 27, 824

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

Fisheries (*Ireland*)

Boards of Conservators — Free Fishing Licences, Questions, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland; Question, Mr. Callan [no reply] *Mar* 31, 1094

Fishery Board—Payment of Coastguardsmen employed on Special Duty, Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 31, 1094

Sea Coast Fisheries (*Ireland*)

Encroachments of French Fishermen, Observations, Mr. Kenny *Mar* 31, 1146; Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *April* 13, 1463

Inland Navigation and Drainage (*Ireland*)

The River Bann, Question, Sir Thomas M'Clure; Answer, Mr. Hibbert *Mar* 26, 649

Law and Justice (*Ireland*)

Case of Mr. John Boyle O'Reilly, Observations Mr. Sexton; Reply, Sir William Harcourt; Observations, Mr. T. P. O'Connor *Mar* 31, 1131

Charge of Assault against George Barker (*Grange Petty Sessions*), Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *April* 13, 1461

Claim for Malicious Burning—Trial at Wicklow Assizes, Questions, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *April* 13, 1450

Clerk of the Peace, Co. Donegal—Alleged Abstraction of Public Records, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 31, 1086

Death of Denis Murphy, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 23, 219

Election of Petty Sessions Clerk, Toome Bridge District, Co. Antrim—Mr. Kelly, Question, Mr. Small; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 20, 45

Industrial School of Saint Joseph, Dundalk, Questions, Mr. Biggar; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *April* 13, 1458

Ligoneil Petty Sessions, Co. Antrim, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *April* 13, 1464

Nenagh Assizes—Dr. M. J. Cahalan's Claim for attending as a Witness, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 26, 659

Riot at Newry—Trial and Acquittal of William Orr, Questions, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Mar* 24, 393; *Mar* 26, 664

The Craughwell Murder Case—Compensation, Question, Observations, Mr. O'Brien; short debate thereon *Mar* 31, 1147

The Crown Solicitor, Co. Kilkenny, Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Mar* 31, 1089

The Tubbercurry Prisoners, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Mar* 31, 1099

Thurles and Templemore Petty Sessions Districts—Appointment of Clerk, Question, Mr. John O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 26, 660

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

The Magistracy (*Ireland*)

Bailieborough Petty Sessions, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 31, 1099

Borris in Ossory Petty Sessions District, Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 30, 970

Trim Petty Sessions — Major Traill, R.M., Co. Meath, Question, Mr. O'Sullivan; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 23, 217

Mr. Samuel Donaldson, J.P., Co. Donegal, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 23, 223

Colonel Forbes, R.M., Belfast, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 20, 41

Mr. Hardman, J.P., Newtownstewart, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 31, 1093

Mr. Mallaghan, Ballymena, Question, Mr. Moore; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 26, 655

The Grand Jury and the "Free Force," Co. Kilkenny, Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 24, 387

Law and Police (*Ireland*)

Case of Owen Patrick and Thady Lang v. Patrick Lynch, Question, Mr. Commins; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 30, 989

False Charge of Firing at the Person—Case of Mr. Spunner, Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 26, 657

Mr. James Ellis French, Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *April* 16, 1855

The Detective Department — Mr. Jenkinson, Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *April* 13, 1463

The Riots at Derry—Firing at a Procession, Questions, Mr. Lewis, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 31, 1085

Prisons (*Ireland*)

Legislation, Questions, Sir R. Assheton Cross, Mr. T. A. Dickson; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 27, 822

Royal Irish Constabulary

Extra Pay for Acting as Inspectors of Weights and Measures, Question, Mr. M'Coan; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 26, 651; Question, Mr. Synan; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 27, 827

Fishing Irregularity, Lismore District, Questions, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 20, 43; *Mar* 27, 824

Irish National League Meeting at Rosscrea, Question, Mr. John O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 27, 834

Special Draft for Maghera, Co. Londonderry, Question, Mr. Commins; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 30, 981

Sergeant Delaney, Questions, Mr. Barry; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 26, 665; *Mar* 30, 993; *Mar* 31, 1100

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*Royal Irish Constabulary*—cont.
Mr. Fleury, District Inspector of Lisburn, Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *April* 13, 1453
Sergeant M'Canley and others, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 20, 46
District Inspector Murphy, Observations, Mr. Justin Huntly M'Carthy; Debate thereon *Mar* 30, 1018

State of Ireland
Police Protection to Rev. Francis Dopping, Columbkill, Co. Longford, Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *April* 16, 1849

Crime and Outrage (Ireland)
The Catholic Chapel, Hillsborough, Co. Down, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *April* 13, 1464
[See titles *Land Law (Ireland) Act*, 1881 — *Irish Land Commission*
Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Act, 1882]

Ireland—Industries
The Select Committee, Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Answer, Lord Richard Grosvenor *Mar* 27, 844; Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, Lord Richard Grosvenor *Mar* 30, 998; Personal Explanation, Sir Eardley Wilmot *Mar* 31, 1147
Nomination of Select Committee, Moved, "That the Select Committee on Industries (Ireland) do consist of Twenty-one Members" (*Sir Eardley Wilmot*) *April* 9, 1297
Amendt. to leave out "Twenty-one," insert "Twenty-three" (*Mr. John Redmond*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That 'Twenty-one,' &c." [House counted out]

Islands of the Pacific—see title *Western Pacific, Islands of the*

JACKSON, Mr. W. L., *Leeds*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1935

Jamaica—Revenue Department
Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *Mar* 27, 845

JAMES, Hon. W. H., *Gateshead*
Law and Police—Boy Acrobats, 1097, 1098
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1657, 1661

JAMES, Sir H. (*see* ATTORNEY GENERAL, The)

JERNINGHAM, Mr. H. E. H., *Berwick-on-Tweed*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 2, Amendt. 148

JERSEY, Earl of
Asia (Central)—Russia and Afghanistan—Advance of the Russians—The Negotiations, 1840
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—Cost of the Army of Occupation, 2

JONES-PARRY, Mr. T. L., *Carnarvon, &c.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, Amendt. 1545, 1546

KENNARD, Mr. C. J., *Salisbury*
France and China—Hostilities—Right of Search for Contraband of War, 1300

KENNAWAY, Sir J. H., *Devon, E.*
Law and Police—Boy Acrobats, 1097
Post Office—Letter Carriers, 967, 968

KENNY, Mr. M. J., *Ennis*
Army (Annual), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, 370; Comm. *add. cl.* Motion for reporting Progress, 792, 800; 3R. Amendt. 957, 959
Ireland—Questions
Fishery Piers and Harbours—Cleggan Pier Co. Galway, 1154
Law and Police—The Detective Department—Mr. Jenkinson, 1463
National Education—Non-vested National Schools, 380
Royal Irish Constabulary—District Inspector Murphy, 1038, 1040, 1041
Sea Coast Fisheries—Encroachment of French Fishermen, 1146, 1463
National Education (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 535
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Act, 1883—Breakfasts to the Unemployed, 1861
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 2, Amendt. 267, 274, 294; Schedule 3, 435
Venezuela—Revolutionary Expedition against the Government, 1469

KENSINGTON, Right Hon. Lord (Comptroller of the Household), *Haverfordwest*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 5, 507, 514

KIMBERLEY, Earl of (Secretary of State for India)
Army and Militia Reserve Forces—Message from the Queen, 623
Asia (Central)—Russia and Afghanistan—Russian Advances on the Murghab, 1600
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—New Egyptian Loan—International Guarantee, 814
War in the Soudan—General Graham's Force—Action on march near Suakin, 642
Germany, Austria, and Russia, Address for Papers, 638
India—Bengal Tenancy Act—Bengal Landlords, 38

KING-HARMAN, Colonel E. R., *Dublin Co.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1939

KINNEAR, Dr. J., *Donegal*
British Guiana—Alleged Cession of Territory by Venezuela, 654

LABOUCHERE, Mr. H., *Northampton*
Army and Militia Reserve Forces—Consideration of H.M. Message, Amendt. 1483
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—International Arrangement, 263
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 715
Supply—Land Forces at Home and Abroad (Exclusive of India), Amendt. 172.

LAING, Mr. S., *Orkney, &c.*
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—International Arrangement, 265

LALOR, Mr. R., *Queen's Co.*
Ireland—Government Officials, 1456

LAMINGTON, Lord
Diplomatic Service—Secretaries of Embassies, 807
Metropolitan Improvements — Parliament Street, &c. Motion for Papers, 373, 374

Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881—*The Irish Land Commission*
Appeals in Co. Kerry, Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 31, 1088

Sub-Commissioners
The Queen's County, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 30, 978
Mr. Greer, Question, Mr. Tottenham; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *April* 13, 1459

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES) (*Miscellaneous Questions*)
Convictions of Innocent Men—A Court of Criminal Appeal, Observations, Mr. Hopwood, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Speaker *Mar* 30, 1008; Observations, Mr. Hopwood; Reply, Sir William Harcourt; Observations, Sir Eardley Wilmot *Mar* 31, 1123
Ex-Police Inspector Minahan, Questions, Mr. Sheil; Answers, Sir William Harcourt *April* 16, 1852
High Court of Justice—Chancery Division, Questions, Mr. W. H. Smith, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Tomlinson; Answers, The Attorney General *Mar* 23, 214
Sentence on Henry Williams at Winchester Assizes, Question, Mr. W. Fowler; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Mar* 24, 381; Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Mar* 30, 991
Sentence on Mrs. Weldon, Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *April* 16, 1851

[*cont.*

LAW AND JUSTICE (*England and Wales*)—cont.
The Office of Sheriff, Question, Sir Baldwyn Leighton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 13, 1467

Criminal Law
The Dynamite Explosions at Westminster Hall—Constables Cole and Cox, Question, Mr. Fay; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Mar* 20, 52

LAW AND POLICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)
Boy Acrobats, Questions, Sir John Kennaway, Mr. W. H. James; Answers, Sir William Harcourt *Mar* 31, 1097
Metropolis—Sham Clubs, Question, Mr. Hugh Mason; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Mar* 26, 652

LAWRANCE, Mr. J. C., *Lincolnshire, S.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, Amendt. 1734, 1737

LEA, Mr. T., *Donegal*
Ireland—Landlord and Tenant—Turf Rights, 1625
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 2, 168

LEAKE, Mr. R., *Lancashire, S.E.*
Local Authorities (Expenses of Conferences), Comm. 1433
Parliament—Business of the House, 56
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1724, 1727

LEATHAM, Mr. E. A., *Huddersfield*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1837

LEATHAM, Mr. W. H., *York, W. R., S. Div.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, Amendt. 1931

LEFEVRE, Right Hon. G. J. Shaw (Postmaster General), *Reading*
Parliament — House of Commons — Ladies' Gallery, Res. 1007
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 2, 166, 288; Schedule 5, 510, 561, 562, 564. 612; Schedule 6, 1355, 1424, 1425
Post Office—Questions
Irregular Deliveries at West Brompton, 1087
Letter Carriers, 968
Mr. A. Turner, Postmaster at Oakham, 1153
Parcel Post Horses, 50
Political Postmasters, 664
Sixpenny Telegrams, 234
Post Office (Ireland)—Questions
Acceleration of Mails to the West, 650, 1458
Irish Mails, 1846
Kilkenny and Waterford Mail, 831
Letter Sorters on the Irish Packet Boats, 974
Mail Service to Kerry, 657

[*cont.*

LEFEVRE, Right Hon. G. J. Shaw—*cont.*
Mr. Mathews, Postmaster of Ballymena, 1848
Mount Temple, Co. Westmeath, 824
Post Office (Acquisition of Sites), Appointment and Nomination of Select Committee, 961
Post Office—Postal Service (Great Britain and North America), Appointment of Select Committee, 194
Post Office Sites, 2R. 193
Post Office Sites [Purchase of Land and Expenses], Comm. 1962
Supply—Admiralty and War Office, the New, 1171, 1173, 1174, 1179, 1180, 1193, 1196, 1201, 1206, 1207, 1214, 1215
British Museum, 1262, 1264, 1267
Report, 1432
Revenue Department Buildings, 1226
Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens, 1064, 1065
Surveys of the United Kingdom, 1259
Telegraph Acts Amendment, Motion for Leave, 1072, 1082

LEIGHTON, Sir B., *Shropshire, S.*
Law and Justice—The Office of Sheriff, 1467
Local Taxation, Ministerial Statement, 1466
Local Taxation and Local Government, 387

LEIGHTON, Mr. S., *Shropshire, N.*
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 885
Elementary Education—Revised Code, 1885, Motion for an Address, 1599
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1772, 1774, 1785

LEITRIM, Earl of
Trinity College (Perpetuity Grants), 2R. 198, 203

LEVETT, Colonel T. J., *Lichfield*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1788, 1799

LEWIS, Mr. C. E., *Londonderry*
Ireland—Law and Police—Riots at Derry—Firing at a Procession, 1085
North British Railway, 2R. 1447, 1448
Parliament—Business of the House, 63
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 2, 158; Schedule 3, 324, 332, 445; Schedule 5, 511; Amendt. 538, 546, 550, 552, 562, 573, 584, 591
Prince and Princess of Wales—Royal Visit to Ireland—Offensive Speeches, 1452

LEWISHAM, Viscount, *Kent, W.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 6, Amendt. 1374, 1377, 1384; Schedule 7, 1930

Lighthouse Illuminants
Questions, Mr. Gray; Answers, Mr. Chamberlain *Mar* 27, 825

Literature, Science, and Art
British Museum — Lighting and Hours of Opening, Questions, Mr. Daniel Grant, Mr. Molloy; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 16, 1853

[*cont.*

Literature, Science, and Art—cont.
The National Gallery—The Annual Grant, Question, Observations, The Earl of Wemyss; Reply, Lord Thurlow; short debate thereon *Mar* 20, 38;—*The Catalogue*, Question, Mr. Joseph Cowen; Answer, Mr. Hibbert *Mar* 31, 1095

LLOYD, Mr. M., *Beaumaris*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 309

LLOYD, Mr. S. S., *Warwickshire, S.*
Parliamentary Elections—County Boundaries (Warwickshire, &c.), 673
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 4, 469; Schedule 5, 550

Local Authorities (Expenses of Conferences) Bill (*Mr. Leake, Mr. Algernon Egerton, Mr. Agnew, Mr. Arnold*)
c. Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *April* 10, 1432
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Healy*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Original Question put, and agreed to; Committee—R.P. [Bill 88]

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Labourers Act) (No. 1) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord President*)
l. Read 2ª * *Mar* 27 (No. 35)
Committee *; Report *April* 14
Read 3ª * *April* 16

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Labourers Act) (No. 2) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord FitzGerald*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Mar* 30 (No. 64)

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Public Health Act) (No. 1) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord FitzGerald*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Mar* 30 (No. 63)

Local Government Provisional Orders Bill (*Mr. George Russell, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Report * *Mar* 27 [Bill 91]
Read 3° * *Mar* 30
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Carrington*) *April* 13 (No. 66)

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. George Russell, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 31 [Bill 120]
Read 2° * *April* 14

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) Bill
(*Mr. George Russell, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Report * *Mar* 27 [Bill 86]
Read 3° * *Mar* 30
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Carrington*) *April* 13 (No. 67)

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. George Russell, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 23 [Bill 107]
Read 2° * *Mar* 31
Report * *April* 13
Considered * *April* 14
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Carrington*) *April* 16 (No. 71)

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 3) Bill
(*Mr. George Russell, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 23 [Bill 108]
Read 2° * *Mar* 31
Report * *April* 13
Read 3° * *April* 14
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Carrington*) *April* 16 (No. 72)

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 4) Bill
(*Mr. George Russell, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 31 [Bill 116]

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 5) Bill
(*Mr. George Russell, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 31 [Bill 117]
Read 2° * *April* 14

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 6) Bill
(*Mr. George Russell, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 31 [Bill 118]
Read 2° * *April* 14

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 7) Bill
(*Mr. George Russell, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 31 [Bill 119]
Read 2° * *April* 14

Local Taxation and Local Government
Questions, Sir Baldwyn Leighton, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 13, 1466
Legislation, Question, Mr. Duckham; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Mar* 24, 378; Question, Sir Baldwyn Leighton; Answer, Mr. Gladstone, 387

LODER, Mr. R., *Shoreham*
Education Department — Education Grants, 1096

London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Bill (by Order)
c. 2R. deferred, after short debate *Mar* 26, 646
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*) *April* 14, 1608
Amendt. to leave out from "That," add "this House declines to assent to the Second Reading of a Private Bill which proposes to set aside the provisions of 'The Disused Burial

[*cont.*

London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Bill—cont.
Grounds Act, 1884'" (*Mr. Ritchie*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; main Question put; Bill read 2°

LOWTHER, Right Hon. J., *Lincolnshire, N.*
Asia (Central)—Russo-Afghan Frontier, 1116, 1117
England and Turkey, 997
Mines, Accidents in—Report of the Royal Commission, 232
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1642, 1647

LOWTHER, Mr. J. W., *Rutland*
Egypt—Zebehr Pasha, 1100
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1645, 1648

LUBBOCK, Sir J., *London University*
Education Department—School Board Elections (Voting), Appointment of Select Committee, 517, 518
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—Revenue and Expenditure, 383

Lunacy Acts Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Mar* 26 (No. 60)

Lunacy Laws—Reception of Insane Persons into Workhouses
Question, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answer, Mr. George Russell *Mar* 24, 390

LYONS, Dr. R. D., *Dublin*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 2, 280; Schedule 3, 412; Schedule 4, Amendt. 489; Schedule 5, 602

MCARTHUR, Sir W., *Lambeth*
Africa—West African Settlement—Sir Samuel Rowe, 379

MCARTHUR, Mr. A., *Leicester*
West India Islands—Communications with the United States and Canada, 1848

MACARTNEY, Mr. J. W. E., *Tyrone*
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—International Arrangement, 266
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 90, 134, 138

M'CARTHY, Mr. Justin, *Longford*
Army (Annual), Comm. *add. cl.* 798
Ireland—Questions
National Schools—Teachers' Examinations, 221
Royal Irish Constabulary—District Inspector Murphy, 1021
State of Ireland—Police Protection to the Rev. Francis Dopping, Columbkill, Co. Longford, 1849

[*cont.*

M'Carthy, Mr. J.—*cont.*
National Education (Ireland) Motion for Leave, 526
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 442; Schedule 5, 603
Ways and Means—Report, 186

M'Carthy, Mr. J. Huntly, *Athlone Bo.*
Army—Longford Barracks, 1098
Education Department—Science Teachers, 967
Ireland—Questions
National Education—Degree Qualifications, 969
National School Teachers—Case of Miss Sophia Howe, Ballycastle, Co. Mayo, 967
Royal Irish Constabulary—District Inspector Murphy, 1018, 1043, 1044
Ways and Means, Report, 190

M'Clure, Sir T., *Londonderry Co.*
Ireland—Inland Navigation and Drainage—River Bann, 649

M'Coan, Mr. J. C., *Wicklow*
Asia (Central)—Russia and Afghanistan—Penjdeh, 382, 383
Declaration of Paris, 1856, 1155
Egypt—Army of Occupation, 672;—Convention, 1100
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—Questions
Deductions from the Coupons, 1476
Egyptian Preference and Unified Debts, 1464
International Arrangement, 227, 228, 229, 676
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 730
England and Turkey—Anglo-Turkish Convention, 1095, 1096
Ireland—Questions
Piers and Harbours—Greystones Breakwater, 990
Royal Irish Constabulary—Extra Pay for acting as Inspectors of Weights and Measures, 651
Visit of H.R.H. the Prince and Princess of Wales to Ireland—Disturbance at Mallow, 1860

Macfarlane, Mr. D. H., *Carlow Co.*
Asia (Central)—Questions
England and Russia—Russo-Afghan Frontier, 231
Russia and Afghanistan—Russian Advances, 1633, 1634, 1635
Russian Attack on the Afghans at Penjdeh, Ministerial Statement, 1165
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 712
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 82
Scotland—Suspension of Evictions, 230, 980

Mac Iver, Mr. D., *Birkenhead*
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 1916

McKenna, Sir J. N., *Youghal*
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 713
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 424

Mackie, Mr. R. B., *Wakefield*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Comm. Schedule 7, 1837

Mackintosh, Mr. C. Fraser-, *Inverness, &c.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Comm. Schedule 1, 93

McLagan, Mr. P., *Linlithgowshire*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 112
West India Islands—Grenada Highways, &c. Improvement, 666

Macliver, Mr. P. S., *Plymouth*
Army—Non-Commissioned Officers' Pensions, 1478
Navy—Purchase of Merchant Steamers, 1851

MacMahon, Mr. E., *Limerick City*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Schedule 3, 415

Madagascar—Postal Communication
Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *April* 14, 1626

Magniac, Mr. C., *Bedford*
France and China—Hostilities—International Law—Contraband of War—Rice, 1101, 1102
Supply — Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens, 1069

Makins, Colonel W. T., *Essex, S.*
London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway, 2R. 1617
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, Amendt. 1666, 1667, 1668
Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers), 2R. 360, 361

Manners, Right Hon. Lord J. J. R., *Leicestershire, N.*
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—International Arrangement, 247
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 6, 1345; Schedule 7, Amendt. 1729, 1730, 1731, 1823, 1941
Supply—Admiralty and War Office, the New, 1198

Mappin, Mr. F. T., *East Retford*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, Amendt. 1745, 1746, 1747

Marjoribanks, Hon. E., *Berwickshire*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 89, 90

Marlborough, Duke of
Asia (Central) — Russia and Afghanistan—Articles in the "Times" Newspaper, 196, 802
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—New Egyptian Loan—International Guarantee, 814

Marriages Validity Bill [H.L.]
(*Mr. Attorney General*)
c. Read 1° * *Mar* 20 [Bill 103]

MARRIOTT, Mr. W. T., *Brighton*
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 902, 911

MARTIN, Mr. R. B., *Tewkesbury*
Supply—Fire Brigade in the Metropolis, 1281

MARUM, Mr. E. P. M., *Kilkenny Co.*
Ireland — Magistracy — Grand Jury and the "Free Force," Co. Kilkenny, 387
Post Office—Kilkenny and Waterford Mail, 831

MASKELYNE, Mr. M. H. N. STORY-, *Cricklade*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1818; Amendt. 1820, 1822

MASON, Mr. Hugh, *Ashton-under-Lyne*
Law and Police (Metropolis)—Sham Clubs, 652

MAXWELL, Sir H. E., *Wigtonshire*
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Examinations, 50
Egypt (War in the Soudan)—General Graham's Force—Actions at Suakin, 667, 668
Parliament — Palace of Westminster — Westminster Hall, 234

MAXWELL-HERON, Captain J. M., *Kirkcudbright*
Army (Annual), Comm. *add. cl.* 797
Egypt (War in the Soudan)—General Graham's Force—Actions at Suakin, 667

MAYNE, Mr. T., *Tipperary*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 429; Schedule 5, 586, 604

MELDON, Mr. C. H., *Kildare*
National Education (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 527
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 420; Schedule 5, 609

MELLOR, Mr. J. W., *Grantham*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1773

Merchant Shipping—Registry of Shipping
Question, Mr. Joseph Cowen; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *Mar* 26, 653

Metropolis
Sham Clubs, Question, Mr. Hugh Mason; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Mar* 26, 652
The Parks—Victoria Park, Question, Mr. Bryce; Answer, Mr. Herbert Gladstone *Mar* 27, 835

Metropolitan Improvements — Parliament Street, &c.
Moved, "That there be laid before this House, papers relating to the widening of Parliament Street, Charles Street, &c." (*The Lord Lamington*) *Mar* 24, 373; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

MILLTOWN, Earl of
Criminal Law Amendment, 2R. 1440

MILNER, Sir F. G., *York City*
Army—Payment for Additional Kit, 1869

Mines, Accidents in—Report of the Royal Commission
Question, Mr. J. Lowther; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Mar* 23, 232

MINTO, Earl of
Minister for Scotland — Scotch National Schools, 208, 212

MOLLOY, Mr. B. C., *King's Co.*
Army (Annual), Comm. *cl.* 6, 773, 780, 781
Army (Auxiliary Forces) — Officers of the Reserve—Equipment Money, 1863
British Museum — Lighting and Hours of Opening, 1854
Supply — British Museum, &c. 1261, 1263, 1264; Amendt. 1267, 1269, 1273, 1274
County Court Buildings, 1237, 1238
Fire Brigade in the Metropolis, 1279, 1280
Surveys of the United Kingdom, 1257

MONK, Mr. C. J., *Gloucester City*
Cape of Good Hope Advance, 2R. Amendt. 350
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 713
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1942
Spain—Commercial Negotiations, 979

MOORE, Mr. A. J., *Clonmel*
Ireland—Magistracy—Ballymena — Mr. Mallaghan, 655

MORETON, Lord, *Gloucestershire, W.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1691

MORGAN, Right Hon. G. Osborne (Judge Advocate General), *Denbighshire*
Army and Militia Reserve — Consideration of H.M. Message, 1483
Army (Annual), 2R. 367, 368, 369; Comm. *cl.* 5, 768, 769; *cl.* 6, 772, 773, 777, 778, 780, 781; *cl.* 7, 782; *add. cl.* 785, 795, 796, 799

MORLEY, Earl of (Under Secretary of State for War)
Army — Military Expedition to the Soudan—Defective Ammunition, 643, 645
Royal Military Academy, Woolwich — New Buildings, 645
Cape of Good Hope (Advance), 2R. 807
Egypt (Finance, &c.) — Cost of the Army of Occupation, 3

MOUNT-TEMPLE, Lord
Opening of Museums on Sunday — Natural History Museum, South Kensington, Res. 23

MUNDELLA, Right Hon. A. J. (Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education), *Sheffield*
Allotments Extension Act, 1882—Charity Commission—Flawton Charity Land, 845
Education Department—Questions
Brailes Endowed School — A Political Schoolmaster, 222
Croydon School Board, 1626
Education Code, 671
Education Grants, 1096
School Board Divisions (Metropolis), 972
Science Teachers, 967
Education Department (Scotland)—Questions
Ayr (Landward) and Ayr (Burgh), 216
Kirkintilloch School Board, 1304
School Accommodation in Caithness, 1624
Education (Muir's School, &c. Scheme), Motion for an Address, 1754, 1759
Elementary Education—Revised Code, 1885, Motion for an Address, 1580, 1590, 1599
Ireland—Pharmacy and Poisons Acts, 42, 43
Supply—Surveys of the United Kingdom, 1255, 1256, 1257

Municipal Voters (Relief) Bill
(*The Earl of Rosebery*)
l. Read 2ª * *Mar* 26 (No. 39)
Committee *; Report *April* 14
Read 3ª * *April* 16

MUNTZ, Mr. P. A., *Warwickshire, N.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1520, 1793, 1812

MUNTZ, Mr. P. H., *Birmingham*
Heligoland — Proposed Cession to Germany, 1015
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 5, 564

NAPIER OF MAGDALA, Lord
Egypt (War in the Soudan)—General Graham's Force—Action on march near Suakin, 641

National Education (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Mr. Hibbert*)
c. Motion for Leave *Mar* 24, 518; after debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 111]

NAVY (*Miscellaneous Questions*)
Administration—The Accountant General of the Navy, Question, Lord Oranmore and Browne; Answer, The Earl of Northbrook *April* 14, 1601
Admiralty Retirement, Question, Mr. Stuart-Wortley; Answer, Mr. Hibbert *April* 13, 1476
NAVY—*cont.*
Experiments at Eastney, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey *Mar* 26, 664
H.M.S. "Camperdown," Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey *Mar* 30, 980
H.M.S. "Canada," Question, Baron Henry De Worms; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey *Mar* 26, 663
H.M.S. "Garnet," Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Caine *Mar* 24, 381
H.M.S. "Inflexible"—The 81-ton Gun, Question, Mr. French-Brewster; Answer, Sir Arthur Hayter *Mar* 20, 65
H.M.S. "Mercury"—Portsmouth Dockyard, Question, Mr. E. Stanhope; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey *Mar* 30, 976
Merchant Steamers for the Navy, Purchase of, Questions, Sir John Hay, Mr. Stewart Macliver; Answers, Sir Thomas Brassey *April* 16, 1850
Merchant Steamers as Transport Cruisers, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey *April* 10, 1302
Naval Discipline Act—Cases of Endersby and Quinn, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Caine *Mar* 30, 988
Protection of the Black Sea and Baltic, Questions, Mr. Norwood; Answers, Sir Thomas Brassey *April* 10, 1301
Ships—Building and Repairs, Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey *April* 13, 1452
The Baltic—Preparations for Hostilities on Breaking up of the Ice, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey *Mar* 26, 663
The China Station, Question, Observations, Viscount Sidmouth; Reply, The Earl of Northbrook; short debate thereon *Mar* 27, 815
The Ericson Torpedo Boat, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Caine *Mar* 20, 50
Torpedo Boats—The Controller of the Navy, Questions, Viscount Sidmouth; Answers, The Earl of Northbrook *Mar* 24, 376
Torpedoes—Numbers and Armament, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey *Mar* 30, 981
Troopships—The Dockyards, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Caine *Mar* 26, 652

New Guinea
Questions, Mr. William Redmond; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 20, 57

NEWPORT, Viscount, *Shropshire, N.*
Army (Military Expedition to Suakin)—The Transport Department, 839
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1783, 1795

NOEL, Mr. E., *Dumfries, &c.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 86
Scotland — Law and Justice — Magistracy — Commission of the Peace—Dumfries Borough and County, 837

NOLAN, Colonel J. P., *Galway Co.*
Army—The Reserve Men, 991
Army and Militia Reserve Forces—Consideration of H.M. Message, 1482
Army (Annual), Comm. *cl.* 5, 768, 769; *cl.* 6, 770, 776, 781; *add. cl.* 785, 799, 800
Customs—Galway Docks, 1848
France and China—Hostilities—International Law—Contraband of War—Rice, 1102
Ireland—Questions
Fishery Piers and Harbours — Clogher Head, Co. Louth, 1300;—Greystones Pier, 658
Highways—Payment of Road Contractors, Co. Galway, 1465
Tramways and Public Companies Act, 1883—Proposed Connemara Railway, 673
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1727, 1955
Post Office (Contracts)—Irish Mails, 1458

NORTH, Colonel J. S., *Oxfordshire*
Egypt (Military Expedition)—Royal Marines at Suakin, 650
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1748, 1749

North Borneo Company—Labuan
Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *Mar* 24, 380

North British Railway Bill (*by Order*)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir Charles Forster*) *April* 13, 1443
Amendt. to leave out "now," add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Waddy*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

NORTHBROOK, Earl of (First Lord of the Admiralty)
Navy—Questions
Administration—Accountant General of the Navy, 1602
The China Station, 816
Torpedo Boats—Controller of the Navy, 377
Post Office—Telegraphic Communication with Hong Kong, 1606

NORTHCOTE, Right Hon. Sir S. H., *Devon, N.*
Army—Queen's Message—The Reserves, 848
Army and Militia Reserve Forces—Consideration of H.M. Message, 1481, 1494
Asia (Central)—Questions
England and Russia—Preparations for Hostilities, 984
Herat—Action of England in case of Sudden Seizure by Russia, 1865
Russia and Afghanistan—Negotiations, 621
Russian Attack on the Afghans at Penjdeh, Ministerial Statement, 1158, 1160, 1163, 1164, 1165, 1308, 1309, 1310;—Negotiations, 1471, 1472
Russo-Afghan Frontier, 1110; — Russian Advances, 1634

[*cont.*

NORTHCOTE, Right Hon. Sir S. H.—*cont.*
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—International Arrangement, 58, 60, 61; Motion for Adjournment, 235, 236, 243, 266
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 683, 716, 931, 938, 943, 1924, 1926
Parliament—Business of the House, 1157, 1158, 1873
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 68, 107; Schedule 3, 340; Schedule 4, 463, 467, 479; Schedule 5, 497, 501; Schedule 6, 1383, 1396; Schedule 7, 1512, 1536, 1652
Suez Canal—International Commission, 384, 678
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, 679

NORTHCOTE, Mr. H. S., *Exeter*
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 1910
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 2, Amendt. 148, 154

North Sea Fisheries—Belgian Trawlers
Question, Mr. Birkbeck; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey *Mar* 30, 990

NORTON, Lord
Education Department—Higher Education in Wales, 820
Metropolitan Improvements — Parliament Street, &c. Motion for Papers, 376
Parliament—Westminster Hall (Restoration), 802

NORWOOD, Mr. C. M., *Kingston-upon-Hull*
Asia (Central)—Russian Attack on the Afghans at Penjdeh, Ministerial Statement, 1164
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 1902, 1904
India—Aden Harbour, 1624
Navy—Protection of the Black Sea and Baltic, 1301
Suez Canal—Proposed Commission, 224

O'BEIRNE, Colonel F., *Leitrim*
Army (Annual), Comm. *add. cl.* 786

O'BRIEN, Sir P., *King's Co.*
Parliament — House of Commons — Ladies' Gallery, Res. 1005
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 444
Supply—Royal Palaces, 1057, 1058
Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens, 1070

O'BRIEN, Mr. W., *Mallow*
Ireland—Questions
Fisheries—Boards of Conservators—Free Fishing Licences, 1094
Fishery Piers and Harbours—Culdaff Pier, Co. Donegal, 669
Law and Police—Riot at Newry—Case of William Orr, 393, 664, 665
Piers and Harbours—Malin Head Pier, 669
Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Arrests in Killarney, 838
Relief of Distress Act—Loans to Landlords for Public Works in Donegal, 989

[*cont.*

O'Brien, Mr. W.—*cont.*
Roman Catholic Chaplains at Suakin, 987
Royal Irish Constabulary—Fishing Irregularity—Lismore District, 43, 824
Ireland—Law and Justice—Questions
Craughwell Murder Case—Compensation, 1147
Nenagh Assizes — Dr. M. J. Cahalan's Claim for attending as a Witness, 659
Riots at Derry—Firing at a Procession, 1085
National Education (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 536
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 2, 290; Schedule 3, 425, 428
Ways and Means, Report, 191

O'Connor, Mr. A., *Queen's Co.*
Afghanistan—Arrest of Ayoob Khan, 1636, 1854
Army (Annual), 2R. 367, 368; Comm. *cl.* 6, 771, 779; *add. cl.* 788, 799
Asia (Central)—Questions
Herat — Action of England in case of Sudden Seizure by Russia, 1865
Russian Attack on the Afghans at Penjdeh, Ministerial Statement, 1166;—Negotiations, 1473
Russo-Afghan Frontier, 1109
Egypt—Convention, 1101
Egypt (War in the Soudan)—Questions 680
General Graham's Force—Actions on the 20th and 22nd of March, 391
Withdrawal of the Forces, 1143
Egyptian Loan, 2R. 1290, 1296
France and China—Hostilities—International Law—Contraband of War—Rice, 1105
Inland Revenue Department—Extra Payments, 1108
Ireland—Questions
Irish Land Commission (Sub-Commissioners), 978
Lunatic Asylums—Insufficient Accommodation, 978
Magistracy—Borris in Ossory Petty Sessions District, 970, 971
National Education — National School Teachers—Delay of Payments, 977
Poor Law—Edenderry Union—Clerk of the Guardians, 661, 662
Local Taxation, Ministerial Statement, 1467
Post Office Sites [Purchase of Land and Expenses], Comm. 1963, 1964
Supply—Admiralty and War Office, the New, 1208, 1211
Fire Brigade in the Metropolis, 1284
Furniture of Public Offices, Great Britain, 1216, 1220, 1224
Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, 1274
Metropolitan Police Court Buildings, 1241
Sheriff Court Houses, Scotland, 1244, 1245, 1248
Surveys of the United Kingdom, 1257, 1258
Universities (Scotland), Motion for Leave, 962
Ways and Means, Report, 192, 193

O'Connor, Mr. J., *Tipperary*
Ireland—Questions
Labourers' Act, 1883—Operation of the Act, 670
Law and Justice—Thurles and Templemore Petty Sessions District—Appointment of Clerk, 660
Poor Law—Ballyshannon Union—Appointment of Relieving Officer, 829
Royal Irish Constabulary—Irish National League Meeting at Roscrea, 834

O'Connor, Mr. T. P., *Galway*
Army (Annual), 2R. 368, 369
Army (Promotion)—82nd Regiment, 829, 1107
Education Department—School Board Elections (Voting), Appointment of Select Committee, 518
Egypt (War in the Soudan)—General Graham's Force—Actions on the 20th and 22nd March, 391
Ireland—Questions
Law and Justice—Case of Mr. John Boyle O'Reilly, 1137
Magistracy—Ballymena—Mr. Mallaghan, 656
Newspaper Press—The "United Ireland"—Offensive Cartoons, 48
Registration of Parliamentary Voters—Extension of Time for Preparing the Lists, 985
Royal Irish Constabulary—District Inspector Murphy, 1051
Tenement Valuation, 982
Law and Justice—Case of H. Williams, Convicted of Perjury at Poole, 991
National Education (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 534
Parliament—Business of the House, 64, 846, 847
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 89, 94; Schedule 3, 415, 443, 446; Schedule 4, 448, 451, 453, 454, 460, 467, 470, 471; Schedule 5, 566; Schedule 6, Amendt. 1356, 1368, 1370, 1424
Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers), 2R. 363
Postal Service (Great Britain and North America), Appointment of Select Committee, 195
Supply—Royal Palaces, 1053
Telegraph Acts Amendment, Motion for Leave, 1081
Ways and Means, Report, 188

O'Donnell, Mr. F. H., *Dungarvan*
Asia (Central) — Russia and Afghanistan — Russian Attack on the Afghans at Penjdeh —Negotiations, 1474
Egypt—Questions
Finance, &c.—International Arrangement, 251
Suppression of the "Bosphore Egyptien," 1166, 1468
Zebehr Pasha, 1630
Prince and Princess of Wales—Royal Visit to Ireland—Riot at Mallow, 1623

O'Kelly, Mr. J., *Roscommon*
Asia (Central)—Russian Attack on the Afghans at Penjdeh, Ministerial Statement, 1164, 1309;—Negotiations, 1469

O'Kelly, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Egypt—Questions
Affairs of the Soudan — General Gordon's Mission, 1307
Suppression of the "Bosphore Egyptien," 1166, 1304
War in the Soudan, 680; — Withdrawal of the Forces, 1141
France and China—Hostilities—International Law—Contraband of War—Rice, 1105

Onslow, Mr. D. R., *Guildford*
Asia (Central)—Questions
Russia and Afghanistan—Advance of the Russians, 675, 676, 1633, 1635
Russia and Afghanistan—Penjdeh, 382
Russian Attack on the Afghans at Penjdeh, Ministerial Statement, 1165; — Negotiations, 1473
Russian Railway from the Caspian to Sarakhs, 53
Russo-Afghan Boundary, 53, 54, 1119
Russo-Afghan Frontier Commission, 389, 390
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—International Arrangement, 62
Egypt (War in the Soudan), 681
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 721
North British Railway, 2R. 1450
Parliament—Palace of Westminster—Smoking Room, 229
Post Office—Parcel Post Horses, 50
Railways (India)—Railway from Quetta to Candahar, 1632
Suez Canal—Proposed Commission, 224, 225

Opening of Museums on Sundays—The Natural History Museum, South Kensington
Moved to resolve, "That whereas a considerable majority of the Trustees of the British Museum present at a general meeting on the 17th of January last specially called to consider the question, voted in favour of opening the National History Museum at South Kensington on Sunday afternoons; and whereas it is desirable to afford the working classes of London such further opportunities of instruction, recreation, and enjoyment as they would obtain thereby, and as are already conceded in Manchester, Birmingham, Stoke-upon-Trent, Dublin, Newcastle, Middlesbro', and other centres of industry; that, for the above and for other reasons affecting the health and happiness, the morality and sobriety, of the working classes of London, this House is of opinion that the time has now come to support the decision taken by the Trustees of the British Museum in regard to this question" (*The Lord Thurlow*) *Mar* 20, 7
Amendt. to leave out after ("That") insert ("the Trustees of the British Museum having applied to the Treasury for the funds necessary to light up the Natural History Museum with the electric light, and having lighted up the Reading Room of the British Museum with the electric light till eight o'clock at night for several years with 'very satisfactory results,' and having obtained estimates for lighting the whole of the

[*cont.*

Opening of Museums on Sundays—The Natural History Museum, South Kensington—cont.
British Museum at night with electricity, and bearing in mind that the South Kensington Museum has been opened till ten o'clock at night for twenty-eight years, and been visited at night by 6,885,722 persons, and that the Bethnal Green Museum has been opened at night for twelve years, and been visited in the evenings by 3,567,278 persons, and that a Parliamentary Committee has recommended 'That the British Museum and National Gallery should be opened on week-day evenings between the hours of seven and ten in the evening at least three days in the week,' this House is of opinion that the time has arrived when this recommendation should be carried into effect, and the national collections opened on week-day evenings but not on Sundays") (*The Earl Cairns*); after debate, on Question, whether the words &c.; Cont. 64, Not-Cont. 64
Division List, Cont. and Not-Cont. 34
The numbers being equal, the Not-Contents had it, according to the established Rule
Amendment (*Earl Cairns*) put, and agreed to

Oranmore and Browne, Lord
Navy (Administration) — Accountant General of the Navy, 1601, 1603
Trinity College (Perpetuity Grants), 2R. 207

O'Sullivan, Mr. W. H., *Limerick Co.*
Ireland—Magistracy—Trim Petty Sessions—Major Traill, R.N., Co. Meath, 217

Otway, Sir A. J. (Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means and Deputy Speaker), *Rochester*
Army (Annual), Comm. *cl.* 6, 781, 782; *add. cl.* 784, 797, 800
North British Railway, 2R. 1448, 1449
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 68, 80, 81, 87, 90; Schedule 2, 148; Schedule 4, 486, 487; Schedule 5, 546, 617, 618, 620; Schedule 6, 1339, 1340, 1363; Schedule 7, 1524, 1544, 1551, 1552, 1559, 1563, 1640, 1649, 1650, 1654, 1696, 1698, 1699, 1701, 1703, 1748, 1749, 1770, 1781, 1834, 1944
Supply—British Museum, &c. 1266
County Court Buildings, 1235
Public Buildings, Great Britain, 1166

Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Provisional Order Bill (*Mr. Holms, Mr. Chamberlain*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 9 [Bill 124]
Read 2° * *April* 14

Paget, Mr. R. H., *Somersetshire, Mid*
Education Department — Revised Code, 1885, 1467
Elementary Education—Revised Code, 1885, Motion for an Address, 1576
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1775, 1776, 1778, 1779, 1781, 1782, 1784

[*cont.*

PAGET, Mr. R. H.—*cont.*
Parliamentary Elections — Representation of the People Act, 1884—Deputy Returning Officers, 662
Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers), 2R. 364

PALMER, Mr. C. M., *Durham, N.*
France—Ship Brokerage, 979

PARKER, Mr. C. S., *Perth*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 111, 112

Parliament
LORDS—
Private Bills
Ordered, That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Friday the 19th day of June next: [and other Orders] *Mar* 23, 212

Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills
Ordered, That Standing Orders Nos. 92. and 93. be suspended; and that the time for depositing petitions praying to be heard against Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills, which would otherwise expire during the adjournment of the House at Easter, be extended from this day to the first day on which the House shall sit after the recess *Mar* 27

House of Lords—The late Earl Cairns, Observations, Earl Granville; short debate thereon *April* 13, 1435
Westminster Hall (*Restoration*), Question, Lord Norton; Answer, The Earl of Rosebery *Mar* 27, 802

COMMONS—
THE NEW RULES OF PROCEDURE
Adjournment — (Rule 2) (Draft Convention relating to Egyptian Affairs)
Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Sir Stafford Northcote*) *Mar* 23, 235; after debate, Motion withdrawn

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE
Moved, "That the Orders of the Day be postponed until after the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Egyptian Loan" (*Mr. Gladstone*) *Mar* 27, 849; after short debate, Motion agreed to

SITTINGS AND ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE
Resolved, That, whenever the House meets at Two of the clock, the Sittings of the House shall be held subject to the Resolutions of the House of the 30th of April 1869 (*Lord Richard Grosvenor*) *Mar* 26
Adjournment—The Easter Recess, Observations, Earl Granville *Mar* 20, 1
Moved, "That this House, at its rising, do adjourn till Thursday the 9th of April" (*The Marquess of Hartington*) *Mar* 31; Question put, and agreed to

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*Sittings and Adjournment of the House*—cont.
Moved, "That this House, at its rising, do adjourn till To-morrow" (*Lord Richard Grosvenor*) *Mar* 27, 963; Motion agreed to

ORDER
Select Committees—Attendance of Members, Question, Observations, Mr. Sexton; Reply, Mr. Speaker *April* 16, 1841
Railway Rates and Charges Bills, Question, Mr. Rolls; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *April* 16, 1853

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE AND PUBLIC BUSINESS
Questions, Mr. Raikes, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Dr. Cameron, Mr. R. N. Fowler; Answers, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Speaker *Mar* 27, 846; Questions, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Sexton; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *April* 16, 1873;—*Questions to Ministers,* Question, Mr. Leake; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 20, 56;—*Irish Bills,* Questions, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, 63;—*The East India* (*Loan*) *Bill,* Question, Mr. E. Stanhope; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross, 65;—*The Cape of Good Hope* (*Advance*) *Bill,* Question, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answer, Mr. Hibbert, 66;—*Parliamentary Elections* (*Redistribution*) *Bill,* Question, Sir R. Assheton Cross; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Mar* 26, 680;—*The Egyptian Loan Bill,* Questions, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 9, 1157

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS
County Boundaries (*Warwickshire, &c.*), Question, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Mar* 26, 673
Parliamentary Elections (*Corrupt and Illegal Practices*) *Act,* 1883 — *Breakfasts to the Unemployed,* Questions, Mr. Kenny, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answers, The Attorney General *April* 16, 1861
Representation of the People Act, 1884—*Deputy Returning Officers,* Question, Mr. R. H. Paget; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 26, 662

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER
The Smoking Room, Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, Mr. Herbert Gladstone *Mar* 23, 229
Westminster Hall (*Restoration*), Questions, Sir Herbert Maxwell, Mr. Causton; Answers, Mr. Herbert Gladstone *Mar* 23, 234

The House of Commons—The Ladies' Gallery
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 30, To leave out from "That," add "in the opinion of this House, it is advisable to substitute for the present grating of the Ladies' Gallery (or some portion of it) a railing so constructed as not largely to exclude sound, light, and air; and generally, that the accommodation of the gallery should be im-

[*cont.*

Parliament—Palace of Westminster—The House of Commons—The Ladies' Gallery—cont.
proved" (*Mr. Sydney Buxton*) *v.*, 999; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 121, N. 75; M. 46 (D. L. 86)

PARLIAMENT—HOUSE OF LORDS
Sat First
Mar 27—The Earl of Shrewsbury and Earl Talbot, after the death of his father

Took the Oath for the First Time
April 13—The Lord Bishop of London
April 14—The Lord Bishop of Llandaff

Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill
The Boundary Maps, Question, Mr. Francis Buxton; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Mar* 20, 51
Representation of the City of London, Question, Mr. J. G. Hubbard; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 20, 55
The Wimbledon Division, Question, Mr. Grantham; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *April* 14, 1626

Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill (*Mr. Gladstone, The Marquess of Hartington, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Attorney General, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman*)
c. Committee [Seventh Night]—R.P. *Mar* 20, 66
Committee [Eighth Night]—R.P. *Mar* 23, 266
Committee [Ninth Night]—R.P. *Mar* 24, 394
Committee [Tenth Night]—R.P. *Mar* 25, 538
Committee deferred, after short debate *Mar* 26, 767
Committee [Eleventh Night]—R.P. *April* 10, 1310
Committee [Twelfth Night]—R.P. *April* 13, 1500
Committee [Thirteenth Night]—R.P. *April* 14, 1639
Committee [Fourteenth Night]—R.P. *April* 15, 1762
Committee [Fifteenth Night]—R.P. *April* 16, 1929

Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers) Bill (*Mr. Attorney General, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Read 2°, after short debate *Mar* 23, 360 [Bill 99]

PARNELL, Mr. C. S., *Cork City*
Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary—District Inspector Murphy, 1041, 1044
Local Authorities (Expenses of Conferences), Comm. 1433
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 5, 1327, 1336; Schedule 6, 1363, 1419, 1425
Supply—County Court Buildings, 1234, 1236
Fire Brigade in the Metropolis, 1285
Surveys of the United Kingdom, 1249, 1251, 1252, 1253, 1255, 1256
[*cont.*

PARNELL, Mr. C. S.—*cont.*
Visit of H.R.H. the Prince and Princess of Wales to Ireland—Disturbance at Mallow, 1636, 1637, 1638, 1856, 1858, 1859

PATRICK, Mr. R. W. COCHRAN-, *Ayrshire, N.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 98

PEASE, Mr. A., *Whitby*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1830

PEDDIE, Mr. J. DICK-, *Kilmarnock, &c.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 75; Amendt. 95, 99, 108; Schedule 6, 1399
Supply, Report, 1431

PEEL, Right Hon. A. W. (*see* SPEAKER, The)

PEEL, Right Hon. Sir R., *Huntingdon*
Parliament—House of Commons—Ladies' Gallery, Res. 1006
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1708, 1709, 1790, 1792, 1793
Supply—Admiralty and War Office, the New, 1178, 1180, 1181, 1183, 1206, 1207

PELL, Mr. A., *Leicestershire, S.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1535, 1541, 1730

PENDER, Mr. J., *Wick, &c.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 88

PERCY, Right Hon. Earl, *Northumberland, N.*
Army and Militia Reserves—Consideration of H.M. Message, 1483

PERCY, Lord A. M. A., *Westminster*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 319

PICTON, Mr. J. A., *Leicester Bo.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 5, Amendt. 499, 502

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders Bill (*Mr. Holms, Mr. Chamberlain*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 9 [Bill 123]

PLAYFAIR, Right Hon. Sir Lyon, *Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities*
Elementary Education—Revised Code, 1885—Motion for an Address, 1583

PLUNKET, Right Hon. D. R., *Dublin University*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 423; Schedule 5, 608

Police Bill (*Mr. Henry H. Fowler, Secretary Sir William Harcourt, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Hibbert*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 24 [Bill 113]

Poor Law (*England and Wales*)
Pauper Married Couples, Question, Lord George Hamilton; Answer, Mr. George Russell *April* 16, 1842
Poor Rates and Pauperism—The Insane Poor, Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Mar* 26, 658
Small-Pox — Re-vaccination as a Preventive, Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Mr. George Russell *Mar* 31, 1092

PORTMAN, Hon. W. H. B., *Dorsetshire*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1652

POST OFFICE (*Miscellaneous Questions*)
Contracts—Clothing Contracts, Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, Mr. Brand *April* 13, 1451
The Irish Mails, Question, Colonel Nolan; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *April* 13, 1458; Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *April* 16, 1846
Irregular Deliveries at West Brompton, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *Mar* 31, 1087
Letter Carriers, Questions, Sir John Kennaway; Answers, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *Mar* 30, 967
Letter Sorters on the Irish Packet Boats, Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *Mar* 30, 974
Political Postmasters, Question, Mr. Whitley; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *Mar* 26, 664;—*Mr. A. Turner, Postmaster at Oakham*, Question, Mr. E. Stanhope; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *April* 9, 1153
Savings Banks Act—Belfast (*King Street*) *Savings Bank*, Questions, Mr. Gray; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 9, 1151
Sixpenny Telegrams, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *Mar* 23, 234
The Parcel Post Horses, Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *Mar* 20, 50

Post Office—Postal Service (*Great Britain and North America*)
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed 'to inquire into the conditions of the Postal Service between Great Britain and North America, and to report what alterations should be made with a view to its improvement" (*Mr. Shaw Lefevre*) *Mar* 20, 193; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Post Office Sites Bill
(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Hibbert*)
c. Read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee *Mar* 20, 193; short debate thereon [Bill 72]
Select Committee nominated *Mar* 27; List of the Committee, 961

Post Office Sites [*Purchase of Land and Expenses*]
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *April* 16, 1962; after short debate
[House counted out]

Prevention of Crime (*Ireland*) *Act*, 1882
Arrests in Killarney, Questions, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 27, 838
Proclamations — Prohibition of Meeting at Burroughtown, Co. Wexford, Observations, Mr. William Redmond; Reply, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman; Observations, Mr. Barry *Mar* 31, 1144

Public Buildings—Estimated and Actual Cost
Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. Hibbert *April* 16, 1844

Public Health Acts — Medical Officer of Health, Cheltenham—Appointment of Mr. Roch
Question, Mr. J. A. Campbell; Answer, Mr. George Russell *April* 16, 1860

Public Health (Members and Officers) Bill (*Sir John Kennaway, Mr. Long, Mr. Cowen*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 25 [Bill 114]

Public Offices—The New War Office and Admiralty
Question, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answer, Mr. Hibbert *Mar* 31, 1106

PULESTON, Mr. J. H., *Devonport*
Cape of Good Hope (Advance), 2R. 354, 360
Egypt (Affairs of the Soudan)—Lord Wolseley and the Soudan, 54
Parliament — House of Commons — Ladies' Gallery, Res. 1002
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 308

RAIKES, Right Hon. H. C., *Cambridge University*
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—The Porte—The Convention of London, March 18, 1885, 1157
England and Turkey — Anglo-Turkish Convention, 1096
Parliament—Business of the House, 846

[*cont.*

RAIKES, Right Hon. H. C.—*cont.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 76, 88; Amendt. 139; Schedule 2, Amendt. 156, 158; Schedule 3, 305, 311; Amendt. 312, 325, 330, 331; Schedule 4, Amendt. 447, 459, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 470, 471; Schedule 7, Amendt. 1503, 1508, 1519, 1520, 1522, 1524, 1526, 1527, 1528, 1529, 1538, 1542, 1543, 1544, 1546, 1547, 1549, 1565, 1569, 1639, 1643, 1645, 1646, 1647, 1648, 1649, 1651, 1653, 1654, 1655, 1656, 1660, 1670, 1672, 1674, 1685, 1686, 1690, 1692, 1693, 1696, 1703, 1704, 1707, 1709, 1710, 1712, 1729, 1731, 1732, 1733, 1737, 1739, 1740, 1741, 1742, 1743, 1744, 1745, 1747, 1748, 1749, 1750, 1767, 1768, 1774, 1775, 1776, 1778, 1780, 1781, 1783, 1786, 1789, 1800, 1801, 1802, 1803, 1804, 1805, 1806, 1810, 1815, 1816, 1821, 1822, 1823, 1824, 1825, 1831

RAMSAY, Mr. J., *Falkirk, &c.*
Education (Muir's School, &c. Scheme), Motion for an Address, 1759

RAMSDEN, Sir J. W. *York, W. R., E. Div.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1936

RANKIN, Mr. J., *Leominster*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, Amendt. 1698, 1699, 1701, 1704

Rating of Machinery Bill (*Mr. Norwood, Mr. Brunton, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Slagg*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 15 [Bill 127]

REDESDALE, Earl of (Chairman of Committees)
Trinity College (Perpetuity Grants), 2R. 203

REDMOND, Mr. J. E., *New Ross*
Industries (Ireland), Nomination of Select Committee, 1298
Ireland—Poor Law—Night Nursing in Workhouses—Return of Attendants, 653, 654

REDMOND, Mr. W. H. K., *Wexford*
Africa (South)—Sir Charles Warren's Mission, 53
Army (Annual), 2R. 369
Egypt (Events in the Soudan) — Mr. Frank Power, 64
Ireland — Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Proclamations — Prohibition of Meeting at Burroughtown, Co. Wexford, 1144, 1145
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 135; Schedule 2, 292; Schedule 3, 432; Schedule 5, 615, 617, 618, 620
Supply—Land Forces at Home and Abroad (Exclusive of India), 176
Western Pacific—New Guinea, 57, 58

REED, Sir E. J., *Cardiff*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, Amendt. 297, 311

Registration (Occupation Voters) Bill (*Mr. Attorney General, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Henry H. Fowler*)
c. Select Committee nominated *Mar* 20; List of the Committee, 195

Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 23 [Bill 110]
Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Harrington; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *Mar* 31, 1090

Representation of the People Act, 1884—*Registration of Parliamentary Electors (Ireland)*
Question, Mr. Healy; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *April* 13, 1459

REPTON, Mr. G. W. J., *Warwick*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 5, 553

RICHMOND AND GORDON, Duke of
Agricultural Statistics—Correction, 36

RITCHIE, Mr. C. T., *Tower Hamlets*
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Queen's Message—Embodiment of the Militia, 681, 998
Egypt (Military Expedition) — Canned Meat, 968, 969
London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway, 2R. 646, 1608, 1612; Amendt. 1613
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 319, 320

ROGERS, Mr. J. E. Thorold, *Southwark*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 2, 152; Schedule 3, 327; Schedule 7, 1726

ROLLS, Mr. J. A., *Monmouthshire*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1740
Railway Rates and Charges, 1853

ROSEBERY, Earl of (Lord Privy Seal and First Commissioner of Works)
Metropolitan Improvements — Parliament Street, &c. Motion for Papers, 373, 374, 375, 376
Parliament — Westminster Hall (Restoration), 802

ROSS, Mr. C., *St. Ives*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1561

Royal Irish Constabulary Redistribution Bill (*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 20 [Bill 105]
Read 2°, after short debate *Mar* 26, 801
Committee; Report *Mar* 30, 1083
Considered * *April* 15

RUSSELL, Mr. G. W. E. (Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board), *Aylesbury*
Lunacy Laws — Reception of Insane Persons into Workhouses, 391
Poor Law (England and Wales) — Pauper Married Couples, 1842;—Small-Pox — Revaccination as a Preventive, 1092
Public Health Acts—Medical Officer of Health, Cheltenham — Appointment of Mr. Roch, 1861

RUSSELL, Mr. C., *Dundalk*
Education (Muir's School, &c. Scheme), Motion for an Address, 1754
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 342; Schedule 7, 1744

RYLANDS, Mr. P., *Burnley*
Egyptian Loan, 2R. 1292
Navy (Ships)—Building and Repairs, 1452
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1770, 1794
Supply—Admiralty and War Office, The New, 1192, 1193
Fire Brigade in the Metropolis, 1280
Furniture of Public Offices, Great Britain, 1219, 1220, 1225
Metropolitan Police Court Buildings, 1241
Sheriff Court Houses, Scotland, 1247
Surveys of the United Kingdom, 1250, 1258

SALISBURY, Marquess of
Africa (South)—Bechuanaland, 622
Army and Militia Reserve Forces—Consideration of Queen's Message, 623, 1601
Asia (Central)—Questions
Russian Advance on the Murghab, 1600
Russian Attack on the Afghans at Penjdeh —Negotiations, 1442, 1443, 1839
Russo-Afghan Frontier, 803
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—New Egyptian Loan—International Guarantee, 808, 815
Egypt (War in the Soudan)—General Graham's Force—Action on march near Suakin, 641
Federal Council of Australasia, 1R. 1840
Germany, Austria, and Russia, Address for Papers, 639
India — Bengal Tenancy Act — The Bengal Landlords, 37
Metropolitan Improvements — Parliament Street, &c. Motion for Papers, 374
Parliament—House of Lords—The late Earl Cairns, 1436
Post Office—Telegraphic Communication with Hong Kong, 1607

SAMUELSON, Sir B., *Banbury*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, Amendt. 1747, 1748, 1749

SCLATER-BOOTH, Right Hon. G., *Hants, N.*
Egyptian Loan, 2R. 1290
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1696

SCOTLAND (*Miscellaneous Questions*)
Law and Justice (*Scotland*)—*The Magistracy—Commission of the Peace, Dumfries Borough and County*, Question, Mr. Ernest Noel; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 27, 837
Minister for Scotland—Scotch National Schools, Question, Observations, The Earl of Minto, The Earl of Fife, The Earl of Aberdeen; Reply, The Earl of Dalhousie *Mar* 23, 208
Suspension of Evictions, Question, Mr. Macfarlane; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Mar* 30, 980
Tenure of Land in the Highlands, &c.—Legislation, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Mar* 30, 968
The Boundary Commission (*Scotland*)—*Instructions to the Commissioners*, Question, Mr. John Hamilton; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 24, 378
Trawling—Legislation, Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 26, 672

Education Department (*Scotland*)
Ayr (*Landward*) *and Ayr* (*Burgh*), Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. Mundella *Mar* 23, 216
Kirkintilloch School Board, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. Mundella *April* 10, 1303
School Accommodation in Caithness, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. Mundella *April* 14, 1624
The Cumnock School Board Election, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 27, 830

SCOTT, Mr. M. D., *Sussex, E.*
Asia (Central)—Herat—Action of England in case of Sudden Seizure by Russia, 1864

SELLAR, Mr. A. C., *Haddington, &c.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 83, 84, 93

SELWIN-IBBETSON, Sir H. J., *Essex, W.*
London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway, 2R. 1608, 1613
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1668

SEXTON, Mr. T., *Sligo*
Army—1st Life Guards—Catholic Soldiers, 974
Army (Annual), 2R. 366, 367, 369, 371; Comm. *add. cl.* 789, 793, 796, 798
County Officers and Courts (Ireland) [Pensions], Comm. Motion for Adjournment, 365, 366
Egyptian Loan, 2R. 1294
Ireland—Questions
Fishery Piers and Harbours — Clogher Head, Co. Louth, 1299, 1300
Friendly Societies—Distribution of Funds, 46
Government Officials, 1456
Industrial School Act—Female Schools, 1460, 1461
Inland Revenue—Mr. Richard Harvey, Stamp Distributor at Drogheda, 45
Irish Industries—Select Committee, 998
Landlord and Tenant—Sir Gilbert King's Tenants, 218

[*cont.*

SEXTON, Mr. T.—*cont.*
Local Government Board—Surcharge on the Corporation of Dublin for Expenses in attending Cork Industrial Exhibition, 982, 983
Magistracy—Mr. Hardman, J.P., Newtownstewart, 1093;—Mr. Samuel Donaldson, J.P., Co. Donegal, 223, 224
National Education — Model School at Bailieborough, Co. Cavan, 220;—Report of the Commissioners, 1087, 1088
Newspaper Press—The "United Ireland"—Offensive Cartoons, 49
Piers and Harbours—Sligo Harbour Board, 1843;—Works at Easky and Aughris, 222
Post Office—Acceleration of Mails to the West, 650
Registration of Voters Bill, 1090, 1091
Royal Irish Constabulary — District Inspector Murphy, 1025, 1027, 1032;—Sergeant M'Canley and others, 46
Sligo Harbour Board—Repayment of Loan, 1152, 1153
Ireland—Law and Justice—Questions
Charge of Assault against George Barker (Grange Petty Sessions), 1461
Death of Denis Murphy, 219
Mr. John Boyle O'Reilly, 1131, 1132, 1135, 1137
Tubbercurry Prisoners, 1099
Ireland—Poor Law—Questions
Election of Guardians — Drumfin (Sligo Union), and Tyholland Division (Monaghan Union), 971
Election of Guardians—Dunfanaghy Union, 225
North Dublin Board of Guardians, 977, 1462
National Education (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 523, 524, 530
Parliament—Questions
Adjournment, 963
Business of the House, 63, 1874
Order—Select Committees—Attendance of Members, 1841, 1842
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 1, 84, 130, 131; Schedule 2, 275, 282; Schedule 3, Amendt. 394, 398, 403, 404, 407, 408, 409, 411, 412, 428, 443; Schedule 4, 450, 453; Schedule 5, 499, 549, 554, 555, 564, 581; Amendt. 594, Schedule 5, 1321, 1323, 1335; Schedule 6, Amendt. 1399, 1400, 1411, 1412, 1425, 1430
Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers), 2R. 364
Postal Service (Great Britain and North America), Appointment of Select Committee, 194
Post Office (Acquisition of Sites), Appointment and Nomination of Select Committee, 961, 962
Post Office Sites [Purchase of Land and Expenses], Comm. 1962
Royal Irish Constabulary Redistribution, 2R. 801; Comm. *add. cl.* 1083
Supply—County Court Buildings, 1235, 1238
Royal Palaces, 1055
Surveys of the United Kingdom, 1259, 1260
Telegraph Acts Amendment, Motion for Leave, 1082
Ways and Means, Report, 178, 182

SHEIL, Mr. E., *Meath Co.*
Law and Justice—Ex-Police Inspector Minahan, 1852
Registration of Parliamentary Electors (Ireland)—Cost of Preparing Lists, 1852

SIDMOUTH, Viscount
Defences of the Empire—Defence of the Coaling Stations, 1838
Navy—The China Station, 815, 820
Torpedo Boats—Controller of the Navy, 376
Post Office—Telegraphic Communication with Hong Kong, 1603

SIMON, Mr. Serjeant J., *Dewsbury*
Jamaica—Revenue Department, 845
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1746; Amendt. 1835

SLAGG, Mr. J., *Manchester*
Education (India)—Director of Public Instruction in India, 1630
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 886
Gold and Silver Plate—Hall-Marking, 651

SMALL, Mr. J. F., *Wexford Bo.*
Law and Justice (Ireland) — Election of Petty Sessions Clerk, Toome Bridge District, Co. Antrim—Mr. Kelly, 45
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 5, 583; Schedule 7, 1949; Amendt. 1953, 1956

SMITH, Right Hon. W. H., *Westminster*
Education Department—Education Code, 671
Egypt (War in the Soudan)—General Graham's Advance—Action near Suakin, 170
Egyptian Loan, 915; 2R. 1292
Egyptian Loan—Messrs. Rothschild, 1457
Electric Lighting Act, 1457
France and China—Hostilities—Contraband of War—Rice, 674, 675, 1153
High Court of Justice—Chancery Division, 214
Lunacy Laws — Reception of Insane Persons into Workhouses, 390
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 322
Supply—Admiralty and War Office, the New, 1189, 1213
Supply—Supplementary Estimates—Ways and Means, 63
War Office and Admiralty, the New, 1106

SMITH, Mr. S., *Liverpool*
Egypt (War in the Soudan) — Withdrawal of the Forces, 1128
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 6, Amendt. 1371, 1373

SOLICITOR GENERAL, The (Sir FARRER HERSCHELL), *Durham*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1658
Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers), 2R. 362, 363, 365

Solicitors (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord FitzGerald*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *Mar* 23 (No. 53)
Read 2ª * *April* 13

Spain
The Commercial Negotiations, Question, Mr. Monk ; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 30, 979
Declaration of December 21, 1884, Question, Mr. Cartwright ; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *April* 14, 1627

SPEAKER, The (Right Hon. ARTHUR WELLESLEY PEEL), *Warwick*
Army (Annual), 2R. 366, 367, 371
Asia (Central) — Russia and Afghanistan—Afghan Boundary Commission — Sir Peter Lumsden's Mission, 1862
County Officers and Courts (Ireland) [Pensions], Comm. 366
Egypt—Slave Trade in the Soudan—Prisoners of the Mahdi, 393
War in the Soudan — Withdrawal of the Forces, 1141
Egyptian Loan, 2R. 1296
France and China—Hostilities—International Law—Contraband of War—Rice, 1102
Ireland—Questions
Charges against Irish Officials — Case of James Ellis French — Colonel Bruce, 1156
Industries, Select Committee, Personal Explanation, 1147
Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Proclamations — Prohibition of Meeting at Burroughtown, Co. Wexford, 1145
Registration of Voters, 1091
Royal Irish Constabulary — District Inspector Murphy, 1019, 1026, 1038
Law and Justice — Convictions of Innocent Men—Establishment of a Court of Criminal Appeal, 1010
North British Railway, 2R. 1448, 1450
Parliament—Business of the House, 847, 848
Select Committees — Attendance of Members, 1841, 1842
Post Office Sites [Purchase of Land and Expenses], Comm. 1963, 1964
Visit of H.R.H. the Prince and Princess of Wales to Ireland — Disturbance at Mallow, 1637, 1639, 1860
War Office and Admiralty, the New, 1106

STANHOPE, Earl
Asia (Central)—Russia and Afghanistan—Advance of the Russians—Negotiations, 1840

STANHOPE, Hon. E., *Lincolnshire, Mid*
Asia (Central)—Russian Attack on the Afghans at Penjdeh—Negotiations, 1473
Russo-Afghan Frontier Commission, 389, 994
Inland Revenue — Income Tax — Half-Yearly Payments, 1849
Navy—Portsmouth Dockyard—H.M.S. "Mercury," 976
Parliament—Business of the House, 65

STANHOPE, Hon. E.—*cont.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 4, 483 ; Schedule 7, 1732, 1737, 1940
Post Office — Mr. A. Turner, Postmaster at Oakham, 1153
Supply — British Museum, &c. 1260, 1261, 1270
Fire Brigade in the Metropolis, 1279
Surveys of the United Kingdom, 1257

STANLEY, Right Hon. Colonel F. A., *Lancashire, N.*
Army (Auxiliary Forces) — Calling out of the Reserves, 975
Army—Queen's Message—The Reserves, 849
Egypt (War in the Soudan)—General Graham's Forces — Action near Suakin (March 22), 233
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 713

STANLEY, Hon. E. L., *Oldham*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 331 ; Schedule 7, Amendt. 1728, 1729, 1737

STANLEY, Mr. E. J., *Somerset, W.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1782

STANTON, Mr. W. J., *Stroud*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1675, 1679, 1683, 1687, 1689

STOREY, Mr. S., *Sunderland*
Egypt (War in the Soudan)—General Graham's Force—Action near Suakin (March 22), 843, 844

STRATHEDEN AND CAMPBELL, Lord
Germany, Austria, and Russia, Address for Papers, 630, 638, 639

STRUTT, Hon. C. H., *Essex, E.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1669

Suez Canal
Navigation of the Canal — International Arrangements, Question, Mr. Gourley ; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 23, 225
The Proposed International Commission, Questions, Mr. Norwood, Sir H. Drummond Wolff ; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice ; Questions, Mr. Onslow, Mr. Gibson [no reply] *Mar* 23, 224 ; Questions, Mr. Gibson, Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir H. Drummond Wolff ; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 24, 384

SULLIVAN, Mr. T. D., *Westmeath*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1960
Visit of the Prince and Princess of Wales to Ireland—Disturbance at Mallow, 1638

[*cont.*

SUPPLY
Supplementary Estimates—Ways and Means—Question, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 20, 63

SUPPLY
Resolutions [19th March] reported *Mar* 20, 170
First Resolution [Numbers] agreed to
Resolution 2 [Pay and Allowances]
Amendt. to leave out "£4,543,000," insert "£4,043,000" (*Mr. Labouchere*), 172; Question proposed, 'That £4,543,000' stand part of the said Resolution;" after short debate, Question put; A. 67, N. 18; M. 49 (D. L. 74)
Resolution agreed to
[See title *Army (Annual) Bill*]
Considered in Committee *Mar* 30 — CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES — CLASS I. — PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS—Votes 1, 2, 3
Resolutions reported *April* 9
Considered in Committee *April* 9, 1166—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES — CLASS I. — PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS—Votes 6 to 20
Resolutions reported, and, after short debate, agreed to *April* 10, 1431

Suspension of Evictions (Scotland) Bill
Question, Mr. Macfarlane; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Mar* 23, 230

SUTHERLAND, Mr. T., *Greenock*
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 882

SYDNEY, Earl (Lord Steward of the Household)
Egypt (War in the Soudan) — Military Co-operation of the Colonies—H.M. Answer to the Address, 196

SYKES, Mr. C., *York, E. R.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1833

SYNAN, Mr. E. J., *Limerick Co.*
Ireland—Board of Works—Payment of Drainage Instalment, Loughill, Co. Limerick, 827
Royal Irish Constabulary — Extra Pay for Acting as Inspectors of Weights and Measures, 827
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 2, 276

TALBOT, Mr. J. G., *Oxford University*
Education Department—Education Code, 671
Elementary Education — Revised Code, 1885, Motion for an Address, 1569, 1580

Telegraph Acts Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Hibbert*)
c. Motion for Leave *Mar* 24, 537; debate adjourned
Debate resumed *Mar* 30, 1072; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Bill ordered
Read 1° * *Mar* 31 [Bill 121]

TENNANT, Mr. C., *Peeblesshire*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 345

THOMPSON, Mr. T. C., *Durham*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1657, 1662, 1809

THURLOW, Lord
Opening of Museums on Sundays — Natural History Museum, South Kensington, 3
Science and Art — National Gallery — Annual Grant, 39

TOLLEMACHE, Mr. H. J., *Cheshire, W.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1549

TOMLINSON, Mr. W. E. M., *Preston*
Army (Annual), Comm. *cl.* 6, 780
Asia (Central) — Russia and Afghanistan — Afghan Boundary Commission — Sir Peter Lumsden's Mission, 1862
Egyptian Loan, 2R. 1296; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1927, 1928
Friendly Societies Acts, 1876 and 1877 — Disputes between Head Societies and Branches, 215
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 2, 170; Schedule 6, 1346, 1378, 1398; Schedule 7, 1690, 1722
Supply—British Museum, &c. 1265
County Court Buildings, 1229, 1234
Furniture of Public Offices, Great Britain, 1222
Revenue Department Buildings, Great Britain, 1225, 1226, 1228
Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens, 1067, 1068, 1072
Telegraph Acts Amendment, Motion for Leave, 1080

TORRENS, Mr. W. T. M'C., *Finsbury*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 3, 318; Schedule 4, 459

TOTTENHAM, Mr. A. L., *Leitrim*
Ireland—Irish Land Commission (Sub-Commissioners)—Mr. Greer, 1459

Trade and Commerce
Chinese Duties on Tea—The "Li-kin Dues," Questions, Mr. Hopwood; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *April* 10, 1304; *April* 13, 1468
France — Ship Brokerage, Question, Mr. Charles Palmer; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 30, 979
Spain—The Commercial Negotiations, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *Mar* 30, 979

Tramways (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord President*)
l. Read 2ª * *Mar* 27 (No. 31)
Committee * *April* 14
Report * *April* 16

WILLIAMS, Major-General Owen, *Great Marlow*
Army (Military Expedition)—Camel Corps, 992, 1098

WILLIAMSON, Mr. S., *St. Andrews, &c.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 4, 482

WILLS, Mr. W. H., *Coventry*
Education Department — Brailes Endowed School—A Political Schoolmaster, 221

WILMOT, Sir J. E., *Warwickshire, S.*
Army (Military Expedition to the Soudan)—Defective Ammunition, 832
Industries (Ireland)—Select Committee, 844; —Personal Explanation, 1147
Law and Justice—Conviction of Innocent Men —Establishment of a Court of Criminal Appeal, 1127
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 2, 155, 156; Schedule 3, Amendt. 294, 297; Schedule 5, 556

WILSON, Sir M., *York, W. R., N. Div.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, Amendt. 1834

WOLFF, Sir H. D., *Portsmouth*
Army and Militia Reserve Forces—Consideration of H.M. Message, 1492
Asia (Central)—Russo-Afghan Boundary, 54, 232
Russo-Afghan Frontier Commission, 390
Civil Service (Parliamentary Candidature)—Sir W. Brampton Gurdon, 1155
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—International Arrangement, 251, 252, 253;—Suez Canal, 677, 678
Egypt (War in the Soudan)—General Graham's Force—Action near Suakin, 22nd March, 844
Suakin-Berber Railway, 1871

[*cont.*

WOLFF, Sir H. D.—*cont.*
France and China—Hostilities—International Law—Contraband of War—Rice, 1102, 1105
Naval Discipline Act—Cases of Endersby and Quinn, 988
Navy—Baltic—Preparations for Hostilities on Breaking up of the Ice, 663
Troopships, 652
Suez Canal—Proposed Commission, 224, 385
Supply—Admiralty and War Office, the New, 1194

WOODALL, Mr. W., *Stoke-on-Trent*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 4, Amendt. 460, 464

WORTLEY, Mr. C. B. STUART-, *Sheffield*
Admiralty Retirement, 1476
Egyptian Loan, Comm. 890
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1932; Amendt. 1933, 1935, 1936, 1937
Supply—Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens, 1069
Telegraph Acts Amendment, Motion for Leave, 1079

WYNDHAM, Hon. P. S., *Cumberland, W.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1567, 1642, 1648

YORKE, Mr. J. R., *Gloucestershire, E.*
Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution), Comm. Schedule 7, 1681, 1686, 1688

Young Girls, Protection of—Legislation
Question, Mr. Cropper; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Mar* 24, 393

ZOUCHE OF HARYNGWORTH, Lord
Trinity College (Perpetuity Grants), 2R. 207

ERRATUM.

Page 882, line 15, from top, for (Mr. T. C. Bruce) *read* (Baron de Worms).

BIBL. LONDIN. UNIV.

END OF VOLUME CCXCVI., AND FOURTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1884-5.

LONDON: CORNELIUS BUCK, 22, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.